



**Revised Framework for
Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)
of Future JARDs in Uganda**

Draft

7 November 2008

**By
Holger Pyndt, LGDK, Denmark and
Godfrey Kiwanuka Musisi, Uganda**

Table of Content

1. Introduction	3
2. Key findings in relation to JARD 2008.....	3
2.1 Reporting of the Regional Consultations (RC).....	3
2.2 Approval and dissemination of JARD 2007 Undertakings	4
2.3 Production of the JARD report.....	4
2.4 Timing and planning of JARD 2008 activities	4
2.5 Regional Consultations for JARD 2008	5
2.5.1 District/Municipal Consultations in future.....	6
2.5.2 Regional Consultations in future	7
2.6 How to ensure more consistency in District/Municipal Consultations	7
2.7 Improved work in the DSWG	8
3. The use of the LGSIP CRM indicators.....	8
3.1 Using a limited number of indicators	8
3.2 Use of performance indicators within sectors.....	9
3.3 The validity of the Annual Performance Assessment	10
4. Potential changes in the proposed M&E Framework for JARD.....	11
4.1 Proposed framework has not really been tested	11
4.2 Implement the M&E Framework for JARD 2009	11
4.3 Additional recommendations.....	11
5. Action points.....	11
Annex 1: Executive Summary of the proposed M&E Framework for Future JARDs, April 2008.....	13
Annex 2: Review of Recommendations from Regional Consultations JARD 2007.....	16
Introduction	16
Topical papers presented	16
CRM thematic areas.....	17
Input for JARD 2007 Undertakings.....	17
Summary and conclusions	17
Annex 3: Proposed JARD Calendar	19

1. Introduction

During a consultancy in the period October 2007-April 2008, Mr. Pyndt and Mr. Musisi (the Consultants) developed a draft Framework for M&E of Future JARDs in Uganda. The final version of this was dated 20 April 2008. The Executive Summary is presented as Annex 1 to this report.

The consultants were re-hired to provide an external monitoring of the Regional Consultations of JARD 2008 and as part of this work to¹:

- Draft a M&E report on JARD Regional Consultations
- Draft a Revised M&E Framework for JARD

A separate report has been produced on the JARD 2008 Regional Consultations.

This note constitutes the report on the Draft Revised M&E Framework for JARD, for which the monitoring of the JARD 2008 Regional Consultations has provided important inputs and reference is made to this report.

2. Key findings in relation to JARD 2008

2.1 Reporting of the Regional Consultations (RC)

In Annex 2 is placed a short review of the report of the RC for JARD 2007.

In overview form the following number of recommendations were presented at RCs in 2007:

Overview of recommendations within different areas of the RC for JARD 2007	
Thematic area	Number
JARD 2006 Undertakings	7
Topical papers	126
Audit	5
CRM areas	111
Other areas	60
As input for JARD 2007	21
Grand total	330

It is evident that the 330 recommendations constitute a form of long list where all mentioned recommendations in group work and plenary have been taken onboard. Only the 21 recommendations as input for the formulation of Undertakings of the JARD 2007 have serious priorities been made but very few of these were taken on board in the formulation of Undertakings for JARD 2007.

Much work needs to be done to make the report of Regional Consultations for JARD 2008 a strong input for the JARD National Forum.

This work should concentrate on:

¹ Terms of Reference for Technical Assistance to Regional JARD Consultations 2008, JARD/JOC, October 2008

- Stricter priority making among the long list of recommendations
- Refinement of recommendations (grouping, formulation, avoidance of overlaps)
- Ensurance of clearer links between the recommendations and the LGSIP thematic areas and the CRM indicators

As mentioned in our report of last year, we find however, that it would be better to elaborate an ordinary, comprehensive LG Sector Performance Report to be discussed at the JARD Forum instead of the synthesized regional report as in JARD 2007. This LG Sector Performance Report should document the progress of decentralisation through the status of implementation of the CRM performance indicators.

As input for compilation of this LG Sector Performance Report we find each of the 5 JARD “regions” should make individual reports, cf. our proposed JARD Calendar in Annex 3, hence we see no future need for a synthesized regional report if the proposal for a LG Sector Performance Report is adopted.

2.2 Approval and dissemination of JARD 2007 Undertakings

As far we have been informed the DSWG met in December 2007 to confirm the agreed Undertakings of the JARD 2007 Forum on 6-7 December 2007 and to receive the detailed report on implementation of Undertakings of JARD 2006 and previous JARDs.

