

SiRS and Sector Programme Support

SiRS
Sida Rating System

Content

1. Background	3
2. Differences between Sector Programmes and Projects	4
2.1 How to deal with high numbers of immediate results	5
2.2 How to deal with process orientation and different categories of results	5
2.3 How to deal with the absence of annual plans and/or annual follow-up	6
3. The rating of risk in Sector Programmes	8
Appendix A. Results and Indicators – Some Definitions	10
1. General	10
2. Terminology	10
3. The problems of attribution	11
Appendix B. SiRS and Sector Programme Support – The Example of Education Sector Support in Cambodia	13
1. Introduction	13
2. Background Education Sector Support in Cambodia	13
3. The “Expanded Basic Education Programme 2002–2005”	14
4. Rating of Immediate Results	15
5. Rating of Overall Performance	16
6 Rating of internal and external risk	16
Annex 1. EBEP: Planned results and achievements	19

Published by Sida 2004

Department for Policy and Methods

Printed by Edita Sverige AB, 2004

Art. no.: SIDA3896en

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from www.sida.se/publications

1. Background

The basic principles of SiRS are to assess the results and implementation of the programme/project in relation to plans and to review the risk situation. These basic principles should also be applied in sector programme support (SPS). The rating of sector programmes may however include some additional challenges: the size of a SPS is often much larger than a regular programme/project, an SPS more often involves a process orientation where objectives are gradually developed along the track, and the complexity in terms of structure (sub-programmes, components, outputs etc) is much higher.

This annex provides further guidance on how to apply the Sida Rating System in connection with contributions in connection with SPS¹. These methodological guidelines may also apply to other modes of cooperation, such as budget support and budget support to organisations etc. These additional guidelines contain a brief recapitulation of the central definitions regarding results and indicators, and suggest how rating of overall performance and risks should be carried out. In a separate appendix there is a case study where the recommendations of these guidelines have been applied. The case study is the Swedish support to the education sector in Cambodia.

¹ In addition to the Principles and guidelines for SiRS, reference is also made to Sida's Policy for SPS.

2. Differences between Sector Programmes and Projects

There are numerous and significant differences between sector programmes and regular projects. But from a rating perspective they are not impossible to cope with. It is still a question of assessing whether the programme is *on track* (implementation progress assessment) and if it is on the *right track* (risk assessment).

Nevertheless, the sheer size of the intervention is one very tangible difference between a sector programme and a project. A sector programme may consist of hundreds of outputs, which projects seldom do. The problem of size is addressed in section 2.1 below.

Another difference is that sector programmes normally are more process oriented than projects. This means that the intervention logic and result chain – i.e. the road ahead (track) is less firmly laid out compared to more narrowly designed projects. This in turn means that both the strategy and the identified means to reach the defined medium- and longterm objectives are much more hypothetical and need to be reassessed and probably modified under way. Keeping the objectives in mind and using indicators of effects (*outcome(s)* and *impact*) in order to ensure that the programme *is on the right track is even more fundamental* than in traditional projects. At the same time, and from an external partner's point, less attention to detailed implementation and immediate results performance might be justified.

Also the results of sector programmes are to a higher degree a mix between outcome(s), outputs, process development etc, which may make the follow up and result assessment somewhat more problematic. The issue of process orientation and different categories of results is dealt with in section 2.2 below.

A third difference is that the planned results in sector programmes – in practice – are often not broken down in annual plans. This problem is approached in section 2.3 below.

The notion of external factors also differs between regular projects and sector programmes since virtually only non-sector risks are to be considered as external (see 3 below).

2.1 How to deal with high numbers of immediate results

The number of immediate results (outputs) that can be rated is limited to ten in the SiRS Computer Tool and this also serves as a restriction in the rating of SPS. The way to deal with this dilemma is to look at more aggregated result levels.

The results in a sector programme are often defined as outputs and they are, in turn, often organised in “components”, “target areas” or “areas”, some-times structured into “sub-programmes”. The results within these components are normally closely related, for example on a sub-sector or thematic basis. When this is the case, you are advised to carry out the rating of “immediate results” by components (or by sub-programme). The results at output level are weighed together and the component is given one joint score in accordance with the rating scale. The rating for the component is registered in the SiRS Computer Tool in the view “Rating of Immediate Results”. In the boxes for comments you should register how the results were assessed and balanced, what outputs were given priority etc. (See below for some additional advice on how to go about it). The same procedure is thereafter repeated for the other components.

Finally the Overall Performance is rated, based on the performance of the components/immediate results. In the box for comments you should here also register how the components were balanced together.

2.2 How to deal with process orientation and different categories of results

Sector programmes often encompass a greater variety of categories of results as well as of indicators of achievements and it is important to understand the terminology, differences and use the different types. For further guidance to understand the difference between results and result indicators and between immediate results and effects (outcome(s), impact), please refer to appendix 1.

