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# Introduction

## Background to PNDS-SP and PARTISIPA

The *Programa Nasional Dezenvolvimentu Suku* (PNDS), or National Program for Village Development, is a Government of Timor-Leste (GoTL) owned and managed program that aims to improve human development in Timor-Leste. PNDS provides villages in Timor-Leste with grants to construct or rehabilitate, manage and maintain small-scale infrastructure. Water supply systems, roads, bridges, irrigation and small local markets are examples of projects.

Australia’s PNDS Support Program (PNDS-SP) has been assisting GoTL to deliver an effective program. PNDS and PNDS-SP share aspects of a common program logic. Australia’s goal for PNDS-SP was that community members attain increased social and economic benefits, which aligned with the goal of PNDS.

PNDS-SP began in 2013 and until mid-2019 its sole focus was to support GoTL with the implementation and management of PNDS. From mid-2019 to mid-2021 the focus of PNDS-SP, renamed PARTISIPA, is on three main work areas:

1. To continue to support GoTL with the implementation and management of PNDS;
2. To pilot support in three municipalities for improved decentralized service delivery;
3. To support a more integrated management of rural water.

## Background to the PARTISIPA Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Plan

This document outlines the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan (MELP) for PARTISIPA, which will run from mid-2019 to mid-2021. The MELP describes the PARTISIPA approach to tracking and assessing progress towards outcomes and performance targets.

The PARTISIPA MELP builds on a previous PNDS-SP MELP that was developed in 2013 and provides some basis for planning the M&E system. Over time, the previous PNDS-SP MELP has become outdated as the program has iteratively adjusted its approach. Most consequentially, PARTISIPA intends to pilot support in three municipalities for improved decentralized service delivery and also aims to support a more integrated approach to rural water management. These elements were not present in the previous PNDS-SP MELP, necessitating the development of a revised MELP document.

To provide a strong basis for the new PARTISIPA M&E system several workshops were held with key stakeholders to confirm a shared understanding of end of program outcomes and the pathway to their achievement.

The first workshop series was held over five days in late April and early May 2019, bringing together around 40 stakeholders from PNDS-SP, DFAT, other DFAT investment partners (PHD and GfD) and three external consultants[[1]](#footnote-1). The workshop sessions were facilitated by M&E House in Dili. The first workshop sessions included a ‘situation assessment’ of the three main work areas of PARTISIPA (listed above). Each situation assessment involved background presentations of the current situation and status; problem identification; PESTLE context analysis[[2]](#footnote-2); stakeholder analysis; and an analysis of implications, strategies and solutions. On subsequent days, a smaller group of core PNDS-SP and DFAT staff developed an adjusted program logic and theory of change, including identification of program activities and outcomes at different levels, for the three main work areas. The fifth day of workshops brought all stakeholders together again to disseminate information on progress and respond to questions about the direction of the PNDS-SP program.

The second workshop series was held over two days in early June 2019 with key stakeholders from PNDS-SP and DFAT. This workshop built on the outputs of the first workshop series. Participants refined the ToC, defined evaluation questions and sub-questions, identified indicators, methods and data sources, and considered the timing of M&E activities (such as data collection, analysis and reporting). A formal ‘Evaluability Assessment’ report was not written. Instead, the outputs from both workshop series were cleaned, compiled and shared with all workshop participants. The outputs from both the first and second workshop series have provided the basis of this PARTISPA MELP.

This document includes the following sections:

* **Theory of Change (ToC):** This section presents the program’s hypothesis of how change will happen, in order to contribute to the identified end-of-program outcomes;
* **Scope:** This section covers the purpose, audience, and boundaries of the MELP;
* **Key Evaluation Questions and sub-questions:** This section presents the KEQs for each outcome with corresponding indicators;
* **Methods:** This section provides details on implementation of this MELP - data collection methods, identifying tools, responsibilities and timing;
* **Learning and dissemination:** This sectiondescribes how M&E processes will feed into learning and dissemination;
* **Implementation:** This section defines the resources available and the roles and responsibilities for implementing the MELP;
* **Timeline for implementation:** This section defines the schedule for implementation of key MELP activities.

PARTISIPA may review the MELP annually and make any amendments as necessary.

# Theory of change

The PARTISIPA ToC is presented in Annex 1 and is described in detail below.

## Goal and End-of-Program Outcomes (EoPOs)

The goal of PARTISIPA is that *community members attain increased social and economic benefits.* This goal reflects the overall GoTL goal for the PNDS program. To contribute to this goal, PARTISIPA has three end-of-program outcomes (EoPOs):

* EoPO 1: Effective government implementation of PNDS and rural water O&M
* EoPO 2: Select municipalities have improved public administration for service delivery
* EoPO 3: Communities build and manage quality small-scale infrastructure

By the end of June 2021, PARTISIPA will be accountable for progress towards achieving these three EoPOs.

**EoPO 1: Effective government implementation of PNDS and rural water O&M**

EoPO 1 reflects the work that PARTISIPA is doing to support the national government to effectively deliver the PNDS program and rural water supply. PARTISIPA is undertaking a range of foundational and influencing activities that are expected to lead to immediate outcomes (sometimes called outputs), intermediate outcomes, and the achievement of this EoPO. Influencing activities that contribute to the results pathway include the facilitation of opportunities for sub-national government to advocate to national policy makers; the provision of technical support, advice, training and mentoring to relevant national government counterparts; supporting the development of inclusive policies, systems and tools and communication products; and generating and sharing evidence to inform policy and decision making. The intermediate outcomes under EoPO 1 are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EoPO 1 | Effective government implementation of PNDS and rural water O&M |
| * IO 1.1 | The national government allocates and disburses (adequate) budget for implementing PNDS and the O&M of rural water infrastructure |
| * IO 1.2 | Policies and guidelines are in place for implementing PNDS, O&M for rural water infrastructure, and sub-national administration |
| * IO 1.3 | Relevant government counterparts understand and use GoTL systems for PNDS, O&M of rural water infrastructure, and sub-national administration |
| * IO 1.4 | Key GoTL counterparts demonstrate strategic leadership |
| * IO 1.5 | The government uses evidence to make decisions |

**EoPO 2: Select municipalities have improved public administration for service delivery**

PARTISIPA aims to improve public administration for service delivery in selected municipalities only, as activities related to EoPO 2 are being piloted from mid-2019 to mid-2021, the last two years of the PNDS Support Program investment. The results and lessons learned from implementation will inform the design and implementation of future DFAT investments in this area. Particular activities to be undertaken relating to EoPO 2 include providing technical support, advice, training and mentoring to relevant sub-national government counterparts; supporting formal coordination mechanisms for sub-national government; and supporting the training delivered by municipalities to administrative posts and suco levels. The intermediate outcomes for EoPO 2 are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EoPO 2 | Select municipalities have improved public administration for service delivery |
| * IO 2.1 | The national government allocates and disburses (adequate) budget for implementing PNDS and the O&M of small-scale infrastructure |
| * IO 2.2 | Policies and guidelines are in place for implementing PNDS, O&M for small-scale infrastructure, and sub-national administration |

**EoPO 3: Communities build and manage quality small-scale infrastructure**

PARTISIPA also supports communities to build and manage small-scale infrastructure. In addition to the support provided to sub-national government to improve public administration (EoPO 2), PARTISIPA provides technical support, tools, training and mentoring to relevant stakeholders at municipal, administrative post and suco levels. PARTISIPA also supports inclusive community planning, management and accountability processes for PNDS and rural water. The intermediate outcomes under EoPO 3 are as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EoPO 3 | Communities build and manage quality small-scale infrastructure |
| * IO 3.1 | Sub-national governments plan and manage their resources to support service delivery |
| * IO 3.2 | Suco structures and community members plan and implement small-scale infrastructure |
| * IO 3.3 | Suco structures and community members manage and maintain small-scale infrastructure |

## Stakeholders

Stakeholders are those who are integral to PARTISIPA achieving its EoPOs. Effectively engaging relevant stakeholders at different levels – national and sub-national – is critical to the performance of the program and the realisation of the change pathways identified in the ToC. Figure 1 illustrates where PARTISIPA stakeholders lie within spheres of control, influence and concern.