Apart from the fact that the reporting on implementation of Undertakings of JARD 2006 and previous JARDs was not detailed enough², the implementation of a meeting in the DSWG soon after the JARD Forum marks an improvement.

One positive result of this is that the stakeholders much sooner than for JARD 2006 received the official JARD 2007 Undertakings. ULGA e.g. received the Undertakings on 24 January 2008. For JARD 2006, Undertakings were received in June 2007, so this marks a strong improvement.

We however maintain our recommendation that the production of draft Undertakings should be revised in accordance with our guidelines in the proposed M&E Framework.

2.3 Production of the JARD report

The official JARD 2007 Report came out in April 2008. This is actually one month later than for JARD 2006.

The 2007 report marks an improvement in relation to the report of JARD 2006 in the sense that the content is clearer structured along the LGSIP thematic areas and the Undertakings better presented.

We however maintain our recommendation that this report for JARD 2009 should be replaced by a proper LG Sector Performance Report, being produced in draft form prior to the JARD Forum and being presented and discussed there – as is the common practise for other sectors.

2.4 Timing and planning of JARD 2008 activities

A proposed work plan for JARD 2008 was received from MOLG showing an effective working period on August through December 2008.

The calendar contains the following activities:

- JOC organisation committee meetings regularly
- CAO/TC meeting in September
- District/Municipal consultations in October

² Viewpoint from Development Partners

- Regional consultations in November
- National JARD Forum in the first half of December
- Assessment of JARD 2008 in the second half of December

With this plan for JARD 2008, activities become as congested as for JARD 2007.

The planning meeting with CAOs/TCs scheduled for September was cancelled due to inability to make funding available in time. Instead, MOLG sent out a detailed circular. This marks a step backwards in relation to JARD 2007 when CAOs/TCs were called for a meeting 28-29 September 2007 so it is strange MOLG could not make funding available in time, knowing well in advance that this meeting would be needed.

District/Municipal consultations are not fully over yet. For the Western region, 4 Districts had submitted written reports to MOLG, 8 Districts claimed to be bringing the reports to the RC in Mbarara (could not be verified), while 7 Districts had not made any report and probably had not had any District Consultation yet. As the RC supposedly is to base itself of the outcome of the District/Municipal Consultations this situation is untenable.

As far as funding is concerned, MOLG informs that only 50 mill Ush. out of a planned 93 mill. Ush could be made available for the District/Municipal consultations³. ULGA informs that some of the Districts – as last year – have not yet received any funding for their JARD consultations⁴.

The actual dates for the Regional Consultations were according to information from Development Partners received with less than a week's notice providing problems for their participation.

The planned activity on the assessment of JARD is a new element in relation to JARD 2007 that marks a good improvement, if implemented as intended.

The congestion of District/Municipal Consultations and the Regional Consultations leads to an inability to synthesize progress and problems in Districts/Municipalities prior to the Regional Consultations and use this as input for them as it was originally intended.

We refer to our proposed JARD Calendar and maintain our recommendation on the placing of JARD activities during the year with bigger time intervals – especially the District/Municipal Consultations, the Regional Consultations, and the JARD Forum.

The planning of JARD activities over the year seems still to need significant strengthening, so that planning can be done well in time before events and funding of activities does not become a problem.

Planning of activities for JARD 2009 should start in January 2009 and the JARD Calendar could guide the process.

2.5 Regional Consultations for JARD 2008

The findings and recommendations in relation to the Regional Consultations for JARD 2008 are contained in our special report on this. The following is a resume of core findings:

- a) It can be concluded that there are clear links between the RC and the LGSIP thematic themes, measured in terms of the thematic areas the six papers deal with. This being said, there was however no discussion during the RC on the fulfilment of the 35 indicators in the CRM of the