The results or other indicators of progress and performance may relate to the service production received by the beneficiaries, but they may also relate to planned changes in the cooperative framework itself or the results relating to inputs, activities or internal processes of change and reform.

Much could be said about what kind of results should be included and given priority when a Sector Programme² is *designed*. When the performance of the Sector Programme is *rated*, however, the expected results and progress indicators as included in the annual plan of the Sector Programme have to be taken as given, regardless if they relate to the service production, the internal processes or the cooperative framework. As a programme officer, you should however be aware of the different categories of results, and weigh the performance so that important results are given a high relative “weight” in the rating. When doing so, the objective of the programme – which should express the intended improvements for the beneficiaries – has to be kept in mind.³

² This will not be repeated here; instead reference is made to Sida Policy for Sector Programme Support.

³ An imbalance between different categories of results, or a lack of focus on impact on beneficiaries, should be addressed in the policy dialogue.

For example, results relating to inputs, activities, internal processes, monitoring systems and the cooperation framework may be strategically important and successfully achieved and thereby justifying a positive rating. But if, at the same time, no results are achieved that directly relate or can be attributed to the service production or the situation for the beneficiaries, it is less obvious that the programme is performing well.

Given the character of sector programmes, you are also advised to give priority and *high weights to indicators as close as possible to the programme purpose and reflecting effect at beneficiary level* (outcome indicators), if such result indicators are included in the programme document and information is available through programme or national monitoring mechanisms on a recurrent basis⁴

Some types of indicators may also be more important during certain phases of the programme than others. During the initial and preparatory stages, *process indicators* of different kinds may provide much more important information on performance and progress than more concrete result indicators – and vice versa. Please note that the “result indicators” always can be changed between rating rounds, although such changes should be commented upon.

There could be several other factors involved in the actual set of result indicators you choose among and finally select. First of all, the results and other indicators agreed upon in the programme documents may prove to be less than satisfactory, or the installed monitoring and information system supposed to provide the related and up-dated information does not work properly. In both cases, changes and improvements have to be pursued in dialogue with development partners. Secondly, programme support normally *involve many other partners* and the preferences, comparative advantages or division of labour may affect the set of result indicators you may finally choose.

All in all, the selection of result indicators should reflect a *careful mix*, the information value, the current stage of the programme, and to the extent possible provide information on effects at beneficiary level. The choice should be commented upon in the box for comments in the Computer Tool.

2.3 How to deal with the absence of annual plans and/or annual follow-up

The core of the performance rating in SiRS is to annually compare the actual results to the planned results. This requires that the overall plan of the programme/project, which may encompass any number of years, is broken down into annual plans, including results and their indicators. Furthermore, it requires that the reporting of the programme/project is done with the same periodicity and corresponds to the annual plan. More or less explicitly, this how most projects are organised, and this should also be the case for sector programmes.

⁴ Internal processes, relevant capacity, proper monitoring etc. could also be considered to be necessary means to improve the service production, why these achievements to some extent could be considered to be included in results regarding the service production.

In reality, however, it seems that a majority of Sida supported sector programmes either lack detailed annual planning or have reporting that does not correspond to the annual planning. Even if this situation could be improved over time, the question is how to apply the SiRS methodology in these cases.

The basic principle described above is also valid in this case. Available information should be used and made the most possible out of. For example some “components” may be better described and monitored than others and, hence, easier to rate. Some components may be explicitly linked to certain well defined and monitored outcome indicators, which may serve as indicators of progress.⁵ Some results may be clearly defined for a 5-year period and may be followed up annually.

If you, however, conclude that it is not possible to fairly assess the progress of a component, you are advised to use the score Not Applicable (N/A) in the SiRS. In such a case, the reasons why it was not possible to assess the progress of the implementation of the component should be given in the comments. Action should also be taken to avoid that the same thing happens next year.

⁵ See SiRS Principles, Annex 1 regarding the problems of attribution.

3. The rating of risk in Sector Programmes

As noted above, the process character of sector and similar complex development programmes makes learning, piloting and adaptation to key features in programme management. The objectives and identifiable outcome(s) provide the compass and important indications with regard to the question – *on the right track?*

In SiRS, this dimension is dealt with by the *risk assessment*, which thus becomes even more important in SPS than in more traditional project support.

Another important feature of the risk assessment is to identify the party that controls the causes of uncertainty and should be responsible for handling the risk. The assessment of internal risk is closely related to the design, organisation and management of the project /programme – i.e. within the scope of influence or control of the programme/project partners. In a regular project, it is therefore often reasonable to define adoption of supportive *government policies as external to the project*. The same goes organisational weaknesses in relevant sector institutions, which are not key actors in the implementation of the project.

However, in a sector programme, the purpose is often to develop and strengthen the sector as a whole, including its strategies, policy guidelines, key sector institutions and delivery systems. Also budgetary allocations targeted to the sector should be treated as an internal factor. This implies that *the scope for defining external factors* becomes relatively smaller. Still, however, parliamentary approval of supportive legislation, macro-economic shocks, the impact of HIV/Aids and other such non-sector factors should be part of the external risk assessment.