The ‘sphere of control’ comprises those with whom the program works directly. These stakeholders include PARTISIPA staff and their direct relationships with government counterparts. Since EoPO 3 very much depends on GoTL public transfers and the involvement of the PNDS government counterparts, they have also been located in the sphere of control. The sphere of control does not imply that these stakeholders are ‘controlled’, but rather that the program has relative control over the mix of activities (relevance), and how they are implemented (appropriateness).

The ‘sphere of influence’ comprises those stakeholders whom PARTISIPA is trying to influence in order to achieve the immediate and intermediate outcomes in the ToC. For PARTISIPA, the sphere of influence includes the national government, targeted municipalities, and community groups (usually suco structures or water groups).

The ‘sphere of concern’[[3]](#footnote-3) comprises those whom the program ultimately aims to impact – community members. These stakeholders are sometimes referred to as the ‘ultimate beneficiaries’ and are located at the goal level of the ToC, although they are beyond PARTISIPA’s line of accountability in the ToC.

Figure 1: Spheres of control, influence and concern
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## Our work

The *Programa Nasional Dezenvolvimentu Suku* (PNDS), or National Program for Village Development, is a nation-wide community development program of the Government of Timor-Leste. Launched in June 2012 for an initial duration of eight years, it contributes to rural development by funding the ‘missing link’ to services – basic village infrastructure – and providing jobs and training. The project fully encompasses the nation’s 452 villages, and sucos would receive infrastructure development grants with some variation based on suco population and remoteness of the suco from its municipal capital.

PNDS is financed from Timor-Leste’s state budget, and to assist the Government with the implementation of the program, Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade established the National Program for Village Development Support Program (PNDS-SP), to provide advisory services to PNDS, and assist in a range of areas, such as capacity building and training, gender and social inclusion, ICT support, monitoring and evaluation and technical support in the three implementation areas of social development, engineering and finance.

The scope of PARTISIPA covers three broad working areas: support to PNDS; municipal strengthening in three municipalities; and rural water supply. These are briefly described below.

### Activities in PNDS

The support to PNDS continues to be the core part of PARTISIPA. At national level, program advisers continue to work with their national counterparts at the PNDS Secretariat to provide services for the social development, finance and engineering of the PNDS program and associated programs funded by other donors. Examples of current collaborative partnerships are the constructions of playgrounds and school buildings. In the coming years, new partnerships could be explored – funded either through other donors, or by other GoTL ministries – thereby creating a national platform that could be used in different ways, including for the rapid deployment of resources to sucos in the event of a natural disaster or other emergencies.

At municipal level, PARTISIPA’s Field Support Team continue to mentor and collaborate with their municipal and administrative post counterparts to build well-designed, good quality and functional small-scale infrastructure in support of local development and improved local service delivery.

### Activities in municipal strengthening

In the municipalities of Baucau, Bobonaro and Ermera, PARTISIPA’s Municipal Advisors will guide the program’s activities in strengthening the local public administration for improved service delivery. PARTISIPA’s activities in these municipalities will also be coordinated with similar municipal strengthening efforts from other donors (e.g. UNDP and EU). The exact scope of support activities will be determined in the annual workplans.

### Activities in rural water supply

The third work area of PARTISIPA is to assist communities to build and manage quality small-scale infrastructure for rural water supplies. These activities fall into different categories.

* **New rural water supply delivered via PNDS.** The PNDS continues to deliver a significant number of rural water supply systems and the PARTISIPA program will continue to support GoTL to deliver rural water supply via PNDS for the 2019-2021 period. As well as supporting the development of new rural water systems using PNDS funding, the program will give more focus to repairing and maintaining older systems.
* **Support to Administrative Post Facilitators (FPAs) to strengthen community level oversight and management of rural water infrastructure through the Suco Council and water management groups (GMFs).** Most reviews of rural water sustainability identify a correlation between active engagement of women and the suco authorities in water management with well-functioning GMFs and the increased likelihood that water supply infrastructure is maintained and functioning. An expanded Field Support Team will collaborate with the Municipal Water and Sanitation Service (SMASA) Facilitators at the Administrative Post level to support Suco authorities and GMFs to operate and maintain their water supply infrastructure.
* **Financial support for O&M of rural infrastructure, particularly water.** Operations and maintenance of suco infrastructure is crucial for basic service delivery, the most important being water. The program plans to identify the most appropriate Public Financial Management (PFM) mechanisms for the allocation of financial resources to municipalities and sucos to maintain basic infrastructure within a decentralised service delivery system. If the program is successful in these efforts, then the focus for subsequent years will be to support the operationalisation of such mechanisms, including supporting the development and implementation of relevant laws, regulations, guidelines, training modules and other relevant activities.

### Cross-cutting and general support activities

Apart from the work in the above three areas, PARTISIPA also has some cross-cutting and general support activities.

* **Policy and strategy support, generating evidence and supporting learning.** PARTISIPA will operate at different levels. The activities linked to the work areas described above will predominantly be at the sub-national levels. This will be complemented at the national level with activities that are more geared towards policy development and strategy support, generate evidence gained from implementing the program activities, support learning and capacity building for different groups of stakeholders, and engage in specific actions to improve gender equity and social inclusion.
* **General support.** This covers procurement and logistics support, corporate services (i.e. finances and human resources management), and IT support. The activities in these areas are not captured in the M&E framework, but they are as important as the other ones to the overall success of the program.

## Principles

PARTISIPA has identified the following principles as being integral to the program. These principles are also reflected in the Theory of Change.

* **Community-driven development:** PARTISIPA aims for its activities to support processes and systems that enhance community planning and construction of small-scale infrastructure assets. The to-be-built infrastructure assets have been selected and prioritised in a consultative manner, actively involving women and men at aldeia and suco levels.
* **Community management:** PARTISIPA aims for its activities to support processes and systems that allow communities to better operate and manage their small-scale infrastructure assets. The decision-making for these assets rests with communities, in line with the Central Government’s commitment to support local development and combat rural poverty through decentralisation.
* **Transparency:** PARTISIPA will ensure the transparency of its operations with GoTL at all levels, and it hopes to foster reciprocal transparency. PARTISIPA supports PNDS’ efforts to democratize access to information, so that communities have easy, convenient and timely access to all necessary technical and financial information to inform their decision-making.
* **Accountability:** PARTISIPA will promote upwards and downwards accountability between national government and communities. PARTISIPA supports PNDS in building a clear understanding of the rights and responsibilities of all actors in PNDS, to allow for effective accounting of decisions made, funds utilized, and works constructed. PARTISIPA is also accountable to DFAT for its use of resources in support of PNDS and other program activities.
* **Gender & disability inclusion:** PARTISIPA will actively work to ensure men, women and disabled people have a voice in decision-making on community development issues, and ultimately benefit from PNDS.
* **Iterative & adaptive practice:** PARTISIPA implementation is based on a theory of change. However, the precise activities and processes by which the program is delivered will be informed by monitoring data and lessons-learned, allowing for iterative changes and adaption to strengthen program performance.
* **Thinking and working politically in partnership:** PARTISIPA willwork in partnership and building effective relationships with GoTL, partners, development partners and civil society organisations to better understand the context and to better target program support.

# Scope of monitoring, evaluation and learning plan

## Purpose

The purpose of the MELP is to document the system that PARTISIPA will use to collect and analyse data, generate results and evidence, and produce reports and other material for accountability, learning and adaption. The MELP is thus vital for understanding and communicating progress towards the achievement of the program’s EoPOs and the contribution to the overall PNDS goal.

