

7.5 | Session B5: Subnational Evaluation Systems

Moderator

- ◆ **Stephen Porter**, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, IEG, World Bank

Panellists

- ◆ **Zoran Dimitrovski** Deputy Minister, Ministry of Local Self-Government, North Macedonia
- ◆ **Cyprian Chillanyang**, Commissioner Policy and Planning, Ministry of Local Government, Uganda
- ◆ **Halima Ibrahim**, Head of Planning and Budgeting, County Government of Isiolo, Kenya
- ◆ **Eleonore Johasy**, Member of Parliament, National Assembly, Madagascar

How can we learn lessons from locally-developed evaluation systems? How do different needs drive different systems and how can local systems be linked to national systems?



- ◆ Does a well-institutionalized NES mean good evaluation practices? Not necessarily. Some experience suggests that **well-established systems may not lead to good practices**. In other places, good evaluative practices exist without a well-established and regulated system.
- ◆ **There is a need for high-level commitment and a legal framework** for evaluation to make sure that evaluations are conducted nationally as well as at local level.
- ◆ **Different sectors will implement and develop their evaluative capacity at different speeds**, and be targeted more through evaluations - especially the ones that will ensure votes at the next election.
- ◆ **In rural areas it is difficult to ensure equal development** (i.e. budget allocation) and exercise government control over projects in local areas, which makes them prone to corruption. You can cheat even the best-established institutions and evaluation systems.

- ◆ **Evaluation is constrained by underfunded M&E units**, as well as low demand and considered value added (i.e. other more pressing issues are prioritized), and fragmented data collection, analysis and visualization systems. This raises the question, do subnational M&E systems need to be linked to the national level?
- ◆ **Some countries have built systems linking higher-level and bottom-up approaches**, to strengthen M&E. Dual evaluation systems in Madagascar include a top-down national integrated evaluation system, combined with a bottom-up outcome mapping system that focuses on local approaches and the impact of interventions. Beneficiaries are made responsible for achieving their objectives, and can identify shortages and make adaptations.
- ◆ **There is a need to ensure the sustained capacity-development** of government staff to avoid the loss of institutional memory and capacity.
- ◆ **The collision of different systems and their needs:** donors have specific formats and requirements that might contradict government criteria, which brings up the issue of acceptability.

Conclusion

Sectoral and National Evaluation Systems will develop at different speeds and show considerable variance in connection and capacity. The development of sectoral systems is often politically driven. As NES are often challenged through systems development and constraints, funding and legal structures, the question is whether sectoral systems should wait, or be dependent on national systems to be developed and move forward.



Quotes



“Participatory approaches can increase accountability, improve service delivery and confidence in government.”

— **Eléanore Johasy**, Member of Parliament, National Assembly, Madagascar

“Without communication, M&E will never be appreciated.”

— **Halima Ibrahim**, Head of Planning and Budgeting, County Government of Isiolo, Kenya



Watch the session



Video recording of the Session B5:

[NEC 2022 | Stream B5 - Subnational Evaluation Systems - YouTube](#)