Sector programmes are quite often monitored by special monitoring arrangements with well defined indicators of outcome(s) and impact at sub-sector or sector level. If these indicators show little progress over time, in relation to set targets, it is a serious indication that the programme is not on track, i.e. that the risks of not achieving the objective are imminent. It is important that annual reports and similar reporting should capture this data in a form that facilitates follow up. When logframes and matrices have been developed and agreed upon in the programme document, they should also be included in the follow up reports on results, and go as high up as possible in the logframe hierarchy.

It should also be remembered that the important thing is not the distinction between internal and external risks as such. What matters is to identify the scope of attention and action needed to manage a situation when the assessment shows:

- a) A situation with a substantial or high risk that the programme / project will not reach its objectives; or if
- b) the project has been outtaken by internal or external events and the objectives have lost its relevance.

Finally, when rating a sector programme, it should be emphasised that the rating only is one component in the follow up and monitoring framework of the programme. Other parts of the follow up which are not covered by SiRS – such as special studies, evaluations – should be addressed according to Sida at work.

Good luck with your rating!

Appendix A

Results and Indicators

– Some Definitions

1. General

In order to choose programme results that can be rated for SiRS purposes, one must be able to identify indicators of performance and achievements at various levels and understand their implications. In programme support, two terms are essential to such an exercise and need to be defined; indicators and monitoring mechanisms.

An *indicator* is a measure of status (baseline/benchmark situation) and of performance or goal achievement. If performance or the goal is a broad concept, the indicator may only give a partial picture of performance or goal achievement. For instance, the “literacy rate” is an indicator giving information about the proportion of the grown population that is able to read and write. In one way or another, this proportion can be measured. It can be measured geographically, for different social strata, and by means of a number of statistical instruments or tools. A *monitoring mechanism* is an arrangement for systematically observing the development of performance or goal achievement, usually by observing and analysing indicators.

Historically, there has been little coherence of indicator typology in the development aid community. To a high degree, this lack of coherence still exists. However, at a basic level there is now reasonable consensus regarding the following standard⁶ typology of input, output, outcome, and impact indicators.

The four groups represent results at different levels that can be interpreted as *monitoring levels*. On the level of output, for instance, an event is monitored such as *number of schools built*. This measurement becomes the output indicator.

2. Terminology

1. Indicators of *input* measure the financial, administrative and regulatory resources provided in programme. *Ex⁷: Share of budget devoted to education expenditure; number of classrooms available.*
2. *Activities* are actions and work undertaken to translate inputs into planned outputs. Normally, no separate indicators are needed at this level.

⁶ See DAC guidelines and reference series; Harmonising donor practices for effective aid delivery, p. 57, OECD 2003, or the European Commission; Guidelines for the use of indicators for country performance assessment, p. 3, October 2002.

⁷ For the sake of clarity all examples are taken from education sector programme support.

3. Indicators of *output* measure the immediate results and concrete consequences of the measures taken and resources used. *Ex: Number of schools built, number of teachers trained.*
4. Indicators of *outcome* measure the intermediate results or consequences of output at the level of beneficiaries. *Ex: average repetition rates in primary school, pupil teacher ratio.*
5. Indicators of *impact* measure the long term and aggregated results or changes in a segment of society targeted by an operation. *Ex: Literacy rates, portion of the population with tertiary education.*

It is not uncommon to distinguish between:

- a) *Status* indicators, providing concrete information on how things are at a certain point of time (number of schools, enrollment rate, teachers trained, girl/boy ratio etc)
- b) *Process* indicators, (sometimes also referred to as governance indicators) which try to capture the status relating to key processes of change or prerequisites for change (legal, institutional or economic reforms, pre-conditions and instruments for capacity development, empowerment etc).

A distinction is also often made between:

- a) *Internal results* – covering the levels of activities and outputs (thus more directly generated by the programme/project)
- b) *External results* – effects at the level of beneficiaries and thus corresponding to outcome and impact.

The four monitoring levels – input, output, outcome and impact – are linked together in what may be called a *chain of results (or Intervention Logic)*, and these links should ideally be made explicit in the programme document and the corresponding programme monitoring mechanism.

SiRS, as a tool for quick and recurrent assessment during the implementation stage of a development intervention, focuses on the generation of immediate results/outputs, and short-term outcomes. Long-term outcomes and impact is dealt with by more sophisticated instruments, such as built-in Monitoring and Evaluation systems and external impact studies and evaluations.

3. The problems of attribution

The problem of attribution concerns our ability to make associations between programme activities/operations, and the results that follow in the target environment. In other words to determine what is “cause” and what is “effect”. In SiRS, the rating should as far as possible rely on the assessments made in monitoring reports. The lower the degree of attribution, the more likely is a misinterpretation of the implementation progress of the programme based on the indicator. This, in turn, may lead to poorly founded decisions on how to proceed with the programme, which would be counterproductive to the idea of the rating tool.