PARTISIPA will use the MELP as follows:

* **Proving/Accountability:** PARTISIPA will provide evidence on progress towards the achievement of EoPOs and the effectiveness of the PARTISIPA approach. PARTISIPA is accountable for the results reported and will assess and manage the risks identified. The monitoring framework (annex 3) outlines the information needed to answer key evaluation questions and sub-questions, methods, indicators, baseline figures and targets.
* **Learning and Improvement:** PARTISIPA will use the body of evidence generated from its monitoring and evaluation activities to learn more about what is working or not working, and why. The program will reflect on this evidence and consider possible responses to improve its effectiveness and efficiency. PARTISIPA will document any changes that are made (adaption) to its set of activities or how they are implemented. PARTISIPA evidence will also be used to inform a future program design which currently has the working title of SAMI (Suco and Municipal Initiative).
* **Knowledge:** PARTISIPA will contribute to the generation of a body-of-knowledge on what works for the delivery of PNDS, decentralisation and rural water supply. This knowledge will be utilised by the program and shared with stakeholders including GoTL counterparts, DFAT and CSOs. Emerging patterns may be helpful for other stakeholders working towards better governance in Timor-Leste.

## Boundaries

This MELP document covers the final two-year period of the PARTISIPA program, from July 2019 to June 2021. The boundaries of the MELP are defined by the activities and outcomes described in the ToC. The line of accountability extends to the EoPOs to be achieved by the end of June 2021. It is further understood that PARTISIPA is subject to internal and external risk factors, which the program has worked to identify and mitigate (Annex 2).

## Audience

PARTISIPA has undertaken a stakeholder analysis and identified the information needs of each audience. These are presented in the table below:

Table 2: Audience for the MELP

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type | Audience | Information needs |
| Primary | PARTISIPA team | Information for proving/accountability: Extent to which the program adds value to PNDS delivery; municipal support; water supply and management; contribution to policy making; progress on work plan implementation and budgeting; achievement of results and meeting targets.  Information for learning and improvement: Extent to which the program is taking the right approach overall and engaging in relevant activities, delivered appropriately. Extent to which the program ToC is valid in relation to contextual factors.  Knowledge: Generating evidence for reporting to DFAT; Informing and influencing GoTL counterparts. |
| Primary | DFAT | Information for accountability and articulating a clear performance story of PARTISIPA. This includes information on outcomes at all levels (immediate, intermediate and EoPO); the PARTISIPA contribution to Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) indicators.  Strategic level information on the impact of PARTISIPA on PNDS. This includes the approach to engaging GoTL, mitigation of risks, public diplomacy; and PNDS ‘big data’ results, including the number of infrastructure projects completed, number of jobs created, community engagement statistics, and other relevant performance data. |
| Primary | GoTL | Information and evidence to influence policy making decisions; reporting information for senior GoTL civil service and parliament. |
| Primary | Design team for SAMI | Evidence and knowledge generated for assessing the PARTISIPA approach and considering possible changes and adaption in SAMI. This includes the level of technical assistance provided; impact on PNDS implementation; influence on political relationships and engagement; changes in contextual factors such as decentralisation; and information on water supply activities. |
| Secondary | Other DFAT programs (GfD, PHD) | Learning and knowledge generated about the PARTISIPA approach: This includes learning around targeted technical assistance with government; contextual information on municipalities and decentralised budgeting; |
| Secondary | Other donors and partners (EU, UNDP, MFAT, water sector) | Knowledge products: Online reports; R&R reports; concept notes; other reporting mediums that describe what PARTISIPA has been doing and learning |

# Key evaluation questions and sub-questions

Key evaluation questions (KEQs) and sub-questions (SQs) provide an organising framework for the MELP design and for reporting. These KEQs and SQs were developed by the PARTISIPA team during a series of workshops and elaborate the key outcome areas described in the ToC.

| Criteria | Key evaluation questions | Sub-questions |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Effectiveness | 1. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported GoTL to improve the implementation of PNDS? | 1.1. To what extent has GoTL demonstrated strategic leadership of PNDS ? |
| 1.2. To what extent did GoTL allocate adequate resources for PNDS (staff, money/budget and assets)? |
| 1.3. To what extent do government counterparts develop, utilise and manage PNDS system? |
| 1.4. To what extent is evidence available, accessed and used by PNDS counterparts? |
| Effectiveness | 2. To what extent are communities engaging with and benefitting from PNDS? | 2.1. To what extent have quality infrastructure projects been implemented through PNDS? |
| 2.2. To what extent do community structures have increased skills and knowledge to manage PNDS in their suco? |
| 2.3. To what extent are PNDS community processes participatory and inclusive? |
| 2.4. To what extent have PNDS activities met the needs of Timorese women and people with disability? |
| 2.5. How are people benefitting from PNDS activities and in what ways? |
| Effectiveness | 3. To what extent has public administration improved in select municipalities? | 3.1. To what extent has PARTISIPA influenced municipal resource allocation (budget, assets, people)? |
| 3.2. How has PARTISIPA contributed to stronger linkages between municipalities and administrative posts? |
| 3.3. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported sub-national government coordinating mechanisms to function effectively? |
| 3.4. How has PARTISIPA support to municipal administrations been effective or relevant for varying municipal contexts? |
| Effectiveness | 4. To what extent has PARTISIPA contributed to improved management of rural water supply in target communities? | 4.1. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported GoTL to agree on an O&M approach for suco infrastructure? |
| 4.2. To what extent have GoTL financial systems to enable rural water sustainability improved? |
| 4.3. To what extent has PARTISIPA helped to improve rural water supply? |
| 4.4. To what extent do frontline staff have the resources needed to support rural water O&M? |
| 4.5. To what extent has suco capacity and access to resources improved their water supply? |
| Effectiveness | 5. To what extent is the program model relevant and efficient? | 5.1. How well did the program promote gender equality, social inclusion and women empowerment? |
| Efficiency |  | 5. 2. Is PARTISIPA investing in the right places to maximise results and relationships through better coordination and networking? |
| Effectiveness |  | 5. 3. Is the approach to building capacity working, and what factors influence it? |
| Relevance and appropriateness |  | 5.4. To what extent is the program adaptive to the evolving context and emerging opportunities? |

# Monitoring and evaluation methods

## Monitoring, evaluation and learning framework

The PARTISIPA M&E system has been developed in line with DFAT M&E standards[[4]](#footnote-4). The monitoring, evaluation and learning framework (MELF), in Annex 3, brings together the PARTISIPA KEQs, SQs, indicators, data collection methods and targets. The MELP will guide collection of data to inform progress against outcomes and generate evidence for learning and knowledge development.

PARTISIPA will strive to apply ‘good practices’ to monitoring and evaluation, which are appropriate to available resources and the complexity of the program. The MELF will:

* **Utilise a mixed-methods approach[[5]](#footnote-5)** - Quantitative methods are often used for measuring what was done and what has changed, whereas qualitative methods can be more useful for describing processes of change and why change has or hasn’t occurred. Mixing both quantitative and qualitative methods may provide greater depth and breadth of understanding, and also offers the opportunity to triangulate results, which can increase rigour.
* **Be lean and efficient** – The focus will be placed on collecting quality and useful data that it is fit-for-purpose. To mitigate the risk of the system becoming burdensome, data will be systematically collected for only relevant indicators that are specific, measurable and relevant.
* **Be utilisation-focused[[6]](#footnote-6)** - PARTISIPAwill conduct M&E in ways that are likely to enhance utilisation findings to inform decisions and improve performance.
* **Be inclusive and transparent** – PARTISIPA aims to take an inclusive approach by engaging key stakeholders in data collection processes and in the interpretation of evidence to generate findings and recommendations. PARTISIPA will transparently disseminate its results to primary and secondary audiences, as appropriate.
* **Have continuity with the previous system** – As far as possible, the MELP will be aligned with the previous PNDS-SP M&E system. This will allow the PARTISIPA team to smoothly transition to the adjusted MELP. The MELP has been written in a style that is easy to understand by the PARTISIPA team and other primary audiences.

The PARTISIPA MELP also describes how certain sub-questions align with DFAT’s Timor-Leste Performance Assessment Framework (PAF). By collecting data and reporting on PAF indicators, PARTISIPA is able to contribute to country level reporting for the Australian Development Cooperation Programs. PARTISIPA will refer to the ‘Performance Assessment Framework - Technical Notes’ when developing tools and collecting data for reporting against PAF indicators.

## Data collection methods

PARTISIPA has identified a range of data collection methods which will be used to answer the KEQs and sub-questions. Annex 4 provides a summary of the data collection methods and tools.

