MOVING TOWARDS RESULTS BASED PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

BUILDING MONITORING AND EVALUATION CAPACITY IN ASEZA

PHASE I: DISCOVERY PHASE

<October 4, 2005>

MOVING TOWARDS RESULTS BASED PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

BUILDING MONITORING AND EVALUATION CAPACITY IN ASEZA

PHASE I: DISCOVERY PHASE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope of Work

The USAID Funded AZEM project has engaged the services of REL Solutions Inc. to conduct a preliminary analysis of the current capacity of the Aqaba Special Economic Zone Authority (ASEZA) to collecting and using performance measurement information in carrying out the business of ASEZA to meet its broad mandate. The key focus of this work was to assess the current capacity of the organization regarding the use of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tools and mechanisms and to identify a practical approach to helping ASEZA improve its performance measurement and M&E capacity. The work was carried out by Robert Lahey, President of REL Solutions Inc.

1.2 Approach

This work, carried out over a ten-day period, involved four on-site elements:

- a review of available documents describing the business of ASEZA and any documentation describing any performance measurement, monitoring and evaluation initiatives that ASEZA has done or is planning to launch;

- Interviews with a selected sample of ASEZA officials at all levels of the organization; i.e. Commissioner, Director and sub-Director. This included a total of thirteen individuals, crossing three Commissions plus corporate service areas;

- consultations (one on one interviews) with staff of the AZEM-Aqaba project;

- Review and vetting of findings with the AZEM-Aqaba management team.

Annex I identifies the individuals consulted. Separate questionnaires were developed for the interviews with the ASEZA officials and for the AZEM consultations. These are given in **Annex II**. The questionnaires reflect the broad approach and lines of questioning used by the World Bank in carrying out 'readiness assessments' of countries or organization engaged in designing and building results based monitoring and evaluation systems.

All interviews were conducted between September 11 and 21, 2005 in the individual are office and were conducted in either English or Arabic, using an AZEM official as translator/facilitator.

While the number of interviews with ASEZA officials is too small to be considered as a representative sample, there was a consistency in the responses that demonstrated a pattern regarding the extent that performance measurement, monitoring and evaluation is (or, is not) used in ASEZA. The coverage across Commissions and across levels of authority/accountability within the organization served to assist in providing a useful cross-section of perspectives and perceptions.

To develop a follow-up plan for ASEZA, the consultant has turned to world-wide best practices. The recommendations for further developing performance measurement, monitoring and evaluation capacity in ASEZA reflect the process used by the federal government in Canada, recognized by the OECD as one of the world leaders in monitoring and evaluation. This is consistent with the approach that has been adopted by the World Bank in its work with countries around the world.

1.3 Outline of Report

The report first presents the observations from this Phase I work. These 'findings' are grouped in Section Two under four headings that reflect key areas critical to the successful use of performance information and monitoring and evaluation systems in any organization. These are: awareness and understanding of the use of performance measurement and M&E; drivers and leadership required for the successful development and implementation of M&E systems; current capacity (and, capacity gaps) to supply performance information; and, current capacity to 'use' performance information.

A fifth set of observations/findings summarizes the challenges and realities that senior management in ASEZA and AZEM must face in considering how best to proceed with performance measurement and M&E development. This is presented in Section Three along with a suggested response for dealing with the particular challenge.

Following these findings, recommendations for next steps are provided in the final section, first graphically in a proposed phased approach to developing and implementing performance measurement and M&E, and then with a more detailed discussion of the actual process used and what this will mean for level of commitment from ASEZA officials.

2. Findings

2.1 Awareness and understanding of performance measurement and M&E concepts and terms

- There is ambiguity across ASEZA in the understanding of the concept of 'performance measurement'.

- Much of the focus is on performance at an operational (output) level. While this level of performance measurement is important, it overlooks higher-order 'results' achieved by ASEZA. Measuring 'outcomes' serves to inform stakeholders on the impact that ASEZA activities, program and policies are having in meeting planned objectives.