If monitoring reports show hesitation on whether a particular result is the consequence of programme operations, one should consider avoiding that indicator for SiRS purposes.

Indicators chosen for rating should preferably be securely founded in an analysis linking input, output and outcome together. If this is not the case, there is reason to make a comment in SiRS computer tool.

Appendix B

SiRS and Sector Programme Support – The Example of Education Sector Support in Cambodia

1. Introduction

In this Appendix you will find an example from Cambodia where SiRS is applied in the context of a sector programme support.

It should be underlined that the rating below only is an *example* on how you could apply SiRS on a sector programme support. The rating is based on available information in the form of a Mid Term Review report, but without detailed knowledge of the programme. In this sense it should be regarded as a preliminary rating done when the report has been *received*, but *before* the review meeting with partner representatives, which may fill information gaps and provide other clarifications needed. The purpose of this example is first and foremost to illustrate how some of the issues mentioned in the guidelines for SiRS and SPS could be addressed.

2. Background Education Sector Support in Cambodia

Sida has been supporting the education sector in Cambodia since the late 1980s, mainly through UNICEF. In view of the destruction of the formal education sector during the Khmer Rouge regime, the sector suffers from severe quantitative and qualitative constraints. There is widespread empirical evidence that poor education is closely linked with poverty in Cambodia, and better education has therefore been identified as an area of high priority in poverty alleviation efforts. The Cambodian government (RGC) has made a commitment to achieve Education for All⁸ by 2015. The commitment is based on a comprehensive sector review, which in turn formed the basis for a strategic education analysis, an education strategic plan and the education sector support programme (ESSP).

During the Sida sector review in 2001, Sida was requested by RGC to support to ESSP and by UNICEF to continue supporting the UNICEF Master Plan of Operation (MPO). Following a realignment of the MPO with the ESSP, it was decided that Sida's support to ESSP would be based on a joint UNICEF/RGC programme proposal. The in-depth assessment of the proposal included an appraisal by the UNESCO Institute of Educational Planning, and it endorsed a support from Sida to the ESSP through UNICEF.

⁸ Adopted by the World Education Forum in Dakar, 2000, and referred to as the Dakar Framework for Action.

The ESSP itself was jointly appraised by donors and NGOs in 2001. It was generally found that the time was not yet ripe for an untied budget support or a basket funding to ESSP, but that more discrete actions were needed within the sector wide framework. Sida also recommended a careful step-by-step process in order to be able to move towards a more consistent and joint sector wide approach. An Education Sector Working Group, ESWG, was set up as the operational platform for discussions among donors within the SWAp framework.

The ESSP wants to address three main dimensions: (i) equitable access to basic education, (ii) quality and (iii) efficiency in service delivery. Among donors, the ESSP is regarded as the first step towards achieving the broader goals of the *Education For All*.

3. The “Expanded Basic Education Programme 2002–2005”⁹

The overall objective for the Sida-funded joint UNICEF/RGC programme – *Expanded Basic Education Programme, EBEP* – closely reflect the goals of ESSP. The overall objective of the programme is “*to contribute to achieving inclusive basic education that is efficient, of high quality and equitable so that the rights of Cambodia children to education are fulfilled through improved planning and implementation of education reform policies and programmes, as part of the government’s strategies for poverty reduction as set out in ESP and ESSP 2001/5*”.

The programme consists of two *sub-programmes*:

- (i) Basic education capacity building for SWAp readiness
- (ii) Expanded learning opportunities for school and child readiness in selected areas.

The first sub-programme aims at *building capacity* in strategic and financial planning and management at different levels, as well as in education monitoring systems. This could be seen as constructing the necessary administrative platform for sector programme support. The second sub-programme aims at addressing constraints both on the supply and demand side with regard to *access and quality* of basic education, as part of the implementation of the *Convention of the Rights of the Child*.

The intervention logic of the programme is summarised in a comprehensive LFA matrix with indicators of achievements. Each of the two sub-programmes is broken down into components (three in the first sub-programme and five in the second sub-programme) with their respective outputs and activities. All in all, the Expanded Basic Education Programme consists of 25 component outputs and an even larger number of “activity” outputs.

With this structure it is rather unfeasible to select a limited number of *outputs* for rating.

⁹ As in many other cases the objective does not express the expected “state of affairs” by the end of the programme, but as a process towards such a state (“A basic education that is efficient, of high quality and equitable...”)

4. Rating of Immediate Results

In this case, the focus of the rating is raised to the level of components. Each of the eight components is underpinned by one or more outputs, which are well specified with verifiable indicators as well as source of verification, as can be seen from the table in Annex 1.