## Data analysis and reporting

PARTISIPA data collection methods will be utilized discretely, and analysis and reporting of this data will also be analysed separately and summarized into results reports. Every six months, results from various data sources will be collated into an evidence matrix (Annex 5), organised according to the key evaluation questions and sub-questions in the MELP.

The evidence matrix will help ensure that the program is able to triangulate results from multiple sources of information, thereby strengthening the quality and robustness of the evidence to answer KEQs and SQs. Analysis of the evidence will be undertaken during events such as ‘Learning dialogues’[[7]](#footnote-7) (see 6 Learning and dissemination) from which key findings and recommendations will be generated with input from stakeholders. These will be reported in the Annual Report and in the July-to-December progress update. The schedule for these activities is outlined in Annex 7.

PARTISIPA also plans to undertake an external Program Review in 2021 which will look back on progress and achievements and also look forward to inform future programming and investments in PNDS and the water sector at the municipal and suco levels.

# Learning and dissemination

The monitoring and evaluation methods described above will feed into PARTISIPA program learning and dissemination in the following ways:

**Regular meetings between PARTISIPA and DFAT:** Regular update meetings will be held to review progress against the work plan, seek feedback and identify priorities. It is envisaged that the program will continue to submit a six-monthly progress report to DFAT in February and an Annual Report in August.

**Regular meetings between PARTISIPA and government counterparts**: PARTISIPA will hold regular ‘monthly progress update’ meetings with government counterparts to discuss the progress in different work areas, noting successes and any constraints, and to agree on risk mitigation strategies. These are typically informal meetings, (i.e. Secretariat meetings) in which advisors also participate. Regular meetings are also held between the PNDS Director and PNDS-SP TL or DTL.

**Learning Dialogues (LD)**: Learning dialogues are a participatory process for engaging key stakeholders to make sense of monitoring and evaluation data and incorporate multiple perspectives prior to report writing. Learning dialogues help organisations reduce their reporting burden, improve fit-for-purpose reporting, and bring out lessons learned for program management and improvement. The learning dialogue is a facilitated workshop with key stakeholders and decision-makers from the program. By conducting this in advance of the reporting deadline, it becomes possible to use the evidence, analysis, and recommendations to inform the progress reporting. The workshops are an opportunity to review the evidence available for each key component of the theory of change, reflect upon what it means, and decide what to do differently. The process works best with an independent facilitator; though internal engagement is essential. The output of the workshop is an evidence matrix that can be used as the basis of reporting and improvement.

**Progress Reports:** Progress reports are the main documents collating evidence, results, and learning against the MELP. The progress reports will comply with the DFAT M&E Standards and the DFAT Timor-Leste Good Practice Note on Reporting (see Annex 6). Important elements include: a description and assessment of implementation of activities; a description and assessment of progress towards EoPOs; the provision of credible evidence for claims of achievement or barriers to achievement; lessons learned from implementation, and proposed management responses and recommendations. The Evidence Matrix (Annex 5) and Learning Dialogue process will be used to bring together information and results into a body of evidence that PARTISIPA will draw on when writing progress reports.

**Performance Assessment Framework (PAF):** All investment partners, including PARTISIPA, are also required to report against the Timor-Leste PAF, for which there are 9 outcomes and 21 indicators. The PAF indicators PARTISIPA reports against have been incorporated into the MELF in Annex 3.

**Broader dissemination of the PARTISIPA learning:** PARTISIPA has a communication strategy in place that describes how the generated information will be made available to relevant stakeholders, including GoTL, DFAT and other donors, and CSOs. Other methods of disseminating information and knowledge include workshops, conferences and seminars, research reports, news and social media, DFAT’s website, television and radio.

# Implementation of the MELP

## Resources

The implementation of the MELP will be managed by the PARTISIPA Evidence and Learning Team Coordinator. All PARTISIPA advisers and technical staff will play an appropriate role in monitoring, evaluation and learning activities (MEL), as these activities are in everyone’s interest. Furthermore, work area managers from the Australian Embassy will also be engaged in MEL activities. In addition, M&E House is on hand to provide technical support on the use of M&E tools, to support data analysis and to facilitate learning events.

## Roles and responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities relating to monitoring, evaluation and learning are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Roles and responsibilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Role | Responsibilities |
| PARTISIPA Evidence and Learning Team Coordinator | Overall responsibility for program operations and MEL, including:   * Planning MEL activities with the PARTISIPA team, M&E House and DFAT; * Managing data collection and analysis; * Collating PARTISIPA results from multiple data sources; * Preparing PARTISIPA Annual Report and six-monthly progress update; * Contributing to the DFAT Aid Quality Check (AQC) process; * Revising the PARTISIPA MELP with support from M&E House in line with DFAT protocols and standards. |
| PARTISIPA Program Managers and teams | Providing support to PARTISIPA Evidence and Learning Team Coordinator, including:   * Contributing to data collection and analysis; * Contributing to the writing sections of the PARTISIPA Annual Report; * Contributing to relevant MEL workshops and activities. |
| PNDS staff | Collecting data related to PNDS activities at sub-national levels, and entering a sub-set of the collected data in the PNDS MIS. |
| DFAT | Engaging in DFAT performance monitoring and reporting requirements, including:   * Monitoring program implementation through meetings, workshops and site visits; * Performing Aid Quality Checks, assessing the aid investments against the criteria: efficiency, effectiveness, gender equality, M&E, sustainability and relevance; * Approving PARTISIPA performance reports; * Approving management responses to performance reports; * Overseeing the strategic direction of PARTISIPA, including new designs, reviews and evaluations; * Communicating relevant management responses to other relevant stakeholders; * Contributing to the Annual Program Performance Report (APPR). * Coordinating support with M&E House as needed; |
| M&E House | Provision of technical and strategic guidance to PARTISIPA, including:   * Technical advice and facilitation support for MELP revision including the ToC and MELF; * Technical support for the design of tools and methods for data collection; * Technical support on approaches to data analysis; * Support preparing the PARTISIPA learning dialogue and facilitation as required; * Support delivering other workshops, such as on program redesign. |

# Timeline for implementation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Frequent / High intensity |
|  |  |
|  | Infrequent / Low intensity |

The timeline for implementing MELP activities is shown below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2019 | | 2020 | | | | 2021 | |
| Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 |
| Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilitators – suco reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FST reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PNDS technical team data reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical audits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advisor reports |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SSC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FST R&R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning dialogues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GoTL R&R consultation (\*) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FGDs with GoTL (\*\*) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KIIs with GoTL (\*\*) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review GoTL documents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning and Reporting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual plan | Aug |  |  |  | Aug |  |  |  |
| Six monthly review/feedback with DFAT |  |  | Feb |  |  |  | Feb |  |
| Written annual report | Jul |  |  |  | Jul |  |  |  |
| End-of-program report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | May |

(\*) As there will be several consultations with GoTL during the design of the follow-on program, it is rather unlikely that there will be additional R&R sessions for the PARTISIPA program.

(\*\*) FGDs and KIIs may happen as part of gathering data in preparation of SSCs.

# Annexes

The annexes for the PARTISIPA monitoring, evaluation and learning plan include the following:

1. **Theory of Change**. Previously, PNDS-SP did not have a ToC separate from that of the PNDS program. This ToC is more elaborate, and has been updated to match the expanded scope of the PARTISIPA program running from mid-2019 to mid-2021.
2. **Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**. The previous M&E framework of PNDS-SP was rather elaborate, was structured around the program goal and end-of-program outcomes, and was only PNDS focused. The new M&E framework of PARTISIPA is structured around five Key Evaluation Questions, and has been updated to match the expanded scope of PARTISIPA. At the same time, there has been some culling of outdated and less relevant indicators of the old PNDS-SP M&E framework.
3. **Data collection methods and strategy**. Monitoring and evaluation data is collected in various ways, using different tools, with the involvement of many people at different levels. This table provides summary information on the methods which will provide most of the data and information.
4. **Evidence Matrix Template**. This template is provided to facilitate the recording of evidence to answer the evaluation questions and sub-questions.
5. **DFAT monitoring and evaluation standards**. In 2013, AusAID published monitoring and evaluation standards to improve the quality of monitoring and evaluation products.   
   This annex, taken from the 2017 DFAT Monitoring and Evaluation Standards[[8]](#footnote-8), gives the standards for progress reporting.