- There is some confusion as to how M&E might link with other initiatives that have been launched or discussed within ASEZA in the recent past; for example, business process re-engineering; ISO; human resource performance assessment.

- The link of performance measurement and the potential role of M&E as a feedback loop to inform strategic planning and policy making is not widely understood. The Strategic Planning exercise within ASEZA seemed to grind to a halt in some Directorates and its existence is even unclear to some.

2.2 Drivers: 'Who' or 'what' is driving the need for greater performance measurement and monitoring and evaluation?

- The driver to promote M&E appears to be externally generated. In conversation with senior officials however, there is agreement on the utility of having/using more and higher-order information on how well ASEZA is performing. The role of M&E as vehicles to supply this type of information is generally not well understood though.

- There is some uncertainty whether all Commissioners would have the same level of enthusiasm needed to sponsor and commit to a program to build a better M&E capacity within ASEZA.

- Throughout ASEZA, at various levels, there are clearly pockets of interest to invest in greater M&E and generate more results-based performance measurement information.

- An important first step to building greater M&E capacity within ASEZA will be to ensure that there is a common understanding of the goals of M&E, an increased awareness of results-based performance measurement and its uses for ASEZA officials and, clarity around the process to build greater internal and sustainable capacity for ASEZA; i.e. a common vision.

- The discussion will need to focus on:

    (i) The need for and use of results-based performance measurement information; and,

    (ii) M&E systems as 'vehicles' to assist ASEZA to move towards results based management.

- There are individuals within ASEZA who could be identified as 'champions' or 'sponsors' for the M&E exercise. These are needed at all levels, so as to provide the leadership for the exercise and provide the supportive communication to all levels throughout ASEZA. Given the participatory nature of M&E development, significant commitment from within ASEZA is needed to launch, drive and sustain the M&E exercise.

2.3 Current Capacity to 'do' monitoring and evaluation; i.e. to supply performance information

- Currently, there is uneven systematic collection of data across ASEZA Directorates and Commissions.

- Much data is gathered, though it is primarily process information and occurs within those organizations where there is a requirement (rules) to collect data (e.g. Customs)

- This level of information is useful and important (especially from an operations perspective) but does not provide a comprehensive set of information on the overall performance of ASEZA or the impact of its various programs or policies.

- There is a recent example of formal, corporate reporting (ASEZA 2004 Annual Report). This was a unique and first-time exercise that can serve as a useful base to build on with more comprehensive reporting and greater analysis in the future.

- Data storage and information systems are issues that will need to be addressed in the future. Currently, there are limited data bases and most data is stored manually, some electronic storage has been introduced.

- Overall there is limited analytical capability within ASEZA, though there are areas and activities that could serve to support greater analysis. For example, at the corporate level (Quality Assurance; MIS and Internal Audit) and within some specific Commissions and Directorates.

- Resources for analysis appear to be limited in the current environment.

- HR and staffing issues (new positions; turnover of key positions; no succession planning; etc.) reduces corporate memory and the analytical capacity at this point

- Links with external agencies capable of data and analysis 'services' (e.g. Department of Statistics, University of Jordan) appear to be limited.

- There is no history of formal 'evaluation' studies within ASEZA; i.e. no studies of 'effectiveness' of ASEZA policies or programs. Additionally, to date, there has been limited focus on assessing the needs of the various clients and stakeholders of ASEZA and how well these needs are being met.

2.4 Capacity to 'use' performance information

- The limited scope of data collection & limited analysis has reduced the ability of ASEZA to integrate performance measurement information into management and accountability and reporting needs.

- With a focus primarily on operational information, much of the information gathering has been 'vertical', thus limiting the ability of ASEZA management to do any form of 'horizontal' analysis or address strategic issues.