³ Interview of A.M.Iga, MOLG on Tuesday 28 October 2008

⁴ Interview of Raphael Magyezi, ULGA on Tuesday 28 October 2008

- LGSIP and this is a major flaw, as this presentation and discussion should lead to formulation of priorities for the next year, rather than a presentation and discussion of the academic papers
- b) It is distorting to have many academic papers presented at the RC – no less than six papers for JSRD 2008 – and the experiences on the ground pushed aside (= the reports of the District/Municipal consultations). The RC in Mbale had more the character of a conference – albeit a good one loaded with information – but the question is if this format serves the key purpose of the District/Municipal and Regional Consultations seen in the light of the LGSIP CRM performance indicators, for which the JARD is the key monitoring instrument
 - c) It is not ideal to have papers presented by persons that have not been involved in writing them. Therefore the RCs should not take place the same days but over two weeks.
 - d) RCs are overloaded with so many papers that they could not be presented within the time allocated, and they overshadow experiences on the ground
 - e) The experiences of the District/Municipal Consultations were not used significantly. As the reports of these consultations should contain reflections on the achievements of decentralisation, challenges, and recommendations they provide a good basis to depart from at the Regional Consultations. The congested timing of events made this impossible for JARD 2007 and 2008 but if the proposed JARD Calendar is followed for JARD 2009 it should be possible to change the format
 - f) The awareness and discussion of JARD 2007 Undertakings would have been improved by more detailed reporting on the individual Undertakings and presentation of written handouts before the presentation. No presentation was made of Undertakings of previous JARDs
 - g) The group work was hurried, badly prepared and poorly facilitated. As a result of this the output of the work in groups was not optimal and time was missing to formulate issues and recommendations in a very clear manner
 - h) Time management was absent, leading to huge delays, frustration and waste of resources. The poor time management seems a joint responsibility of the organizers and the participants and this needs to be rectified to achieve better results of the consultations

On this basis we maintain our recommendations of the M&E Report where we recommended the following on the format in relation to the District/Municipal and Regional Consultations:

2.5.1 District/Municipal Consultations in future

Our proposed agenda for District/Municipal Consultations:

- a) Information about LGSIP and the CRM indicators selected for the year's JARD and last year's Undertakings⁵
- b) Achievement within the selected CRM Performance Indicators. The information for this stems mainly from the last National Assessment reports for the HLGs and LLGs and their financial accounts and in relation to this the following should be discussed:
 - 1) Development within the selected CRM areas since the last assessment
 - 2) Reflection of how improvements can be made in future
 - 3) Discussion of the experienced challenges and problems within each CRM-indicator
- c) Discussion on progress and challenges within key sectors (= the core LG service areas):
 - 1) Education
 - 2) Health
 - 3) Production
 - 4) Roads and Transport
 - 5) Water and Sanitation
- d) The progress and problems with LG financing

⁵ We presume a smaller number of CRM indicators will be selected for detailed scrutiny during the JARD

2.5.2 Regional Consultations in future

The agenda of the Regional Consultations is basically to discuss the results of the review in the Districts and Municipalities in the region as expressed in the regional report (= report synthesizing the District/Municipal Consultations in the region), and this would essentially lead to more or less the same agenda as for the District consultations.

In addition to this, the Regional meetings should formulate draft Undertakings and Recommendations for the national JARD Forum.

If special investigations are launched, these could be presented for discussion at the Regional Consultations as long as they do not take over the main part of the agenda, as is presently the case with the presentation and discussion of papers.

It is still relevant to produce papers for the RCs but these papers should be directed to the themes above:

- Achievements and problems within selected CRM performance indicators in the Districts and Municipalities in the region
- Progress and problems within selected key sectors
- In-depth studies of topical issues
- Progress and problems within LG financing

We mentioned the following areas of interest for in-depth studies: Procurement, involvement of CSOs in local governance, and follow-up on audit queries, as well as studies related to development within selected sectors.

(As we experienced programmes of RCs that were badly implemented (cf. our monitoring reports) we in Annex 4 propose a possible format of RC in future that are in line with the recommendations above and take note of the monitoring experiences)

2.6 How to ensure more consistency in District/Municipal Consultations

It is difficult to verify the quality of District/Municipal Consultations in terms of participation, presentations, quality of discussions, validity of conclusions, etc.

More consistency in the District/Municipal Consultations will have the following effects:

- They take place prior to the RC
- Wide participation of stakeholders is ensured
- Expected outputs are produced
- Reporting is done correctly

The core question is how to prevent flouting in the implementation of District/Municipal Consultations so that the stakeholders in LLGs are provided with a platform for influence. At present there is no quality assurance of the District/Municipal Consultations.

We maintain our recommendation that the District/Municipal Consultations be attached to the HLG Budget Meetings in June. These are compulsory and include the LLG councils and LG stakeholders. By extending the Budget Meeting with one full day, cost benefits could be achieved.

Should the LLG participants in the Budget Meeting be the same as those in the District/Municipal Consultations?

For the District/Municipal Consultations it is important to ensure participation of stakeholders that can demand accountability from the LLG councils and leaders - and hopefully also from the District leaders. **(Musisi to send proposed list of participants).**

MOLG in cooperation with the JOC should elaborate a list of participants of the LLGs in the District/Municipal Consultations so there will be no doubt who to invite – as is done for the RC.