## Annex 1. Theory of Change

**Community members attain increased social and economic benefits**

**EoPOs**

**Influencing activities**

**Intermediate outcomes**

**Immediate outcomes**

**Effective government implementation of PNDS and rural water supply O&M**

**Communities build and manage quality   
small-scale infrastructure**

**Select municipalities have improved public administration for service delivery**

Generate evidence and share it to inform policy and decision-making

Provide technical support, advice, training and mentoring to relevant national government counterparts

Provide technical support, advice, training and mentoring to relevant   
sub-national government counterparts

Facilitate opportunities for sub-national government to communicate and advocate to national policy makers

Support counterpart to develop inclusive policies, systems and tools and communication products

Support formal coordination mechanism for sub-national government

Provide technical support, tools, training and mentoring to relevant stakeholders at administrative post and suco levels

Support delivery of training

Support inclusive community planning, management and accountability processes for PNDS and rural water

Suco structures and community members manage and maintain   
small-scale infrastructure

Policies and guidelines in place for:

- Implementing PNDS

- O&M small-scale infrastructure

- Sub-national administration

Government uses evidence to make decisions

Relevant government counterparts understand and use GoTL systems

- PNDS

- O&M small-scale infrastructure

- Sub-national administration

Municipal representatives coordinate and collaborate within the formal administration

National Government allocates and disburses (adequate) budget for:

- Implementing PNDS

- O&M of small-scale infrastructure

Administrative post representatives coordinate and collaborate between facilitators and the suco

Suco structures and community members plan and implement small-scale infrastructure

Key GoTL counterparts demonstrate strategic leadership

Sub-national government plans and manages their resources to support service delivery

Relevant government counterparts understand their roles and have increased skills and knowledge to fulfil their roles

Community members have increased skills and knowledge to manage small-scale infrastructure

Relevant government decision-makers plan and advocate for adequate budget

Relevant government counterparts engage in the development of policies and guidelines

Administrative post counterparts support communities in village development

Communities support participation of women and PWDs in PNDS and rural water supply activities

National government leads technical training to sub-national government counterparts

Municipal and administrative post technical staff have the knowledge, skills and motivation to fulfil their roles