- There is a need to increase awareness within ASEZA of how performance measurement can be used to help managers and senior officials in various ways; i.e.

    * Decision-making

    * Managing programs and Commission

    * Accommodation (internal & external)

    * Corporate reporting (to internal & external audiences)

    * Priority-setting

    * Budgeting, etc.

- The recent example of using performance information, the ASEZA 2004 Annual Report, is a good start that should be built on (e.g. incorporating more analysis).

3. Challenges and Realities to be faced in designing and planning for 'next steps'

The interviews with ASEZA and AZEM officials revealed a number of issues that need to be recognized and taken into account in planning for 'next steps'. For the M&E development process to be successful, an appropriate response needs to be factored in to deal with each of these issues; that is, a practical and realistic approach to successfully dealing with each of the challenges faced by ASEZA and AZEM. The challenges/realities and recommended response for each is summarized in **Table 1**. Many of these reflect the observations noted in Section Two above.

The plan for 'next steps', discussed in the next section, attempts to bring all of these realities and their appropriate responses together into a comprehensive strategy for the successful development of a results-based performance monitoring and evaluation system for ASEZA.

Table 1: Challenges realities to consider in planed Running for 'Next Steps'	
Challenge/ Reality	**Response**
M&E not demand-driven from within the organization.	Need to increase level of awareness of benefits & gain support & commitment of Commissioners.
Possible confusion in ASEZA with other initiatives (BPR, ISO, HR performance assessment).	Need to communicate to 'connect the dots' & to ensure clear & unambiguous messaging throughout ASEZA.
Possible 'fatigue' of key ASEZA staff; i.e. same set of high achievers to be relied on once again.	Make them believers in importance of the exercise, to both ASEZA and to their area. Need for 'champions' from within & for clear sign of commitment from Commissioners.
Potentially unrealistic expectations of senior ASEZA officials re M&E development, given the current 'fast track' of the organization.	Need for clear & realistic messaging that stresses that M&E development is iterative. Need to address the key questions of 'how far' and 'how fast' & manage expectations.
Very broad mandate of ASEZA (i.e. broad scope for performance measurement), yet limited corporate memory and significant internal change (IT, new positions, turnover, etc.).	Importance of 'awareness' sessions, managing expectations and taking a realistic iterative approach to developing & implementing performance measurement and M&E systems. Also, start with areas with greatest potential to succeed.
Ambiguity of understanding of results-based performance measurement.	Importance of 'awareness' sessions for all levels within ASEZA and clear

	understandable communication vehicles. Bilingual messaging.
Limited focus to date on issues of program 'effectiveness', client needs & client satisfaction.	Need for awareness sessions to broaden horizons on 'performance'. Open potential for new data/information collection and/or evaluation to assist management. Identify resource implications.
Limited analytical capacity & no 'evaluation' capacity currently within ASEZA	Need for capacity building initiatives & resources (both $ & HR) to develop sustainable capability.
Some potential participants to 'awareness' sessions & workshops unilingual (Arabic); others bilingual.	Need to have bilingual (Arabic & English) capability for sessions (bilingual documentation; simultaneous translation or consecutive interpretation).

4. Recommendations re 'Next Steps': A phased approach to performance measurement and M&E capacity building

4.1 General approach to M&E capacity building

The overall strategy recommended as 'next steps' for ASEZA derives from the need for more comprehensive and 'results-based' performance information. Performance monitoring and evaluation (M&E) represent tools that will allow managers in ASEZA to gather this type of information in a systematic fashion. That is, they serve as 'means' to an 'end', rather than an end in themselves.

The starting focus for ASEZA officials therefore needs to be an understanding of where and how performance information can be used and useful to the organization. With a recognition and belief that performance information can assist officials to better manage ASEZA and its component business lines, an improved M&E capacity will allow for measurement and internal and external reporting on the performance of all elements of the organization in meeting their objectives and the broad objectives set out for ASEZA. To be

successful though, M&E capacity needs to be deemed as more than a 'nice to have'; it needs to be recognized as a 'need to have' for a well functioning organization.