To give the District/Municipal Consultations an “obligatory” character we propose the following:

- The implementation of District/Municipal Consultations in connection with the HLG Budget Meeting with the stipulated participation from LLGs could be included in the Annual Assessment of HLGs
- The participation of LLGs in the District/Municipal Consultations in connection with the HLG Budget Meeting with the stipulated participation from LLGs could be included in the Annual Assessment of LLGs
- The actual implementation of District/Municipal Consultations in connection with the HLG Budget Meeting with the stipulated participation from LLGs and HLGs as well as timely reporting by the CAO/TC could be included in the Performance Appraisal Form of CAOs/TCs⁶

Lack of correct implementation of the District/Municipal Consultations may lead to penalties being imposed on the failing HLG and/or LLGs, whereas correct implementation may lead to rewards.

It goes without saying that the timely funding of District/Municipal Consultations is a necessary precondition for achieving better results of the work. With better and timely planning as of JARD 2009 this should not be a serious problem.

2.7 Improved work in the DSWG

MOLG informs that most meetings in the DSWG have been held and that a DSWG secretariat has been established in MOLG with 3 officers attached under the management of Assistant Commissioner Ben Kumumanya.

This has improved the work but detailed regular reporting on JARD Undertakings and LGSIP CRM indicators is still wanting according to Development Partners.

3. The use of the LGSIP CRM indicators

3.1 Using a limited number of indicators

With a view to ease the follow up on the implementation of the LGSIP and the general progress of decentralisation, we recommended to consider using fewer indicators than the total 35 contained in the CRM. We proposed 17 indicators of the CRM, cf. scheme on next page:

We have understood that it has been decided to compile a report on these 17 indicators and hope this may be ready for the JARD 2008 Forum⁷.

⁶ The Performance Appraisal Form includes at present 23 target indicators

⁷ Interview with Vincent Maher, BFC, TA to the DPDG on 31 October 2008

No	LGSIP Thematic area	CRM Performance Indicators	Information Source
1	Service delivery	% of LGs meeting service delivery standards	National LG Performance Assessment
		% of HLG and LLG with functional structures to mainstreaming and co-ordinate HIV/AIDS in the LG service delivery system	National LG Performance Assessment
		Gender and environment integrated in LG plans and BFPs	National LG Performance Assessment
2	Political decentralisation	% of councils adhering to established standards (of political accountability)	National LG Performance Assessment
3	Administrative decentralisation	% of planned LGSIP policy actions completed	JARD, LGSIP CRM, PEMCOM Reports/MOLG
		% of Capacity Building plans in HLGs that meet the national assessment criteria	National LG Performance Assessment
4	Fiscal decentralisation and LG PFM	% of LGs producing timely final accounts	National LG Performance Assessment
		% of LG locally generated revenue as a share of LG budgets	Final accounts/LOGFIAS (LGFC)
		% of fiscal transfers that are conditional and earmarked	National Budget/LGFC
5	Good governance	% of LGs being institutionally dysfunctional due to conflicts	National LG Performance Assessment
		% of LGs publishing financial transfers and budgets	National LG Performance Assessment
		% of LGs with functional Human Rights desk	National LG Performance Assessment
		% of LGs that have ratified, applied and are implementing the Charter on Accountability and Code of Conduct	National LG Performance Assessment
		% of Districts with functional Local Council Courts	National LG Performance Assessment
6	Local economic development	% growth of private sector investments in LGs	Private sector growth surveys/Uganda Investment Authority
		% of businesses supported through local investment centres	LED surveys/Uganda Investment Authority
		Total number of Perf. Indicators: 17	

3.2 Use of performance indicators within sectors

In our M&E report we referred to the Water sector that uses 10 “golden indicators” to measure the overall performance and progress within the sector.

The most recent development of performance indicators within sectors demonstrates an emerging, more dynamic approach to the use of indicators. The work is being done under the Joint Assessment Framework attached to the general budget support.

Illustrated by the Health Sector, the following three elements of performance indicators are being discussed⁸:

- Key Performance Indicators - 6 indicators are proposed
- Key Performance Indicators to be developed - 3 additional indicators are proposed for formulation
- Key Sector Performance Issues and Actions to Improve Sector Performance - 4 issues are mentioned

Similar schemes have been developed for Education (primary and secondary), Water and Environment (both rural and urban water, and water for production), Roads (both main roads, and district, urban and community access roads, and Agriculture.