The table also contains the findings from the mid-term review (MTR) in 2003. The *format* for the MTR report does not entirely coincide with the Project Document, and information on some of the components is missing (large part of component 2, the whole of component 3 in sub-programme 1, and part of component 2 in sub-programme 2). Moreover, the *indicators of achievement* are of a different character: most of the results and indicators in sub-programme 1 express steps in the *process* to create a sector wide programme, whereas results and indicators in sub-programme 2 measure *results* in terms of service delivery (school enrolment, guidelines and plans in place and made operational for school leaders) or even outcome (improved children's health, improved literacy rates).

In general, the indicators do not meet the requirements of *SMART indicators*¹⁰. They are especially weak with regard to the specification of the expected results and they are often not time-bound. The same weakness can be observed at component level, which is generally expressed as an activity or programme area or as a sub-sector. Bearing this in mind, it is still possible to use them for a rating of immediate results (outputs) and the overall performance.

Table 1. Rating of Immediate results EBEP.

Component	Assessment	Comment
1:1	AP	Education For All launched, and Education Law to be completed during 2003
1:2	N/A	Reporting only includes one of five outputs
1:3	N/A	No reporting ¹¹
2:1	SDP	Performance is far from targets and difficulties to track progress due to lack of regular, systematic data collection. (Targets may be too ambitious and could be revised)
2:2	AP	Although several outcome indicators are omitted it can still be concluded that the CFS guidelines are developed according to the time-plan. In addition, the gender gap is narrowing rapidly.
2:3	MDP	Delayed due to voluntary organisation; lack of data regarding literacy rates and HIV/AIDS
2:4	AP	Activities regarding local planning on track: capacity building, EFA plans are replicated at a wider scale than anticipated, baseline studies done
2:5	AP	Strategies developed and implemented based on specific target group interventions

¹⁰ Specific, Measurable, Approved, Realistic, and Time-bound

¹¹ The MTR report did not contain an assessment of this component. In reality, however, there has been good progress in this component and the final scoring will be modified when this information is available.

In summary, *sub-programme 1* which aims at building basic education capacity for SWAp readiness can only be assessed partially, as regards the government policy and regulatory framework. The performance of this component can thus be assessed as *According to Plans (AP)*.

The components that refer to capacity building for implementation of the reform and for building of partnerships with the civil society lack relevant information to be properly assessed (*Not Applicable*), a situation that should be followed up and more information sought at an early convenience.

In *sub-programme 2*, aiming at expanded learning opportunities in selected provinces and to involve stakeholders to effectively participate in this work, there are delays (and lack of data) with regard to the components having the aim to involve parents and caretakers in pre-school activities (component 1) and other forms of extramural activities such as literacy rates and HIV/AIDS awareness (component 3) resulting in rating scores of *SDP and MDP*. Components that refer to basic education, such as child friendly schools, enrolment of girls, systems for planning and monitoring and which address the needs of special target groups appear to be on track (components 2, 4 and 5) and deserve the score *AP*.

5. Rating of Overall Performance

When conducting the overall performance rating, the weighing together of the performance on the component level is a challenge. In doing so, revisiting the programme objective may provide guidance;

"to contribute to achieving inclusive basic education that is efficient, high quality and equitable, so that the rights of the Cambodian children to education are fulfilled through improved planning and implementation of education reform policies and programmes, as part of the government's strategy for poverty reduction as set out in ESP and ESSP 2001/05"

The programme objective has a clear focus on the children as the primary beneficiary group. The components most obviously relating to the results directly linked to the beneficiaries are the components 2:1, 2:2 and 2:3 and accordingly the performance within these areas should be given a higher relative weight when assessing the Overall Performance of the Programme. In addition, the policy and regulatory framework for *Education for All* has been established laying the foundation for downstream implementation activities. The assessment is moreover based on the fact that four of eight components are performing according to plan. Of the remaining four components, two prioritised (2:1 and 2:3) show deviations from plans and the performance of two components are not possible to assess.

All in all, the preliminary assessment of the programme leads to the Overall Performance rating of "*Minor Deviation from Plans*" (*MDP*).

B 6 Rating of internal and external risk

As noted above, EBEP does not represent a full blown Sector Programme Support, but is rather a discrete programme in support of the ESSP. Yet, the expected outcome and indicators for the whole ESSP should be applied when assessing if the programme is on "*the right track*".

The national level indicators are presented in the box below and generally show that the achievements according to targets are well under way, with the exception of the pre-school net enrolment and the survival rates in grade 5 and 6 where targets are still distant.