The experience of other countries can be useful in this regard. The Canadian federal government has been a world leader in developing and implementing results-based performance measurement systems within the public sector. The broad approach outlined below borrows from this general strategy that is, building 'Results based Management and Accountability Frameworks (RMAFs) for ASEZA and for each of its components The process parallels the process used by the World Bank in designing and developing sustainable monitoring and evaluation systems in developing countries around the world.

Table 2 below outlines the characteristics of the recommended process.

Key Elements in the general approach to M&E Capacity Building
THE CONCEPT OF 'PERFORMANCE' • CONCEPT OF 'PERFORMANCE' TO INCLUDE MEASUREMENT AT THREE LEVELS: LEVEL I: CORPORATE OUTCOMES; LEVEL II: BUSINESS LINE OR DIRECTORATE OUTCOMES; & LEVEL III: OPERATIONAL OUTPUTS.
Mechanism to identify relevant measures of performance • Link performance measurement to the key results and success expected of the organization. Requires clarification of business objectives, clients, links of activities to outputs & outcomes; i.e. the 'logic' of ASEZA's programs & policies. • Results based Management and Accountability Frameworks (RMAFs) to serve as vehicle to identify appropriate performance measurement, monitoring and evaluation tools. Both ASEZA-level & Directorate-level RMAFs.
The process: Overall Strategy • A mixed implementation approach: both 'top down' & 'bottom up'. • Early on, need for awareness & knowledge building. • Systematic, but flexible, interactive and participative process. • Seek out 'champions' & work towards early successes. • Recognize process as iterative. Don't expect perfection early on. • Process itself serves to build a learning culture & results-based performance measurement capacity within the organization.
The process: Communications & Commitment • Early on, communication from ASEZA Commissioners to ASEZA officials to acknowledge/ inform staff of importance & priority of this project. • Need to identify 'champions' throughout ASEZA.
The process: Role of AZEM & its consultants • Lead awareness sessions to build understanding /knowledge of performance measurement, results based management & M&E.

• AZEM & its consultants act & be seen as 'facilitators' in the process to profile ASEZA objectives & expected results & identify performance measures. • Ensure language not a barrier to knowledge & capacity building sessions • Challenge role in clarifying program & policy objectives & developing meaningful measures of performance.
The process: Role of ASEZA officials • Commitment from Commissioners essential. • Use key set of ASEZA officials to assist steering & advising the process & as working groups (e.g. Senior Advisory Committee; Working Group). • Key insight to the business of ASEZA (objectives, clients, etc.). • 'Champions' to sustain momentum of the process. • Working group(s) to provide 'hands-on' input to developing profiles, performance measures & appropriate monitoring mechanisms • ASEZA officials must 'own' the final product.
Building Evaluation capacity within ASEZA • Recognition of current limit to analytical capability within ASEZA. • Separate exercise to encourage resourcing /staffing within ASEZA of 'evaluation' analytical capacity. • Consider different organizational models; e.g. position & resource Evaluation as a corporate service and/or within each Commission. • Make appropriate links to Strategic Planning and Data Development. • Encourage development of Annual and Multi-Year Evaluation Plans to look at issues of program & policy 'effectiveness' and implementation of performance monitoring.

4.2 Phasing the development and implementation of M&E

The development and implementation of a monitoring and evaluation capability in any organization should be phased in over time. It is an iterative process that involves a considerable period of elapsed time before it becomes fully operational. The total time invested in any one phase however does not have to be large.

This section identifies the sequencing of the phased development and implementation. For ASEZA, four phases have been identified below and , for each, an identification of the various tasks is provided. An additional section identifies tasks that could be included in subsequent phases of M&E development.

Phase 1: Discovery phase

- Conduct of a 'readiness assessment' of ASEZA vis-à-vis its performance measurement and monitoring and evaluation capability.

