Results Framework

The MOP Perspective for NSDP

Basics

The Results Framework is expected to allow senior government staff to answer three key questions:

- Is the plan being effective?
- How does one know whether one is on the right path?
- If not, where is the deviation?
- How does one use this information continuously for regular corrective action?

This, the RF is a useful at different stages in project and programme management

An approach to M&E

Expenditures made are tracked in terms of them translating to OUTCOMES

<u>It is not enough</u> to allocation of $XXXX for a school building has been adequately spent (**Inputs**)

<u>At least</u>, the school should have actually been constructed as per the specifications & on time, & is functional in terms of its hardware, trained and qualified personnel, teaching curricula, etc. (**Activity/Output**)

<u>Additionally</u>, the school *attracts children from the catchment-area* (**Outcome**)

<u>Finally</u>, children attend schools, pass and become literate/ educated, and the society moves towards becoming more productive, more jobs are created, poverty reduces, etc. (**Impact**)

3

A general caution

There is generally an ambiguity in distinguishing 'outcome' from 'output'. Sometimes, this is also done out of lack of choice. But this could result in problems:

- If outputs are taken as outcomes, there could be problems related to 'moral hazard' (over-use – like counting the visits of patients to Health Centres, which is an output variable)
- On the converse, there could be problems related to dis-use, i.e. under-use of outputs owing to a range factors like their location, access by users, etc. (schools made, but children don't go because of other reasons)
- MOP has a general position that measuring outcomes and impacts is a superior option

At the economy level, the Results Framework would be different

1. It is possible to establish a 'Results Framework' for a project or a programme, but not for the economy / country *in the classic style.*
2. This is because a programme has inputs and is expected to have commensurate outputs, and intended outcome in its 'catchment' area.
3. However, at the economy/country-level, outcomes / impacts do not result from one or two projects, but also by a range of market- and non-market related factors, externalities from other interventions, and the internal and external environment, in different combinations.

Some examples

1. Poverty reduction stems from a range of factors other than direct intervention programmes $\longrightarrow$ labour-using non-farm activities, rural to urban migration, better education &/or health, increase in farm productivity, better farm prices, and a lot more.

2. Agricultural productivity and farmers' incomes have risen more through farmers' initiatives than through extension programmes in most of Asia and these initiatives are fed from external factors.

3. There appears little relationship between family-planning programmes and fertility reduction almost anywhere.

Macro Analysis needs to go beyond classical RF

It follows that classical RF has limitations in macro level applications in open economies: It is just too complex to construct.

Only detailed Econometric and CGE-type Models can be of some help, but they operate for very short time-horizons.

Also, they require too much data, which are just not there, and the models are far too expensive to construct & maintain.

MOP addresses performance at the economy-level: Macro Outcomes and Impacts

1. To match the <u>Outcome Indicators</u> against the <u>Set Targets</u> at the beginning of the plan (or at some other time), for a particular year – e.g. poverty reduction, IMR, literacy

2. In select cases, to match <u>outputs</u> against <u>outcomes</u> – e.g. WATSAN [populations covered by clean water (administrative data on output) v/s populations actually availing of clean drinking water (survey data – outcome)]

3. To develop & use proxy indicators when outputs / outcomes are intangibles or do not have a regular definition – e.g. governance, inclusive growth

The approach

1.   MOP, in consultation with all the line ministries and agencies (incl. SNEC), has identified some 64 core indicators and some 125 auxiliary monitoring indicators to assess the performance of the NSDP. The auxiliary indicators are mainly sectoral

2.   This list will expand further depending upon the need and the requests from various line departments and consultations are continuing

3.   These indicators include all the identified CMDG Indicators – the key indicators are in the core list

Structure of the indicators

The core indicators can be divided into five categories:

1. Aggregate outcome indicators – GDP, poverty, inequality, inflation;
2. Aggregate output indicators which stand for outcomes – BOP, Import/Export, Structure of GDP or Workforce;
3. Sectoral outcome indicators – IMR, MMR, school completion rates;
4. Sectoral outcome indicators which stand for outcomes – crop yield rates, area under crops, roads made, attended births, enrolment rates;
5. Proxy indicators – e.g. for governance, inclusive growth

The classification of the auxiliary indicators is more complex, and is mainly sector-specific

Reporting system and periodicity

1. Earlier, MOP brought out only MTRs. For 2010 and 2011, it also brought out Annual MDG Progress Reports.

2. Now the whole reporting has become **annual**, starting 2012. In the 2014-2018 cycle as well, it should stay that way.

3. The Annual Progress Reports (APR) will report on the progress on core indicators and will use data from both, the Administrative Data System and large surveys.

4. Depending upon an assessment being made now, the periodicity of reporting on the auxiliary indicators will be decided soon.

Level of disaggregation

1. At present, only the aggregate country-level indicators are being reported upon.

2. From 2013 onwards, some province-level disaggregated data too would be presented (esp. on indicators developed from Administrative Statistics), because regional disparity is a recognised concern.

3. As far as possible (though not always), official data sources and not project data, will be used.

4. Effort is also being made to bring some project data into the Official Statistics Framework

Participatory process

1. All the data are fetched from the concerned ministries after explaining to them the reasons and the reporting pattern.

2. At least two inter-ministerial meetings are held to validate the data. In case of discrepancy, small informal groups are formed to resolve the numbers.

3. In the case of both Administrative Data and Survey Data, MOP asks each agency to explain the data generating process and definitions of indicators.

This process helps in better interpretation (& limitations) and also, improvements for the future.

Inter-ministerial Working Group on M&E

1. Recognising that there are problems of comparability across datasets generated by different agencies, the MOP has set up an Inter-ministerial Working Group to examine both, the definitions and data generating processes, of contentious datasets & variables.
2. The Group has now met twice, and is inching towards reaching some consensus.
3. It is also defining new indicators – e.g. of inclusive growth.
4. Additionally, it is liaising with data generating agencies and international experts for a two-way interaction.

Data Usage and Feedback – 1

1. For making the M&E component more useful in planning, effort is being made to train staff in the line ministries on interpretation of data, on Administrative Data Generation (selectively) and on Small-sample Studies/Case Studies
2. A Training Module has been developed by MOP on this, and it is expected that the first Inter-ministerial Training Meeting (7 ministries) will be held in April 2013
3. In three ministries, effort has been initiated to strengthen their Administrative Data Systems

Usage and Feedback – 2

1. Since the APR will be annual, along with successes, shortcomings too will be reported.

2. It follows that in the subsequent years, there would be an Action Taken Section, on the shortcomings reported in the previous years.

3. This part is yet under discussion and requires a larger consensus

THANK YOU