	Baseline	Status	Target
Share of Public Current Budget	13.6% ¹²	18.3% ¹⁶	20.0% ¹⁹
Non salary recurrent budget	31.2% ¹²	44.0% ¹⁶	44.7% ¹⁹
ECCD/Pre-school Net Enrolment	../5.0 ¹³	../6.2	30.0
Primary Net Enrolment (NER)	85.5 ¹⁴	88.9 ¹⁷	90.0 ²⁰
Gender Gap Primary NER	7.7 ¹⁴	4.2 ¹⁷	3.8 ²¹
Net Intake Rate	71.4 ¹⁴	78.1 ¹⁷	95.0 ²⁰
<u>Efficiency of the Primary school system:</u>			
Survival rate to grade 5	56.4 ¹⁵	56.8 ¹⁸	79.0 ²²
Survival Rate to grade 6	48.4 ¹⁵	50.2 ¹⁸	67.8 ²²
Promotion rate G1	51.0 ¹⁴	66.7 ¹⁷	76.5 ²³
Repetition rate G1	37.8 ¹⁴	17.7 ¹⁷	18.9 ²⁴

However, the issue of attribution, i.e. to which extent that achievements in the ESSP are related to outputs and outcomes of the EBEP should be explored. The EBEP has its focus on education quality aspects which are at the lower end of the achievements. Detailed data from the provinces where EBEP is active confirm the general picture that pre-school and primary net enrolment is moving slowly, whereas the net intake rate and gender gap has developed favourably. Survival rates in grade 5 and 6 show modest improvements and the repetition rate I in grade 1 is improving strongly. Generally speaking the ESSP can be considered to be on track, although some quality indicators are still weak. There has been a tendency to emphasise on access over quality.

Internal risk assessment

Sida at Work prescribes a number of (internal) factors that should be included in the Assessment Memo²⁵. The Assessment Memo for the EBEP singles out *aid dependency* and the *level of national funding* of the education sector as two internal risks, suggesting that these factors must be monitored to ensure ownership around Education For All. The

¹² Budget year 2000

¹³ Calculated for school year 1999–2000 based on EMIS data.

¹⁴ School year 1999–2000, EMIS

¹⁵ School year 1998–1999 calculated based on EMIS

¹⁶ Budget year 2003

¹⁷ School year 2002–2003, EMIS

¹⁸ School year 2000–2001 calculated based on EMIS

¹⁹ Budget year 2005

²⁰ Target ESP for October 2005/MPO 90–95percent

²¹ Target MPO, reduction of gender gap by half by Oct 2005

²² Target MPO, increase survival rate to grade 5 by 40percent

²³ Target MPO, increase promotion rate Grade 1 by 50percent

²⁴ Target MPO, reduce repetition rate Grade 1 by 50percent

²⁵ Relevance, Effectiveness and cost-efficiency, Feasibility, Quality of the cooperation framework and Sustainability

extended use of national consultants and other resource persons and the increased relative spending on education – from 14% in 2000 to 18% in 2003 – observed in the MTR imply that these risk factors are brought under control, and therefore are not likely to jeopardise the objectives of ESSP.

More important, the *budget mechanisms*, the *management capacity*, the *monitoring mechanisms* and *harmonisation of procedures* – all very important factors in a SWAp – are lagging somewhat behind and will most likely affect sub-programme 1 in a negative way. Particularly the delay in setting up the monitoring mechanism with systematic data collection on literacy will make it difficult to assess the outcome of the programme on the target groups. These capacity issues are, however, receiving increased attention by the government.

For these reasons – lagging institutional capacity development for management and monitoring and yet too little focus on the quality aspects of education – the *internal risks* are assessed to be *moderate (M)*.

External risk assessment

Good coordination between central and province levels are mentioned as one fundamental assumption regarding the external factors. The general decentralisation ambitions of the Government, supported by Sida in another intervention, seem to enable such coordination in the education sector.

However, the macro economic and state budget framework does not yet allow for necessary increases of the teacher salaries, which may put the reform process at stake. Also the lacking data and definitions of literacy make it difficult to assess the effects on literacy. Lack of incentives for volunteer literacy teachers, however, seem to hamper the literacy training, and most of the literacy classes originally set up, are non-operational. All in all, the reform is largely on track, although these external factors may slow down the pace of reform, unless adequately addressed.

Based on this assessment, the *external risk* is scored as *Moderate (M)*.

Annex 1

EBEP: Planned results and achievements

Sub-programme and Components	Outputs	Indicators	Achievements in MTR
Sub-programme 1			
Component 1: Capacity Building for Sector Wide Management Reform	Necessary policy instruments and guidelines in place to enhance decentralization, community participation in education, and reduced disparities in learning opportunities.	Policy instruments, incl. Education Act, outlining decentralized regulatory framework developed and in place by 2003	The National Education for All Plan 2003-2015 was officially launched in June 2003. The Plan is in line with the ESP/ESSP and other national medium and long-term plans.
	Increased availability and effective utilization of human and financial resources.	The legal and regulatory frameworks and national programs have sufficient provisions to reduce all types of disparities (geographical, social, gender, cultural)	In July 2003 a final draft of an over-arching and enabling Education Law was completed through a consultative and participatory process. The draft is in compliance with the CRC and CEDAW. The completion of the law is MoEYS key priority and is expected before the end of 2003.
			The RGOC has translated its commitment to education and other social sectors into increasing their shares of the national budget. The share for education increased from 13.6 percent at the beginning of the MPO to 18.3 percent for the current budget year.
	Strengthened systems for program monitoring.	Fully operational technical and financial planning, management and monitoring systems at central, provincial, districts/cluster, school/community and institutional levels by 2005.	Irregular and delayed disbursements have been and continue to be a serious constraint.
			ESP/ESSP have contributed to a more strategic and coordinated approach to effective utilisation. In addition, coordinated efforts of donors, including UNICEF, are in place to strengthen financial management and structures capacities at central and decentralised levels.
			See also component 4, sub-programme 2, first output