- Education has 5 indicators for primary + 6 for secondary education, 11 in total
- Water and Environment has 10 for rural and 5 for urban water and sanitation, 2 for production, 17 in total
- Roads has 8 for main roads, 5 for community access roads, in total 13
- Agriculture has 5 for the national agricultural advisory services

It is quite clear that the sectors are very different in nature from the crosscutting nature of the decentralisation sector. Health, education, roads etc. can to a much higher extent than the decentralisation sector use quantifiable indicators.

None the less, the proposed scheme of KPIs has some interesting elements that may be considered for the decentralisation sector as well:

- Use of relatively few performance indicators
- Dynamic approach by having proposed KPIs presented for future integration (as the sector progresses and data become available etc.)
- Formulation of core sector performance issues, and which actions can and should be taken to improve sector performance

This approach is very suited for the annual performance reviews as the achievements within the sector reveal progress and challenges. This again feeds into the definition of next years priority actions designed to improve performance.

The Decentralisation Sector is different from other sectors by having the Annual Performance Assessment implemented, providing information for measurement of 15 of the 35 performance indicators in the CRM.

We recommend the DSWG to constitute a Task Force with the task to:

- Consider if the decentralisation sector should adopt a similar approach to KPIs as is underway for the core sectors
- Review the number and content of performance indicators of the CRM
- Discuss if new/other indicators should be developed

3.3 The validity of the Annual Performance Assessment

We recommended in our M&E Report that the results of the Annual Assessments should be used more vigorously as an input for discussing the performance of LGs and the overall progress of decentralisation.

For this to provide the optimal results, the validity of the Annual Assessments must be high.

⁸ Schemes of performance indicators having been discussed in the DPDG

There have been heard increasing criticism recently that the validity of the Assessments is declining.

We recommend MOLG to consider the formulation of teams for the Assessments carefully and maybe test a new composition with private sector representatives heading the teams, thus leaving the final formulation of results to a neutral side.

4. Potential changes in the proposed M&E Framework for JARD

4.1 Proposed framework has not really been tested

Our final M&E report was delivered in April 2008 and although a draft version was presented in the beginning of February 2008 and a note with issues for consideration presented in October 2007, it has been difficult to introduce the new M&E system for JARD 2008.

4.2 Implement the M&E Framework for JARD 2009

As we see some of the same problems repeating themselves for JARD 2008 as we identified for JARD 2007, we strongly recommend adopting the proposed M&E system for JARD 2009, cf. the Calendar for JARD in Annex 3, and start planning for JARD 2009 in January 2009.

The format, timing and content of the District/Municipal Consultations and Regional Consultations should be changed accordingly so they can feed into the elaboration of a LG Sector Performance Report.

4.3 Additional recommendations

- The use of CRM indicators should be reviewed in light of the development within core sectors and the results of using the proposed 17 CRM indicators for JARD 2008
- The validity of District/Municipal Consultations should be enhanced by attaching them to the HLG Budget Meetings in June, the LLG participation in them should be reviewed, and the status of District/Municipal Consultations should be enhanced by including their implementation in the Annual Assessments of HLGs and LLGs and in the performance appraisal of CAOs/TCs
- The validity of the Annual LG Assessments should be reviewed by MOLG and ULGA/UAAU and be discussed in the DSWG
- The number and content of papers for future JARDs should be reviewed in light of the proposed format for Regional Consultations, i.e. less papers and these should primarily be directed to issued connected to the CRM indicators

5. Action points

The consultants recommend the following Action Points for implementation:

Number	Actions	Responsible inst.
1	Discussion of this report and the monitoring reports of the Regional Consultation at the next meeting in the DSWG	MOLG/LG Associations
2	Decision to implement the proposed M&E Framework for JARD in full for JARD 2009 and to start planning for this in January 2009. This implies following the proposed JARD Calendar and to change the format and timing of the District/Municipal Consultations and Regional Consultations	MOLG/LG Associations

3	Timely decision to elaborate an Annual LG Sector Performance Report for JARD 2009	MOLG/DSWG
4	Timely formulation and approval of TA for quality assurance of JARD 2009, as well as for elaboration of the Annual LG Sector Performance Report for JARD 2009	MOLG/DSWG/ LG Associations
5	Decision by DSWG to establish a Task Force to review the LGSIP CRM indicators in light of the development of KPIs of sectors within the framework of the Joint Assessment Framework	DSWG/MOLG

Annex 1: Executive Summary of the proposed M&E Framework for Future JARDs, April 2008

Background

A consultancy has been implemented by Mr. Holger Pyndt (international consultant) and Mr. Godfrey Kiwanuka Musisi (local consultant) with a view to:

- Assess the level of implementation of JARD Undertakings and recommendations in 2006,
- Carry out M&E of District/Regional JARD consultations in 2007,
- Highlight key areas and challenges to address in relation to future JARDs, and
- Develop a framework for M&E of future JARD Undertakings

This document contains the consultants' proposals as to how to strengthen the JARD process and the M&E of future JARD Undertakings.