- Completed over September 11-23, 2005.

Phase 2: Information/Awareness and Knowledge Building

- Prepare knowledge building and workshop materials; i.e. to demonstrate where and how performance measurement and M&E can be useful and used within ASEZA. Include international comparisons.

- Session and workshop materials in two languages (Arabic, English)

- Conduct Awareness and knowledge-building sessions with different audiences

  * Commissioners

  * Directors

  * Sub-Director level

- Communication from Commissioners to ASEZA staff identifying M&E capacity building as priority for ASEZA.

- Identify senior-level Committee and Working Group representing ASEZA Commissions and corporate services.

- Organize logistics for follow-up workshops (Phases 3 and 4).

Phase 3: ASEZA-level RMAF

- Use workshop format and Working Group.

- Develop profile of ASEZA…clarification of the business objectives, client reach, activities, expected results, risks, etc.

- Development of 'logic model' for ASEZA, linking activities, outputs and outcomes.

- Identification of corporate-level measures of performance, linked to expected results.

- Examine issues around data systems (inventory of existing data systems; plans for the future; data needs associated with specific performance indicators). Ideally, this element would involve IT personnel.

- Determine feasible set of performance measures for short-term and plan for improved performance measurement.

- Identify key corporate issues (strategic, horizontal, priority area) for future in-depth evaluation study, including planned timeline.

Phase 4: Directorate-level RMAFs

- Use workshop format and Working Groups (Directorate-level).

- Identify/select appropriate Directorates (those most likely to succeed).

- Develop 'profile' of the Directorate-level business.

- Develop 'logic model'.

- Develop/identify relevant measures of performance.

- Data system assessment and planning for data development.

- Clarification of feasible set of performance measures for short-term and plan for future improvements in performance measurement and monitoring.

- Identification of key Directorate-level issues for future evaluation study and planned timeline

Later phases

- Establish/review benchmarks, targets and standards for specific Directorates and program areas.

- Monitor the implementation of the M&E system …feedback to: improve the 'quality' of performance measurement and M&E; ensure consistency across organizational units; assess the 'results'-orientation of the performance measurement.

- As part of the above, review the various reporting vehicles used by ASEZA with various internal and external audiences. Any need to amend or introduce new accountability and reporting vehicles?

- Assess the role and performance of the 'Evaluation' group in providing in-depth analysis of the effectiveness of various ASEZA components and business lines. As part of this, assess capacity to meet the needs of ASEZA management.

4.3 Resource requirements for subsequent phases of M&E development

Listed below in **Table 3** is a detailing of the expected time required to complete each of the phases identified above. The figures shown represent work time. Note that delays in scheduling meetings and/or the lack of cooperation and feedback of ASEZA officials who have agreed to participate as a member of a committee in support of this project will extend the elapsed time required to complete the project. Also, the issue of language could be critical to the smooth running of all sessions and workshops. The estimated time figures here assume that all language obstacles will be overcome with both the timely availability of translated session/workshop materials and the availability of suitable translation services for those sessions and workshops where participants do not fully comprehend English.

These figures are best estimates, based on the 'readiness assessment' and the experience of other countries. It is important to note that these estimates of time requirements assume

that the following human resource requirements are met throughout the relevant phases of this project.

Human resource requirements

- Consultant (expert in M&E development) to lead Awareness sessions & as facilitator for workshops

- Translator to participate throughout

- Translation of all documents and slides

- Simultaneous translation or consecutive interpretation during some of the sessions and workshops

- Availability of all Commissioners for a single Awareness/knowledge building session

- Senior level committee identified (ASEZA Director level)

- Working level committee identified (ASEZA Division Head or equivalent)

- Involvement of some corporate services (ASEZA QA and MIS)

Table 3: Expected Time Requirements for Each Phase of M&E Project

Phase 1	Two weeks
Phase 2	Three weeks
Phase 3	Four weeks
Phase 4*	Four weeks

* For Phase 4, the likelihood is that two Directorate-level RMAFs could be developed within this time period, assuming the availability of the needed HR requirements, as detailed above. It may be that preliminary work could also be initiated in other areas, through the involvement of officials from other Directorates in these workshops.