	Enhanced dissemination and utilization of educational information by provincial, district, and cluster/school authorities	Improved utilization of educational data in planning and monitoring	UNICEF supported the MoEYS in strengthening its Education Management Information System. Capacities of EMIS staff were strengthened at central and provincial level. On an annual basis education information is made available and disseminated. A feedback system is in place where school information sheets are sent back to the schools. Data is disaggregated at national, provincial, district, school cluster levels for boys and girls. EMIS data are used extensively by decision makers and form the basis of performance impact reports for the annual ESSP Review. UNICEF also supported Aid Management Information System (AMIS) which contains comprehensive information on donor and NGO funding and activities in education. This has helped strengthening coordination. Recently UNICEF supported the MoEYS Primary, Secondary and Non-Formal Department in setting up departmental information systems with strong linkages to EMIS.
Component 2: Capacity building for PAP implementation	Improved teachers' working conditions and status, especially with regard to remuneration and career development opportunities.	Increased MOEYS expenditure on salaries (100 % increase in teachers' salaries by 2005).	Teachers' conditions and status have improved but remain low and of concern but are put firmly on the agenda in the context of wider civil service reforms.
	Increased capacity at all levels to formulate and implement pro-poor strategies.	An evaluation of the Priority Action Program (PAP) shows satisfactory participation of community in the planning and implementation of the school level PAP activities. All schools receive operation grant in time, replacing collection of fees Number of children receiving scholarships Number of children enjoying breakfast at school	N/A
	Increased progression of children through the basic education cycle.	Progression grades 1-6 and transition rates to grade 7 increase to 90% by 2005. By 2005, 45% of those enrolled in grade 7 are girls.	N/A

Component 3: Strengthening Innovative Partnerships for Quality Education for All	Greater authority and operational autonomy to provincial and regional teacher training colleges.	A majority of Teacher Training Colleges comply with standards of improved performance, especially with respect to female and minority representation, according to a survey designed for the purpose.	N/A
	Increased capacity to enhance the children's learning through improved availability of high quality core instructional materials.	All children in all schools have access to the recommended set of textbooks	N/A
	Central, provincial, and local levels have increased capacity for targeting, planning, and managing NFE programs including an expanded NFE information system	Fully operational NFE information system in place with comprehensive information on number and characteristics of the out-of-school children. Significant increase in number of out-of-school youth and adults having access to basic education programs	N/A
	Participation of NGOs, civil society and donors in the MoEYS led education reform, and EFA follow-up is enhanced	Higher involvement and participation of NGOs and other non-governmental stakeholders in MoEYS planning and implementation of education reform and EFA follow up.	N/A
	A number of policy related studies and pilot activities to test alternative strategies for education reform, including strategies for increased participation of children and parents, are conducted and replicated through partnership between the MOEYS and the NGOs/Civil society organization	Strategies developed and implemented in specific geographic areas	N/A

	Enhanced partnership between MOEY's, national and international NGOs, other relevant Ministries and Commune Councils and Village Development Committees to implement the ECCD policy and strategies so as to achieve the EFA targets.	Percentage of Grade 1 entrants who have attended some form of ECCD increases by 30% by 2005. Total enrolment in some form of organized ECCD and preschools increases. The number of individuals enrolled in NFE programs increases by 10% each year to 2005	N/A
Sub-programme 2			
Component 1: Comprehensive Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCD)	Enhanced learning readiness through improved childcare practices of parents and caretakers and the provision of organized ECCD (including preschools) in selected areas.	Percentage of Grade 1 entrants who have attended some form of ECCD in targeted provinces increases to at least 30 % by 2005. Total enrolment in some form of organized ECCD and preschools increases by at least 30 % in the targeted provinces by 2005	MoEYS has developed and adopted a national ECCD policy. A separate department for Early Childhood Education is now established and linkages set up with the cross-sectoral IECD Sub-Committee of the CNCC. Policy development is under way for expansion of early childhood education, including strategies to expand and achieve the objective of providing at least 30 percent of pre-school age children access to organized ECCD activities at community and school level. In collaboration with Seth Koma, child-minding classes given by volunteer teachers have been supported in the specified areas. Capacities have been improved through training of pre-school teachers and administrators at provincial, district, and village level. The targets seem too ambitious and increased focus and efforts are necessary during the remaining part of the MPO. There are difficulties to track progress due to lack of regular, systematic data collection.
Component 2: Child Friendly Schools	Child Friendly Schools Guidelines	A set of CFS guidelines is in place. 80% of the clusters surveyed in the targeted provinces comply with minimal standards for CFS (including health criteria) and corresponding teaching conditions by 2005.	Draft guidelines and manual for child-friendly schools have been completed. Child-friendly schools are currently being piloted and will be expanded in the six provinces of concentration by 2005.
	Improved teaching/learning processes in the classrooms of selected schools.	Survival rate increases to 90 % in all clusters by 2005. Progression rate increased to 90% in all clusters	N/A