Structure of the document

The document is structured with the following sections:

- Key achievements and remaining challenges in the JARD process
- Issues for consideration
- Development of a framework for the M&E of future JARDs
- Institutional issues
- Proposed Action Points
- Proposed Annual JARD Calendar

Role of JARD in relation LGSIP

It is important to bear in mind that the JARD is the key M&E mechanism for LGSIP implementation and JARD in future needs to be tied closely up with measuring the implementation of the performance indicators of the Common Results Matrix (CRM) of the LGSIP. JARD thus becomes an ongoing activity throughout the year. The anchor point in strengthening the LGSIP implementation and the JARD process is to ensure regular, quarterly meetings in the DSWG with an appropriate level of attention of MOLG and participation of line ministries.

Achievements

A number of achievements of the JARD is recorded, e.g. implementation of a profound baseline study for the first JARD in 2004, institutionalisation of the LG sector review processes, formulation and approval of the LGSIP and the CRM as core instruments to manage the sector development, establishment of an overarching framework for decentralisation with the DPSE, alignment of JARD 2007 with the LGSIP, active involvement of the LGs in the JARD process through district/municipal and regional consultations and the role of their associations ULGA/UAAU, and finally increasing involvement of line ministries in the JARD organisation committee.

Remaining challenges

A number of challenges however remain to be addressed, e.g. late reporting of the JARD conference, weak monitoring of the implementation of JARD Undertakings, irregular meetings in and insufficient attention of MOLG to the DSWG, little use of the results of the annual LG Performance Assessment in the JARD process, congested timing of JARD activities in both 2006 and 2007, too little interaction with line ministries, draft Undertakings are not ready in writing at the beginning of the JARD conference, relatively weak links between district, regional consultations and the JARD conference, and a need to strengthen the overall management of the JARD.

Issues for consideration

The following issues for consideration are identified:

- a) How can the overall management of the JARD be strengthened?
- b) Should the use of LGSIP CRM indicators in relation to the JARD be focussed on fewer indicators that in combination anyway present a fairly good picture of the progress within the Decentralisation Sector?
- c) Should the previous JARD report coming out after the JARD conference be substituted with a traditional Annual Local Government Sector Performance Report to be discussed at the JARD conference?
- d) How can the implementation of JARD Undertakings be improved and be integrated in the monitoring of the LGSIP implementation?
- e) How can the production of JARD Undertakings be improved?
- f) How can the results of the annual LG Performance Assessment be better used in the implementation of the JARD?
- g) How can the integration of line ministries in the JARD be enhanced?
- h) Should additional in-depth studies be launched to address specific issues not fully captured by the annual LG Performance Assessment?
- i) How can the JARD be quality assured?
- j) What is the optimal timing of the JARD activities and the JARD conference?
- k) How can the JARD events over a year be placed to avoid congestion and contribute to making the JARD a fully integrated, ongoing part of the LGSIP implementation?

Development of the Framework for M&E of the JARD - Recommendations

Management of the JARD can primarily be strengthened by implementing regular meetings in the DSWG and assigning responsibility for monitoring the implementation of JARD Undertakings as well as the general LGSIP implementation to a senior officer in MOLG at the level of a director. This will also enhance the possibilities of having line ministries more actively engaged in the JARD.

The consultants recommend focusing on 17 CRM indicators (of the 35 total CRM indicators of the LGSIP) to facilitate regular collection of information to verify progress.

For future JARDs it is also recommended to produce an Annual Local Government Sector Performance Report with the following content:

- 1) Executive summary
- 2) General progress with LGSIP implementation
- 3) Progress within the selected CRM Indicators (e.g. the proposed 17)
- 4) Progress within LG financing
- 5) Overall results of the annual LG performance assessment (this may address issues over and above the results captured through the 11 of the 17 proposed CRM indicators that are derived from the assessments)
- 6) Progress with the interaction with selected key sectors (if it is decided to select core sectors and present results and challenges within these)
- 7) Implementation of previous years' JARD Undertakings and Recommendations

The consultants recommend to form a Task Force with key stakeholder representation to formulate draft Undertakings (and possibly also recommendations) for the JARD, basing themselves on the reports of the District and Regional consultations, the general LGSIP implementation, development in other sectors as well as other national initiatives. Draft Undertakings should be ready in writing at the beginning of the JARD conference so that participants have good time to consider them. Additional Undertakings can also be formulated during the conference itself.