ANNEX I

List of Interviews in ASEZA and the AZEM Project

I List of Interviewees within ASEZA

Corporate Services: Heads

- Quality Assurance (Ammar Atout)

- MIS (Samer B. Al-Hamarneh)

- Internal Audit (Wa'el Al-Asad)

ASEZA Commissioners

- Environment and Health Control (Dr. Bilal Al Bashir)

- Revenue and Customs (Shadi Majali)

ASEZA Directors

- Health Control (Rima Haidar Zu'mot)

- Environmental Planning (Mazen M. Haobsha)

- Customs (Nabeel M. Al-Hindawi)

- Local Community Development (Khalil A. Abdallat)

ASEZA Sub-Director level

- Customs & Revenue, Planning and Development Division Head (Samer S. Hijazeen)

- Manager, Storage and Warehousing (Falah Rakad)

- Quality Assurance (Shorouq S. Maaitah)

- Local Community Development (Shama Ghraquan)

II List of Interviewees with AZEM Project Officials

- Dr. Maurice Girgis , Chief of Party

- Marc Shiman, Deputy Chief of Party

- Karim Mubarak, Senior Capacity Building Advisor

- Sa'id Al-Jaberi, Senior Technical Coordinator & Grants Manager

- Khaled Touqan, ISO consultant

- Amjed Issa

ANNEX II

Interview Guide for Consultations with ASEZA Officials

Background Information

Name of respondent: _____

Position: _____

Organization: _____

Years in current position: _____

Years in organization: _____

Date of Interview: _____

1 Need for and Use of Performance Information and M&E Systems

1.1 Are there any organizations or people that regularly ask for information on how well ASEZA is performing? For example:

- Prime Minister's Office or other government officials
- Board of Commissioners
- National Audit Office **(check)**
- Donors (e.g. USAID)
- Private sector/potential investors
- Media
- Civil society (Citizens, NGOs)
- Other_____

1.2 Do any of the **Commissioners**, either individually or collectively, have requirements for reporting how well ASEZA in general and/or their areas of responsibility in particular are performing (e.g. Commissioner of Investment and Social Development)?

1.3 Do any **Directors** within ASEZA have requirements for reporting how well their broad area, or individual projects within those areas, is performing (e.g. Investment Directorate; Community and Social Development Directorate)?

1.4 Do any of the corporate areas within ASEZA (in particular, Government Affairs; and, Strategic Planning) have need for information on the global performance of ASEZA and its individual Directorates in meeting their objectives? What is the nature of this information? Is it readily available (timely; comprehensive; good quality)?

1.5 Are the key objectives for ASEZA in general and each of the Directorates well articulated so that performance against these objectives can be readily measured?

1.6 Are there any senior officials who advocate collecting and using information on ASEZA performance? For example, Advisors to the King or to the Prime Minister; Board of Commissioners; Chief Commissioner; senior officials responsible for strategic planning; other?

1.7 What information has the Jordanian government requested from ASEZA on how well the organization is performing?

1.8 Are there senior officials who would resist requests for producing this kind of performance-based information? Reasons for the resistance?

1.9 Has ASEZA published any information on the performance of the organization? If so, please describe: purpose; intended audience; nature of the performance information?

1.10 What information have donors requested from ASEZA on how well the organization is performing?

1.11 How easy (or not) has it been for members of civil society to obtain information related to the performance of ASEZA?

1.12 Are there any of the ASEZA Directorates that you would say represent a good model for using performance-based information to manage their activities and programs?