	Improved governance of schools through the provision of responsive, participatory, and accountable systems of education management at cluster and school level	50% of the targeted clusters surveyed comply with standardized criteria for governance and accountability to stakeholders	N/A
	Improved health, nutrition and awareness about HIV/AIDS as a result of school-based interventions	Improved children's health and nutrition in supported areas.	N/A
	Increased enrollment rate of girls in lower secondary schools in selected areas	Transition rates of girls to lower secondary school increases as per ESSP targets in selected areas.	The gender gap in primary school net enrolment is narrowing rapidly and is likely to be met in the majority of the areas. However, in Svay Rieng the narrowing of the gap is slower and, although access has increased impressively, latest figures for Stung Treng suggest an increase in the gender gap.
Component 3: Literacy and Training in Essential Skills	Improved literacy levels of adolescents and the adult population in Seth Koma areas.	Literacy levels among the population aged 15-45 increase by 25% in targeted areas by 2005	In collaboration with Seth Koma, literacy classes given by volunteer teachers have been supported in the specified areas. Operationalisation of the activities has been difficult due to the voluntary character of organized activities. There are difficulties to track progress due to lack of regular, systematic data collection.
	Increased awareness of HIV/AIDS among out of school adolescents and adults in Seth Koma areas	80% of out-of-school youths in target areas have received training in HIV/AIDS.	DFID has entered this area to undertake large-scale interventions which has negatively affected our level of prioritization in this area. Difficulties to track progress encountered due to lack of regular data collection on target population.
	Increased capacity in planning and management capacities, including better utilization of education information system for increased access and quality of education among provincial and district officials as well as among LCSOs, Cluster heads, school directors, SSCs, VDCs, and Commune authorities.	Planning and management in target areas reach satisfactory levels according to standardized criteria set for the task	Substantial capacity building activities have been provided at provincial, district, cluster, school, and community levels in all supported areas towards quality improvement of the school system. Substantial support toward increased access has been provided through various means ranging from girls' scholarships to improvement of infrastructure.
Component 4: Local Planning and Monitoring			

Component 5: Support to Specific Target Groups	Strategic plans for achieving Education for All goals are in place in at least the 18 communes in which Seth Koma and SEILA overlap	Presence and implementation of strategic plans in at least 18 communes in the provinces of convergence by 2005.	Cambodia's National EFA Plan was officially launched in June 2003. UNICEF is currently providing technical support to develop guidelines for EFA planning at commune level through a pilot in three communes using a participatory process for EFA planning and documentation of the planning process. The guidelines and 'model' EFA commune plans will be used for replication in communes at national scale, a much wider scale than originally envisaged in the MPO. Activities to achieve this specific objective are well on track.
	A system to locally monitor the access and learning achievement of children in at least one supported convergence province	Baseline data for learning achievement established using a local monitoring system.	A baseline study on grade 4 competency was carried out in the Seth Koma areas, as well as at national level. The exercise will be repeated at the end of the current programme cycle to verify whether learning achievement has increased as targeted. Related to this, UNICEF will support the development of national standards of achievement.
	Improved quality and access to basic education services for disadvantaged children such as girls, street children, child soldiers, war victims, children with disabilities, minority children and children in remote areas	Gender, socio-economic and urban/rural parity in primary education enrolment and learning achievement by 2005 Learning achievement in targeted clusters increases by 20% in comparison to baseline	Specific interventions were piloted, such as girls scholarships, and addressing educational needs of children living on the Tonle Sap Lake and in former KR areas. These strategies have been effective and implemented with good inter-sectoral coordination with Seth Koma and CNSP program. Successful coordination has also been achieved with NGOs for girls' education, education of minority children, and education of children with disabilities. In particular the scholarship pilot stood at the basis of the development of a national scholarship scheme for girls and children belonging to minority groups).

Halving poverty by 2015 is one of the greatest challenges of our time, requiring cooperation and sustainability. The partner countries are responsible for their own development. Sida provides resources and develops knowledge and expertise, making the world a richer place.



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

SE-105 25 Stockholm Sweden
Phone: +46 (0)8 698 50 00
Fax: +46 (0)8 698 56 15
sida@sida.se, www.sida.se