The results of LG Performance Assessments should be used for verification of the progress of HLGs and LLGs within the selected CRM indicators and be used for handing out awards to best performing HLGs and LLGs at the end of the annual JARD conference. The consultants commend the inclusion of District consultations in the JARD, but to save resources and ease the implementation of future District consultations, it is proposed to implement these in connection with the budget seminar in June that have to be finished no later than 15 June. M&E of JARDs and the LGSIP should be implemented at 3 levels – Districts/Municipalities, Regional level and National level.

The consultants recommend maintaining the existing timing of JARD conferences to November/December. To facilitate the planning and implementation of JARD activities during the year a JARD Calendar is proposed and demonstrated in an Annex.

The consultants see a need from time to time to supplement the planned JARD activities with in-depth studies of areas where the LG Performance Assessment cannot provide the full picture. This could e.g. be procurement, interaction with civil society, follow-up to audit queries, the work of the district service commission, aspects of developments within selected key sectors. It could also be crosscutting elements like environmental issues, human rights, and gender issues.

The consultants also recommend implementation of quality assurance of the JARD processes.

Annex 2: Review of Recommendations from Regional Consultations JARD 2007

Introduction

The report of the Regional Consultations (RCs) of JARD 2007⁹ contains many different forms of recommendations:

- On JARD 2006 Undertakings
- On the topical papers presented at the RCs
- On audit
- On the thematic areas of the CRM indicators
- Other recommendations
- On policy issues as input for formulation of JARD 2007 Undertakings

In overview form the following number of recommendations were presented at RCs in 2007:

Overview of recommendations within different areas of the RCs 2007	
Thematic area	Number
JARD 2006 Undertakings	7
Topical papers	126
Audit	5
CRM areas	111
Other areas	60
As input for JARD 2007	21
Grand total	330

It is evident that the 300 recommendations constitute a form of long list where all mentioned recommendations in group work and plenum have been taken onboard. Only the 21 recommendations as input for the formulation of Undertakings of the JARD 2007 have serious priorities been made.

Topical papers presented

The recommendations were distributed as follows:

Overview of recommendations on topical papers of the RCs 2007	
Thematic area	Number
LED	16
Service delivery under multi-party dispensation	27
Improved urban planning	31
Financing of LGs	37
Restructuring	15
Grand total	126

⁹ “Draft Synthesized Report of the Regional Consultations – The Joint Annual Review of Decentralization 2007”

It is characteristic that the issue of service delivery attracted much attention as well as issues related to urbanisation – and of course the financial issues!!

CRM thematic areas

In overview for the following number of recommendations were presented on CRM thematic areas:

Overview of recommendations on thematic areas of the CRM during RCs 2007	
Thematic area	Number
Service delivery	35
Political decentralisation	29
Administrative decentralisation	14
Fiscal decentralisation	19
Good governance	14
Grand total	111

It is striking that the sixth CRM area of LED is missing. Maybe the recommendations above in relation to presentation of thematic papers also constitute the recommendations in relation to the CRM.

There is overlap between many of the recommendations presented in connection with the presentation of papers (126 recommendations) and in relation to CRM (111 recommendations). For future JARDs more coordination and critical screening of recommendations should be made, first and foremost in order not to make the readers “immune” in relation to recommendations.

It is interesting that MOLG (?) – not mentioned who in the report – reviews 35 specific recommendations (from papers and CRM areas) and provides comments to the different recommendations, of which 9 are labelled “agreeable” and will be taken on, 8 are referred to other CG institutions, 1 is rejected, and various comments are provided to the remaining 17 recommendations.

Input for JARD 2007 Undertakings

In overview form the following number of recommendations were presented as input for JARD 2007:

Overview of recommendations for formulation of Undertakings of JARD 2007	
Thematic area	Number
JARD organisational issues	7
Fiscal decentralisation (incl. Land issues)	4
Political decentralisation	3
Administrative decentralisation	3
Urbanisation	4
Grand total	21

None of these made it to be directly included in the 12 Undertakings of the JARD 2007, although some of the recommendations come thematically close.