Relevant counter-parts have accessed data and evidence

Systems are in place

Formal coordination mechanisms occurring regularly

Advisors embedded in institutions

Develop and implement government engagement strategy

Technical field teams   
in place

Undertake gender equality and social inclusion analysis

Coordination with partners/ donors, other IPs

Technical advice for training

**Foundational activities**

**Principles:**

Community- driven development

Community management

Transparency

Accountability

Gender & disability inclusion

Iterative & adaptive practice

Thinking and working politically in partnership

**Goal**

## Annex 2. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

| Sub-Questions | Indicators | Methods | Baseline [[9]](#footnote-9) | Targets 2019/2020 | Targets 2020/2021 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| KEQ 1. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported GoTL to improve the Implementation of PNDS? | | | | | |
| 1.1. To what extent has GoTL demonstrated strategic leadership of PNDS? | Instances of independent leadership and management | SSCs  Advisor reports | N/A |  | 1 SSC |
| PAF indicator 16. Instances of inclusive policy development | SSCs  Advisor reports  GoTL document review | N/A |  | 1 SSC |
| PAF indicator 20. Instances of improved policy and implementation (manuals, guidelines, standards) | SSCs | N/A |  | 1 SSC |
| PAF indicator 21. Instances of evidence available for decision-making (research, pilots) | SSCs | N/A | 2 SSCs | 1 SSC |
| Percent of PNDS Secretariat policy circulars relating to policy change completed by PNDS Secretariat staff at the assisted and independent level | Advisor reports  GoTL document review | 15% in 2017-18 | 30% | 30% |
| 1.2. To what extent did GoTL allocate adequate resources for PNDS (staff, budget and assets)? | Amount of investment into PNDS (for public transfers, and goods and services) | Advisor reports  GoTL document review | Based on Decree-Law, $22.53 million | N/A | N/A |
| Instances of policy advice and analysis on budget formulation and budget preparation provided to PNDS Secretariat | Advisor reports | N/A | 1 narrative instance | 1 narrative instance |
| 1.3. To what extent do counterparts develop, utilise and manage PNDS systems? | Amount of budget spent on PNDS staff training (by gender, by training type) | Advisor reports | Total: $70,771 GoTL: $25,383 in 2017-18 | N/A | N/A |
| Number of PNDS staff trained (by gender, by training type) | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS Advisor reports | 259 FPAs in 2017-18 | 1 refresher training per FPA | 1 refresher training per FPA |
| Percent of MIS data complete on social, financial and technical activities input by municipal staff (for events that took place during the reporting period) | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS  Advisor reports | 82% in 2017-18 | 70% | 70% |
|  | PAF indicator 9. Number of people who applied improved skills to deliver better quality services (training, evaluation) | Advisor reports | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1.3. To what extent do counterparts develop, utilise and manage PNDS systems? [continued] | Instances of quality sector coordination leading to decision-making | Advisor reports | N/A | 1 narrative instance | 1 narrative instance |
| Percent of action items (as agreed to with Municipal Coordinator during FST visits) followed up appropriately by municipal staff | FST reports  Advisor reports | 70% | 70% | 70% |
|  | *Internal [[10]](#footnote-10): Number of days between the signing of Grant Agreements to the disbursement of Grants to Community Bank Accounts* | *Advisors report*  *PNDS technical team data/reports* | *In Mar-Apr 2019 22 workdays for Infrastructure Funds 31 working days for Operational Funds* | *28 days* | *28 days* |
|  | *Internal: Percent of tickets closed by PNDS Secretariat IT staff in less than 3 business days* | *Advisors report*  *PNDS technical team data/reports* | *92% of tickets closed in average of 16 workdays* | *75%* | *75%* |
|  | *Internal: Percent of tickets solved independently or guided by PNDS IT* | *Advisors report*  *PNDS technical team data/reports* | *89% in FY2018-19* | *80%* | *80%* |
|  | *Internal: Percent of external and in-house training sessions rated as 'good'* | *Advisors report*  *PNDS technical team data/reports* | *92% in FY2018-19* | *90%* | *90%* |
| 1.4. To what extent is evidence available, accessed and used by PNDS counterparts? | Instances of PNDS counterparts using the MIS and other forms of evidence | Advisor reports  GoTL document review | N/A | 1 narrative instance | 1 narrative instance |
| KEQ 2. To what extent are communities engaging with and benefitting from PNDS? | | | | | |
| 2.1. To what extent have quality infrastructure projects been implemented through PNDS? | Number and monetary value of PNDS projects (by sector) | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS  PNDS technical team data/reports | Minimum one project per suco that obtains infrastructure funds | 202 projects | 452 projects |
| Percent of village infrastructure built by PNDS rated 'good' against technical standards | FST reports | 86% (Technical audit 2017) | 60% | 60% |
|  | Frequency and coverage of Field Support Team (FST) visits, (by suco) | FST reports | 51% of sucos in FY2018-19 | 70% of sucos | 70% of sucos |
| 2.1. To what extent have quality infrastructure projects been implemented through PNDS? [continued] | *Internal: Percent of village infrastructure that achieve good rating in construction quality checklist tool TF 9.3.1-9.3.8 as reported by FST* | *FST reports*  *PNDS technical team data/reports* | *50% in FY2018-19* | *40%* | *40%* |
| 2.2. To what extent do community governance structures have increased skills and knowledge to manage PNDS in their suco? | Percent of sucos that achieve moderate or higher rating in the GFM 4 financial monitoring tools, as reported by FST | FST reports  PNDS MIS  PNDS technical team data/reports | 100% in  FY2018-19 | 90% | 90% |
| PAF indicator 6. Number of people with work ready skills (by EJS and PNDS staff) | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS  PNDS technical team data/reports | PNDS staff: 371 EJS: 1,026 in Jan-Jun 2019 | N/A | N/A |
| 2.3. To what extent are PNDS community processes participatory and inclusive? | Number and percentage of participants attending PNDS activities, (by activity type, gender, by PWD) | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS | 35% in Jan-Jun 2019 | 40% female | 40% female |
| PAF indicator 17. Number of people who contribute to community-level decision-making | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS | 2,497 in Jan-Jun 2019 | N/A | N/A |
| 2.4. To what extent have PNDS activities met the needs of Timorese women and people with disabilities? | Proportion of women’s priorities defined in women-only meetings selected to be implemented as projects | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS | 44% for Phase 3 sucos in Cycle 2 in FY2018-19 | 40% | 40% |
| Significant instances of progress in gender and social inclusion in PNDS | Advisors report  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A | 1 narrative instance | 1 narrative instance |
| Significant instances of progress in gender and social inclusion in PARTISIPA | Advisors report  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A | 1 narrative instance | 1 narrative instance |
| 2.5. How are people benefitting from PNDS activities and in what ways? | Amount of money allocated for labour | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS  PNDS technical team data/reports | $5,479,062 for Cycle 1 & Cycle 2 projects in FY2018-19 report | N/A | N/A |
|  | Amount of money allocated for infrastructure | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS  PNDS technical team data/reports | $31,325,661 for all PNDS projects, as in FY2018-19 report | N/A | N/A |
|  | Number of workers (by gender) | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS  PNDS technical team data/reports | F: 4,766 & M:11,659 for Cycle 1 & Cycle 2 projects in FY2018-19 report | N/A | N/A |
| 2.5. How are people benefitting from PNDS activities and in what ways [continued] | PAF Indicator 1. Number of new jobs created - labour for constructions, (by gender) | Facilitator – suco reports  PNDS MIS  PNDS technical team data/reports | 0 in Jan-Jun 2019 | N/A | N/A |
| KEQ 3: To what extent has public administration improved in select municipalities? | | | | | |
| 3.1. To what extent has PARTISIPA influenced municipal resource allocation (budget, assets, people)? | Instances of PARTISIPA influence on municipal resource allocation | Advisors report  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| 3.2. How has PARTISIPA contributed to stronger linkages between municipalities and administrative posts? | PAF Indicator 19. Instances of improved sub-national governance | Advisors report  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A |  | 1 SSC |
| 3.3. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported sub-national government coordinating mechanisms to function effectively? | Instances of improved national-municipal coordination mechanisms | Advisors report  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| 3.4. How has PARTISIPA support to municipal administrations been effective or relevant for varying municipal contexts? | Instances of locally adapted program support in target municipalities | Advisors report  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| KEQ 4: To what extent has PARTISIPA contributed to improved management of rural water supply in target communities? | | | | | |
| 4.1. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported GoTL to agree on an O&M approach for suco infrastructure? | PAF Indicator 8. Instances of improved systems for service delivery | SSC  Advisors report  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A |  | 1 SSC |
| 4.2. To what extent have GoTL financial systems to enable rural water sustainability improved? | Instances of national and municipal government having improved systems in place for disbursement of operational costs associated with rural O&M. | Advisor reports  PNDS technical team data/reports  GoTL document review | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| Percent increase in budget allocation to rural water O&M (through public transfers and associated operational costs) as opposed to rural rehabilitation and construction or urban O&M | Advisor reports  PNDS technical team data/reports  GoTL document review | 2019; $160,000 Municipal Goods and Services for rural water  Public transfer – PNDS only | N/A | N/A |
|  | Percent of budget allocated to rural water O&M is executed in the target municipalities | Advisor reports  GoTL document review  GMF quarterly financial reports to SMASA | N/A | 75% | 75% |
| 4.3. To what extent has PARTISIPA helped to improve rural water supply? | Percent of target sucos with improved water supply coverage (including schools and health facilities) | PNDS and DGAS MIS  Advisor reports  PNDS technical team data/reports  National Census | N/A | 50% | 50% |
| 4.4. To what extent do frontline staff have the resources needed to support rural water O&M? | Percent of frontline staff (FPAs) in target municipalities reporting improvement in the resourcing received to support suco water system O&M | FST reports  PNDS technical team data/reports | N/A | 75% | 75% |
| 4.5. To what extent has suco capacity and access to resources improved their water supply? | GoTL budget allocation to O&M for basic infrastructure, by type of infrastructure | GoTL document review | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of target sucos with increased revenue (tariffs and government grants) and expenditure for water system (O&M) | Advisor reports  GoTL document review  GMF quarterly financial reports to SMASA | N/A | 80% | 80% |
| Instances of increased skills and knowledge of community authorities (suco, GMF) to manage rural water supply systems | Advisor reports  GoTL document review  GMF quarterly financial reports to SMASA | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| KEQ 5: To what extent is the program model relevant and efficient? | | | | | |
| 5.1. How well did the program promote gender equality and social inclusion? | Instances of improved gender equality, social inclusion and women empowerment | Advisor reports  End-of-program review | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| 5.2. Is PARTISIPA investing in the right places to maximise results and relationships? | Instances of improved relationships through better coordination and networking | Advisor reports  End-of-program review | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| 5.3. Is the approach to building capacity working, and what factors influence it? | Instances of improved counterpart capacities for planning and service delivery | Advisor reports  End-of-program review | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| 5.4. How do key counterparts perceive the program, what elements do they value most? | Perceptions of counterparts on the value of the program | Key informant interviews  Focus group discussion  Advisor reports  End-of-program review | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5.5. How well did the program develop and enable coordination and networking? | Instances of effective coordination and networking | Advisor reports  End-of-program review | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |
| 5.6. To what extent is the program adaptive to evolving context and emerging opportunities? | Instances of program adaptations linked to evolving contexts and seizing emerging opportunities | Advisor reports  End-of-program review | N/A |  | 1 narrative instance |