1.13 Are there any reforms that are taking place (or planned) within ASEZA that include efforts to strengthen systems to collect and manage information related to ASEZA performance?

1.14 Any other external pressures driving the need for a more systematic collection and assessment of ASEZA performance?

II Roles and Responsibilities for Assessing Performance: Technical Considerations to Support Performance Measurement and M & E

2.1 Do any Directorates or program areas within Directorates collect information on their performance to support budget expenditure decisions or to enhance their program management?

2.3 Can you briefly describe the role of each of the corporate service areas in ASEZA?

- Quality Assurance Directorate

- Internal Audit

- MIS Directorate

- Strategic Planning

2.4 What data systems do the planning units within ASEZA (at both corporate and Directorate levels) have available to them?

- Budget data

- Output data

- Outcome or impact data

- Performance audits

- Financial audits

- Project or program completion reports

Other_____

2.5 What is the nature of this data and the systems?

- Frequency of collection

- Perceived quality of the data

- Analysis carried out; by whom

- For how long have the systems been in place

2.6 Do any Directorates within ASEZA undertake or commission evaluations or formal reviews of the performance of projects, programs or policies of ASEZA? That is, probing analysis of how 'effective' certain components of the organization are? Such as:

- formal evaluation studies

- client satisfaction surveys

- performance audits

- other_____

2.7 Does the National Statistics Office in Jordan play any role in terms of information gathering that implicates ASEZA?

2.8 Does the National Audit Office **(check)** have the authority to audit ASEZA? Does it have any oversight over the quality of the information produced by ASEZA?

III Technical Considerations: Capacity Building

3.1 How would you assess the current capacity within ASEZA in each of the following areas?

- project and program management

- data analysis

- policy analysis

- setting project and program goals

- budget management

- performance monitoring

3.2 Are you aware of any institutes, research centers, private organizations or universities in the government that could potentially assist in providing technical assistance and training for ASEZA staff in performance-based management?

3.3 Can you identify specific individuals within ASEZA who would be useful contacts to gain better insight into the technical capability of the organization?

Interview Guide for Consultations with Officials of the AZEM-Aqaba Project

1. Need for and use of performance information (M&E) Systems

1.1 What is driving the need for an M&E system?

1.2 What are the key questions that performance information would be expected to answer? (In effect, what kind of information is needed? And, how will the information be used?)

1.3 Who will be needing (benefiting from/using) this information?

1.4 There are generally different types of performance information…some that relate to measures of efficiency; some that relate to measures of effectiveness, such as 'client feedback'.

Is there expected to be more than one use for performance information (that is, need for more than one type of performance information)? and, More than one user?

1.5 How often will the information be needed; i.e. How frequently to gather?

2. Commitment from the organization to measure, monitor & report on performance

2.1 Is the leadership (Commissioners) fully supportive?

2.2 Are there people within the organization who could serve as 'champions' of performance measurement and M&E development:

> * At the Commissioner level?

> * At the Director level?

> * At the operational level?

2.3 Would there likely be anyone within the senior ranks (Commission? Directorates?) who would 'resist'? What would be their concern or the basis of their resistance?

2.4 Are there any 'incentives' within ASEZA for managers to 'use' performance information?

2.5 Do staff and managers within ASEZA know of these efforts aimed at helping institute better performance measurement and M&E systems? If not, are there plans for a senior level message from AZEM?

2.6 How would you assess the willingness of the organization (now and in the future) to 'use' performance information?

> * To report publicly against its objectives/commitments (i.e. a very public accountability tool?

> * To use performance information in informal decision-making?

> * To inform/raise awareness of the accomplishments of ASEZA, in communicating with the business and/or the general community?