Summary and conclusions

The links between the Regional Consultations and the JARD in 2007 were weak, although some of the groups during the JARD conference in December 2007 departed from recommendations made at the Regional Consultations.

The report comprises a long list of all possible recommendations in a number of fields that are not strictly aligned with the LGSIP and there are many repetitions among the 330 recommendations.

Much work needs to be done to make the report of Regional Consultations a strong input for the JARD National Forum.

This work should concentrate on:

- refinement of recommendations (grouping, formulation, avoidance of overlaps)
- ensuring clearer links between the recommendations and the LGSIP thematic areas and the CRM indicators

Annex 3: Proposed JARD Calendar

Proposed flow of JARD activities over a calendar year			
Time	Activity	Result	Responsible
Jan	Meeting for all implementers of JARD Undertakings and Recommendations	Discussion of Undertakings and Recommendations Agreement on who does what and establishment of a time plan for and reporting on implementation of Undertakings and Recommendations	MOLG to call meeting and lead
March	JARD implementers forward quarterly status reports to MOLG with a copy to the DSWG Meeting in the DSWG (quarterly)	Status of level of implementation of JARD Undertakings etc. Possibility to introduce corrective measures	Line ministries and other implementers MOLG
April/ May	JARD Consultation Meeting	Meeting for all CAOs and Town Clerks to prepare for the JARD, information on which CRM-indicators to report on, which sector developments to focus on etc.	MOLG ULGA/UAAU
June	JARD implementers forward quarterly status reports to MOLG with a copy to the DSWG Meeting in the DSWG (quarterly)	Status of level of implementation of JARD Undertakings etc. Possibility to introduce corrective measures	MOLG Line ministries and other implementers ULGA/UAAU
June	District/Municipal Consultations in connection with the HLG Budget Meetings (that are to be held no later than 15 June).	Review of JARD implementation, progress within the selected CRM-indicators, relations with core sectors, and LG financing LLGs and CSOs/NGOs to take part in meetings	ULGA/UAAU MOLG
Aug	Regional reports summarizing the results of Districts and Municipalities Consultations	No later than 1 August ULGA's regional branches will compile the synthesized reports and forward these to the PS, MOLG with copies for the ULGA/UAAU headquarters and the chairperson of DPDG	ULGA's regional branches
Sept	Regional Consultations over a period of two weeks. Meetings to last two days	On a regional level: Review of JARD implementation, progress within the selected CRM-indicators, relations with core sectors, and LG financing Formulation of draft Undertakings for the next JARD	MOLG ULGA/UAAU JOC Line ministries
Sept	JARD implementers forward quarterly status reports to MOLG with a copy to the DSWG Meeting in the DSWG (quarterly)	Discussion in the DSWG of the progress with LGSIP implementation on the basis of the results of the Regional Consultations	MOLG Line ministries and other implementers ULGA/UAAU
Oct	Regional reports	No later than 1 October will reports of the Regional consultations be ready, made by persons assigned by the JARD JOC. Reports will be forwarded to the PS, MOLG with copies for ULGA/UAAU and the chair of the DPDG	MOLG JOC ULGA/UAAU
Nov	Preparation of the draft Local Government Sector Performance Report	No later than 1 Nov the first draft Local Government Sector Performance Report will be ready	MOLG
Nov	Discussion of Draft Undertakings, comments to the draft Local	MOLG will call ULGA/UAAU, MoPS, LGFC, MoFPED and core line ministries for consultation	MOLG ULGA/UAAU

	Government Sector Performance Report	to discuss draft Undertakings at the upcoming JARD and hear comments to the draft Local Government Sector Performance Report	LGFC, MoPS MoFPED Line ministries
Nov	Extraordinary meeting in the DSWG	Discussion of the draft Local Government Sector Performance Report	MOLG Dev. partners
Nov	Printing of draft LG Sector Performance Report	Printing of the draft Local Government Sector Performance Report to all participants in the JARD Forum	MOLG
Nov/ Dec	Annual JARD Forum	Discussion of Implementation of LGSIP as expressed in the draft Local Government Sector Performance Report, approval of Undertakings	MOLG
Dec	Final LG Sector Performance Report	The final Local Government Sector Performance Report is prepared and printed	MOLG
Dec	Meeting in the DSWG (quarterly) Dissemination of JARD report and the List of JARD Undertakings and Recommendations	Meeting in the DSWG to confirm Undertakings, Recommendations etc. All HLGs, line ministries and key stakeholders receive a printed final Local Government Sector Performance Report with the List of Undertakings. Both materials are also placed on MOLG's homepage	MOLG