## Annex 3. Data collection methods and strategy

| **Data collection method** | **Description** | **Tools [[11]](#footnote-11)** | **Responsibility for collection and analysis** | **Frequency of data collection** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PNDS facilitators – suco reports | The PNDS Facilitators document PNDS activities that have occurred in the sucos, and the results and outcomes of these activities. These cover a range of social, financial and technical activities throughout the PNDS implementation cycle. The various steps in the cycle, and the actions that are to be implemented, are fully described in the PNDS Program Operations Manual (POM). | As of March 2019, there were: 22 Social Forms, 36 Finance Forms, and 66 Technical Forms to document and support PNDS program activities. Additionally, there are 5 general POM forms. | The data is collected by the PNDS Social, Financial and Technical Administrative Post Facilitators during visits to the sucos, and is returned by them to their municipal offices. | Data collection is ongoing and primarily driven by the steps in the implementation cycle. |
| PNDS MIS | The PNDS Management Information System (MIS) is the central repository of data on all aspects of PNDS which involves the sucos. The MIS also is the source for all data used in PNDS reporting. | Of all the Social, Finance, Technical and POM forms that are filled-in by the Facilitators, 15 of them provide data which gets entered into the PNDS MIS (database) at municipal level. | At the municipal level, entry of selected data into the MIS is the responsibility of the PNDS MIS Operators, Municipal Accountants and Municipal Engineers. Analysis of the MIS data is handled by the PNDS Secretariat staff, and the PARTISIPA Advisors. | Data entry into the MIS is ongoing and primarily driven by the steps in the implementation cycle. |
| FST reports | Field Support Teams (FSTs) are in the municipalities for three weeks per month, and the last week in Dili. At the end of each week in the field, the teams submit a report to, and have a meeting with, the Municipal PNDS Director and her/his team. These reports outline what has been done by the team, their findings, and the reports list what points need specific attention and/or follow-up. During the ‘Dili week’, the FSTs prepare their reports, and participate in debriefing-and-discussion sessions. PNDS Secretariat staff are also invited to these sessions. | * Weekly debriefing reports, shared with the municipal teams. * At the end of the month, each FST staff reports to her/his FST Coordinator. S/he then reports to the Senior Manager Implementation Team. * The reports from the different teams are compiled in a monthly presentation. | * FST Coordinators are responsible for the municipal debriefing reports. These are analyses in joint sessions in the municipalities. * FST staff are responsible for their individual monthly reports. * FST Coordinators are responsible for their team’s monthly reports. * The Senior Manager Implementation Team is responsible for the overall report. Analysis and discussion is done jointly by the FSTs. | * Weekly when in the field. * Monthly for team and national updates. |
| PNDS technical team data/reports | The Social, Finance, Technical and Training units also have additional spreadsheets in which they track and keep more detailed records than what is stored in the MIS. Examples of this are: technical progress data for playgrounds and school buildings, funded through NZAID; the training database; records of dates of public transfers to sucos; etc.  Using data from the MIS and other reports generated by municipal PNDS staff and PNDS Secretariat staff, advisors prepare occasional memos/reports which highlight and discuss specific points or issues that warrant attention. | * The additional spreadsheets are designed to match the specific information needs of each unit. * No standard tools or formats for these memos or reports. | The responsibility lies with the different advisors/units. The memos/reports and spreadsheets are shared with the other PARTISIPA advisors/units and the concerned PNDS Secretariat staff. | * Unit spreadsheets are updated as new data related to the monitored activities/ events become available. * Ad hoc memos/reports, not tied to a specific frequency. |
| Technical audits | Technical audit reports – of which there have been three so far (2015, 2016, 2017) – assess the quality of construction of samples of completed PNDS projects. They assess whether projects have been designed and built in line with the Technical Construction Standards. The technical audits have been conducted by independent Civil Engineers. | Technical evaluation checklists for: building; clean water supply; bridge; road, drainage and retaining wall; irrigation. | Technical audits are conducted by independent Civil Engineers, with the assistance of PARTISIPA Engineers, and technical staff of the PNDS Secretariat. The main evaluator analyses the data and prepares the report. | Technical evaluations were conducted in 2015, 2016 and 2017. As there was no allocation of infrastructure funding in 2017 and 2018, no follow-up technical evaluation was warranted. It is as yet undecided if there will be another technical evaluation in 2020. |
| Advisor reports | Every six months, the advisors assess progress in their respective work areas, reflecting on achievements and workplan implementation.  The July-to-December reports are used to prepare a presentation for a verbal progress update in mid-February. The July-to-June reports are used to prepare the Annual Reports. The data from the advisors also serves to update the monitoring, evaluation and learning framework (MELF) progress matrix. | The advisor/unit workplans, in combination with the MELF matrix, serve as templates for the advisor reporting. | * Advisors/units are responsible for reporting in their respective work areas. * The Manager Evidence & Learning Team prepares the MELF progress update and/or the Annual Report. | Two reporting periods per year:   * July-to-December progress update in February. * Annual Report in July. |
| Stories of significant change (SSC) | SSCs document significant instances of change which have occurred as a result of PARTISIPA’s activities.  This method involves gathering data from multiple sources to develop a narrative story about a specific change that may have occurred, and the relative contribution of the program towards that change. Data are collected from multiple sources including key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and other sources such as reports, meeting minutes and publications. Data are collated in a narrative report, to tell a ‘story’ about a specific change that occurred in the reporting period.  SSCs that are used to report against narrative PAF indicators will be verified by an independent verification panel. | Template for SSC | * The Manager Evidence & Learning Team identifies possible SSCs on the basis of progress with program activities. * The advisor most closely involved becomes the main author for the SSC. The Manager Evidence & Learning Team supports as necessary. | The program aims to produce one to two SSCs for every six- month period. This is however dependent on progress with project activities, which in turn is dependent on GoTL allocating Infrastructure Funds to the sucos. |
| Review & Reflection (R&R) meetings | Review and Reflection (R&R) meetings can be internal (with PARTISIPA staff only) or with the participation of government counterparts. The meetings’ aims are to share information and gather input on the relevance of program activities, and to raise new ideas and opportunities in response to the changing context. The R&R process produces evidence that can inform both PNDS and PARTISIPA decision-making. | No standard set of tools, but the meetings usually involve a range of communication and facilitation techniques (e.g. brainstorming, ‘World Café’, SWOT analyses, etc.). | Shared responsibility between team members. | R&R meetings were initially held at six-month intervals, but more infrequent since 2017. |
| Focus group discussions (FGDs) | To capture in-depth information and perceptions from government counterparts, and other focus groups, on the influence and achievements of the program. FGDs are semi-structured interviews led by a moderator. The moderator asks broad questions to generate discussion among the participants, to learn about the different opinions participants hold. | Standard set of tools for FGDs such as: checklists, questionnaires, interview guides, group facilitation techniques. | Advisor(s) who organizes the FGD. | As needed. |
| Key informant interviews (KIIs) | To capture in-depth information and perceptions from government counterparts on the influence and achievements of the program.  Information could be gathered through KII or informal meetings. For KII, an interview guide will be developed, the interview undertaken, interview notes written, and thematic analysis of findings undertaken. The Manager Evidence & Learning Team will work with the team to complete the report and analysis after completion of the interviews. In some cases, data gathered from interviews will contribute, together with other data collection methods, to build a Story of Significant Change (SSC) which will be presented as a narrative report and verified in accordance with the SSC process. | Interview guides | Advisor who conducts the Key Informant Interviews. | As needed. |
| Review of GoTL documents | There are official GoTL records or publications which refer to, or have been influenced by PNDS, or other activities of the PARTISIPA program. Examples of such documents are: policies, legislation, research reports, etc.  The documents need to be reviewed and analysed, and the contribution of the program to the document should be identified. The adviser/s involved will provide this evidence and summarise in the six-monthly report against the relevant KEQ / SQ. |  | Each advisor in his/her area of work. | As needed. |
| External evaluation | An external evaluation is a standard DFAT requirement. | To be determined by DFAT | DFAT | Single occurrence |

## Annex 4. Evidence Matrix Template

| **Evaluation Questions and Sub-Questions** | **Evidence** | | **Findings**  **(So what?)** | | **Response**  **(What now?)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What did we do?  (Activities)** | **What did we achieve? (Outcomes)** |
| 1. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported GoTL to improve the Implementation of PNDS? | | | | | |
| SQ 1.1. To what extent has GoTL demonstrated strategic leadership of PNDS? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 1.2. To what extent did GoTL allocate adequate resources for PNDS (staff, money/budget and assets)? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 1.3. To what extent do counterparts develop, utilise and manage PNDS systems? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 1.4. To what extent is evidence available, accessed and used by PNDS counterparts? |  |  |  | |  |
| 2. To what extent are communities engaging with and benefitting from PNDS? | | | | | |
| SQ 2.1. To what extent have quality infrastructure project been implemented through PNDS? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 2.2. To what extent do community governance structures have increased skills and knowledge to manage PNDS in their suco? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 2.3. To what extent are PNDS community processes participatory and inclusive? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 2.4. To what extent have PNDS activities met the needs of Timorese women and people with disabilities? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 2.5. How are people benefitting from PNDS activities and in what ways? |  |  |  | |  |
| 3, To what extent has public administration improved in select municipalities? | | | | | |
| SQ 3.1. To what extent has PARTISIPA influenced municipal resource allocation (budget, assets, people)? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 3.2. How has PARTISIPA contributed to stronger linkages between municipalities and administrative posts? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 3.3. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported sub-national government coordinating mechanisms to function effectively? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 3.4. How has PARTISIPA support to municipal administrations been effective or relevant for varying municipal contexts? |  |  |  | |  |
| 4. To what extent has PARTISIPA contributed to improved management of rural water supply in target communities? | | | | | |
| SQ 4.1. To what extent has PARTISIPA supported GoTL to agree on an O&M approach for suco infrastructure? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 4.2. To what extent have GoTL financial systems to enable rural water sustainability improved? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 4.3. To what extent has PARTISIPA helped to improve rural water supply? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 4.4. To what extent do frontline staff have the resources needed to support rural water O&M? |  |  |  | |  |
| SQ 4.5. To what extent has suco capacity and access to resources improved their water supply? |  |  |  | |  |
| 5. To what extent is the program model relevant and efficient? | | | | | |
| SQ 5.1. How well did the program promote gender equality, social inclusion and women empowerment? |  |  |  |  | |
| SQ 5.2. Is PARTISIPA investing in the right places to maximise results and relationships through better coordination and networking? |  |  |  |  | |
| SQ 5.3. Is the approach to building capacity working, and what factors influence it? |  |  |  |  | |
| SQ 5.4. How do key counterparts perceive the program, what elements do they value most? |  |  |  |  | |
| SQ 5.5. How well did the program develop and enable coordination and network? |  |  |  |  | |
| SQ 5.6. To what extend is the program adaptive to evolving context and emerging opportunities? |  |  |  |  | |

