# The IP3 experience with developing a simple set of performance targets as part of the NSDP process

**Presented by: H.E Leng Vy**

**Presented at: Apsara Angkor Siem Reap**

**Date: 14 November 2013**

## Contents

- **The NSDP "success"**
- **IP3 M&E challenges**
- **Results based management and learning**

# D&D targets in the NSDP: context

- **Background: the IP3**
  - **There are 31 different implementers**
  - **The project document is 450 pages (in English) and 185 outputs**
  - **This year's annual work plan and budget has thousands of activities and hundreds of indicators**
  - **The IP3 collects over 2,000 outcome indicators covering DMK capacity, governance, Commune Sangkat projects and socio-economic information**

- **The challenge**
  - **How to get this down to 1-2 pages? How do we separate the trees from the forest**
  - **How do we make this manageable and useful?**

- **What the targets look like….**
  - **Table 1 an initial set of targets capturing D&D results**
  - **Table 2 the final negotiated set of targets**

# The process used(1)

- **Government makes the first move and takes the lead. Don't solicit suggestions from DPs; make suggestions to DPs**
- **NCDDS: form a small group, including a high level manager / decision maker and technical people (maximum 5 people)**
- **Review existing information**
  - **Annual reports, with "milestones" (priorities)**
  - **The results framework (existing indicators)**
- **Criteria;**
  - **Only look at significant outputs or low level immediate outcomes; don't get distracted by things far beyond your control**
  - **Pick things that best summarizes the program**
  - **Pick things that are challenging; results you want to see happen; think of the big changes needed**
  - **Make sure you can express it in a SMART, clear, measurable language**
  - **Pick measures where you can collect the data; there should be a history of using the indicator**
  - **Pick things everyone will understand (no indexes!)**

3

# The Process (2)

- **NCDDS group: extensive and open debate, led by the Deputy Chair**

- **NCDDS / DP discussions: frank, open with a small group of DPs (about 5 people); Government presents and leads discussion**

- **Negotiation; balance the needs of all parties. It won't be perfect. Compromise but don't agree to something you don't believe in; keep it constructive**

- **Critical elements of success**

    - **Secretariat will have to be strong and include a top decision maker**

    - **Past relations between DPs and Government should be positive and constructive**

# Can we move away from detail?

- **Implementation monitoring**
  - **The IP3 collects a huge amount of implementation data used for fiduciary reporting (through computerized systems). When printed a list of outputs, activities, budgets and indicators is 54 pages at 8 point font**
  - **So….this goes far beyond a system of "early warning" which would identify areas needing management attention**
- **Outcome monitoring**
  - **DMK Capacity assessments, governance / service delivery surveys, Commune /Sangkat projects, socio economic data and social service indicators (over 2,500 indicators in all) give an idea of big trends**
  - **But…are not actionable**

| M&E Activity type | Time Used |
|---|---|
| Implementation monitoring / reporting (fiduciary reporting) | 60% |
| Outcome Monitoring and reporting | 30% |
| Encouraging Results based management | 5% |
| Learning through evaluations | 5% |

# Results Based Management (RBM): what would we have to do?

- **Identify and agree upon priorities, usually in the form of targets at the output / lower level outcome level**

- **Align resources and activities around meeting those targets; design programs around those targets**

- **Design management processes that support the targets; hold performance stakeholders about the targets and performance towards those targets**

- **Create incentives (individual and organizational) for meeting the targets; these would be both carrots and sticks**

6

# IP3: the challenge of managing for results

- **Now that we have some NSDP targets, how can we use them to manage performance?**

- **There are 7 central government agencies and 24 PCs implementing the program; these are autonomous and at the same "hierarchical" level in government. This is typically an issue with cross cutting structural reform programs**

- **Each implementer would need to be committed to achieving their targets not just say they will achieve their targets**

- **The NCDD is not really designed as a performance management institution; it is more of a consultative body**

- **So incentives will be a tricky issue**

# The IP3 learning challenge

- **D&D is a complicated reform, so**
  - Managers will struggle both to manage results and make evidence-based decisions.
  - The current focus on implementation and outcome monitoring is probably not best for decision making
- **To strengthen learning and better facilitate informed decision-making:**
  - Do analysis to assess various options (costs and benefits) and their associated risks. The IP3 does policy analysis but the evidence for and against different options is often not provided
  - Test, where results from the various options are compared
  - Do more thematic evaluations focusing on a particular issue
  - Create a conducive environment for learning, where failure is openly discussed
    - **Thanks!**