3. Documentation on the organization; its role/objectives; clients; and how activities are intended to link to outputs & outcomes

3.1 What relevant documentation exists (from ASEZA? AZEM? Government sources? Elsewhere?)

3.2 How well are objectives articulated…e.g. in formal documents, speeches, etc.?

3.3 Is there any ambiguity around statements on the objectives of ASEZA? What are these objectives?

4. Technical Considerations to Support performance measurement and monitoring

4.1 Is there any performance measurement/monitoring currently ongoing within ASEZA?

    * Across the broad ASEZA organization?

    * Within specific Directorates?

4.2 If so, what is the nature of the information being collected? Is it being reported anywhere? How is it being used?

4.3 Is there any data/information that is being collected on an ongoing and systematic basis within ASEZA?

4.4 What do we know about this data/information?

    * Ongoing collection within which Directorates(s)?

    * How frequently?

    * What is the perceived quality of the data (reliability, timeliness, etc.)?

    * Any analysis done on this data? If so, by whom?

    * Nature of the data: quantitative or qualitative?

    * For how long has this data collection been carried out?

4.5 Is there any capacity for carrying out systematic analysis of data (both qualitative and quantitative) in ASEZA? If so, where located?

4.6 Has any 'evaluation' been carried out within ASEZA; i.e. probing analysis of how 'effective' certain components of the organization are?

5. ASEZA Organization and People to Consult

5.1 Who are the key people to consult with in the senior ranks of ASEZA? Has there been any previous discussion with them about 'performance measurement' and M&E? How best to arrange a meeting?

5.2 Can you identify specific individuals below the Director level who would be useful contacts to gain better insight into the technical capability of the organization? For example, people who might have been associated with any form of data gathering; analysis; related work?

5.3 How best to schedule meetings with ASEZA officials….. Is there an AZEM staff member that could take the lead in setting up meetings with a list of specified individuals? (Note: Meetings to be scheduled over the period from Wednesday September 14 to Wednesday September 21 inclusive.)

ANNEX III

Key Definitions

Performance Measurement**: is a term that is widely used by technical and non-technical people alike, often with different interpretations. Underlying the concept is a series of terms:**

- **Performance: How well an organization, program, etc. is achieving its planned results (i.e. within a given time frame).**

- **Results: A general term that includes both 'outputs' and 'outcomes' achieved by a given organization, program, etc.**

- **Outputs: Products or services produced and delivered by an organization, program, etc. to a target group or population.**

- **Outcome: An external consequence attributed to an organization, program, etc. that is considered significant in relation to its commitments.**

Performance measurement typically occurs at various levels: input stage, output stage and outcome stage. A program logic model helps in identifying these different measures of 'performance'.

Performance Monitoring: **refers to the continuous collection of information and data in a systematic fashion so as to provide an ongoing indication of how well an organization, program, etc. is performing. The critical distinction between 'performance monitoring' and 'Evaluation' is that the former will only provide trend information, while the latter will examine below this and focus on underlying issues of why a particular trend is (or is not) occurring; i.e. Evaluation provides more explanatory information to managers and decision-makers.**

Evaluation**: a disciplined assessment of government programs, policies and activities. It is based on systemically disciplined and objective measurement and analysis, carried out to meet expectations set in policy and standards, and publicly reported.**

Any one evaluation could address a broad range of issues, the selection of which will impact the appropriate methodology, resourcing and time required to carry out.

Summative Evaluation: **an evaluation study that addresses the fundamental issues of whether or not a program needs to continue to exist; whether original**

rationale is still relevant; the impacts and effects that the program has had; its performance and success in meeting its original objectives; and whether there may now be better alternatives to the program.

These issues are usually more difficult to assess and are often associated with methodological issues about how best to measure 'attribution'; i.e. cause and effect relationships.

Formative Evaluation**: an evaluation study that is usually conducted early in the life of a program (or program redesign) to obtain an 'early reading' on whether or not the program is unfolding as its designers originally conceived. Issues addressed are generally oriented to management, design and operational concerns. It also provides an opportunity to reassess clarity of program objectives and the ability to measure/monitor program performance.**