## Annex 5. DFAT monitoring and evaluation standards

**Standard 2. Investment monitoring and evaluation systems**

| No. | Element | Section of MELP where applied / demonstrated |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Design phase mobilisation |  |
| 2.1 | Adequate resources are allocated for M&E | N/A for MELP |
| 2.2 | Terms of reference for the M&E Practitioner reflect requirements for a quality system | N/A for MELP |
| 2.3 | Adequately qualified M&E Practitioner is recruited | N/A for MELP |
|  | M&E Plan |  |
| 2.4 | There is a summary of the investment goals, outcomes, investment size and length and any other relevant information | Investment background, length and size: 1.1  Program goal and EoPOs: 2.1  Work areas of the program: 2.3 |
| 2.5 | There is an adequate basis for the development of the M&E Plan (e.g. Evaluability or Readiness Assessment) | A series of workshops were held with key stakeholders as the basis for the MELP: 1.2 |
| 2.6 | The M&E Plan provides a summary of the overarching system design including key M&E approaches and activities | MELP purpose: 3.1  Scope boundaries: 3.2  Primary users (audience): 3.3  Methods: 5  Resources: 7.1 |
| 2.7 | The M&E Plan is consistent with current international standards for evaluation practice (e.g. Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation – Program Evaluation Standards) | The MELP has been checked for consistency with the OECD DAC standards second edition. |
| 2.8 | Goals and End-of-program outcomes are clearly articulated and assessed | Goals and EoPOs: 2.1  Indicators of gender equality and social inclusion: Annex 3. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework |
| 2.9 | The plan is focused around key performance indicators and evaluation questions linked to specific intended uses of the information | Key evaluation questions: 4  Key performance indicators: Annex 3. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework  Risks: 2.5 |
| 2.10 | The reach/coverage, quality, and exposure of participants to key deliverables are monitored and evaluated | MELF indicators include reach/coverage, quality, exposure and disaggregation: Annex 3. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework |
| 2.11 | Relevant aspects of the context and key risks are monitored | Risks and contextual indicators relating to PNDS program performance: 2.5, Annex 3. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework |
| 2.12 | Methods are fully described for sampling, data collection, management, analysis and processing | Methods: 5, Annex 3. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework  Tools are not annexed due to their number, length and/or online nature. Tools are instead described in the same annex. |
| 2.13 | Baselines are constructed where appropriate | Baselines in the MELF: Annex 3. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework |
| 2.14 | Responsibility is allocated to specific individuals (not organizations) for all M&E activities | Roles and responsibilities: 7.2 |
| 2.15 | Mutual accountability and joint assessment by local partners is provided for (using partner systems where appropriate) | Technical audits, the PNDS MIS, and PNDS technical team data/reports all involve the PNDS Secretariat partner in data collection and analysis. For the MIS, entry of selected data is the responsibility of the PNDS MIS Operators, Municipal Accountants and Municipal Engineers. Annex 4. Data collection methods and strategy |
| 2.16 | Individuals responsible for implementing the M&E plan have the capacity to do so (time, resources and skills) | Roles and responsibilities: 7.2 |
| 2.17 | A strategy for the utilization of information is described | Audience: 3.3  Data analysis and reporting: 5.3  Learning and dissemination: 6  Evidence matrix: Annex 5. Evidence Matrix Template |
| 2.18 | A complete schedule of M&E activities shows when all key M&E activities will be carried out and information available | Timeline for implementation: 8 |
| 2.19 | The M&E plan can be easily understood by non-specialists and key stakeholders | Clear and consistent style throughout |
| 2.20 | The M&E plan is resourced and costed |  |

**Standard 3 Investment progress reporting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **REF** | **DFAT M&E Standards (Progress Reporting)** |
| 3.1 | There is an executive summary that communicates the key information required for routine DFAT reporting and oversight.  Reporting Guidelines[[12]](#footnote-12): Exec Summary can be a stand-alone document |
| 3.2 | The relevant aspects of the context and any risks are adequately described.  Reporting Guidelines: also suggests including emerging opportunities focusing on aspects of the context relevant to understanding the program’s ability to achieve its outcomes |
| 3.3 | There is a reflection on the continuing relevance of the investment |
| 3.4 | The adequacy of progress toward sustained end-of-program outcomes are assessed.  Reporting Guidelines: All findings substantiated with evidence. |
| 3.5 | The reach/coverage, quality and exposure of investment participants to relevant key outputs or deliverables for the reporting period are described. |
| 3.6 | The adequacy of progress implementing the annual plan is described. |
| 3.7 | An assessment of the likely adequacy of planned inputs to meet the expected end-of-program outcomes is provided. |
| 3.8 | The adequacy of progress against the budget is assessed. |
| 3.9 | Key management or implementation systems are described, and their performance assessed. |
| 3.10 | The report provides balanced and fair reporting of positive and negative issues, achievements and challenges |
| 3.11 | For claims of achievement or barriers to achievement, credible supportive evidence is provided. |
| 3.12 | Data or findings are presented in formats that effectively and efficiently communicate important information |
| 3.13 | The frequency of reporting is suitable for effective investment management |
| 3.14 | The report includes lessons learned from implementation that have potentially important implications more broadly |
| 3.15 | Previous and/or proposed management responses or recommendations are summarized |

1. The external consultants are each involved in designing components of a future program to succeed PARTISIPA in 2021 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. PESTLE describes a framework for analyzing political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental factors [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The ‘sphere of concern’ is also sometimes called the ‘sphere of interest’. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. DFAT. (2017). *DFAT Monitoring and Evaluation Standards.* Available at <https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/monitoring-evaluation-standards.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For further reading see: R. Burke Johnson, Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie and Lisa A. Turner. (2007). *Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research.* Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1, 112-133. DOI: 10.1177/1558689806298224. Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235413072_Toward_a_Definition_of_Mixed_Methods_Research_Journal_of_Mixed_Methods_Research_1_112-133> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. For further reading see: Michael Quinn Patton. (2008). *Utilization-Focused Evaluation: 4th edition.* Available at <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/utilization_focused_evaluation> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Events may not be called ‘Learning Dialogues’ and could alternatively be called ‘where are we now and what have we learned?’ [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. DFAT. (2017). DFAT Monitoring and Evaluation Standards. Available at <https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/monitoring-evaluation-standards.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Many of the indicators in the M&E framework do not have specific baseline figures, or targets. For some of the indicators, the performance achieved in FY2018-19 are provided as baseline approximators. For the qualitative indicators (which are captured as “instances of …”) the targets could be one or more stories of instance occurrences. Target setting is also made more difficult by uncertainties on when GoTL budget will be transferred to sucos, and the cyclical nature by certain events which does not always fit well with a six-month or yearly reporting cycle. This can lead to large fluctuations in indicator results between reports, and complicates target setting. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. “Internal indicators” are indicators which, until June 2019, were part of the PNDS Support Program M&E framework, but which no longer have to be reported to DFAT. However, as they serve a purpose for internal monitoring of systems performance within PNDS, the data underlying the indicator will continue to be collected by PNDS. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Tools are not annexed due to their number, length and/or online nature. Tools are instead described in the same annex. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The Reporting Guidelines are from DFAT Timor-Leste Good Practice Note on Reporting. The italics are where there is additional advice to the DFAT Standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)