



Technical Assistance Consultant's Report

Project Number: 39627
January 2008

Kyrgyz Republic: Support to Development and Implementation of National Poverty Reduction Strategy II

Prepared by David Pearce

For President's Office

This consultant's report does not necessarily reflect the views of ADB or the Government concerned, and ADB and the Government cannot be held liable for its contents. (For project preparatory technical assistance: All the views expressed herein may not be incorporated into the proposed project's design.)

Asian Development Bank

ADB TA 4705-KGZ: Support to Development and Implementation of
National Poverty Reduction Strategy II

Monitoring & Evaluation Component

COMPLETION REPORT

January 11, 2008

David Pearce

Prepared under Contract No. S09222

CONTENTS

I.	BACKGROUND	3
II.	M&E PRINCIPLES, POLICIES & PRACTICES	4
III.	DESIGNING KYRGYZSTAN'S CDS MES	5
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMEMNDATIONS	6

ATTACHMENTS:

ANNEX 1:	TIMELINE OF KEY ACTIONS, 2006-07
ANNEX 2:	M&E WORKSHOPS, DECEMBER 6-7, 2006
ANNEX 3:	DONORS' COUNCIL, NOVEMBER 6, 2007
ANNEX 4:	MES TRAINING WORKSHOPS, NOVEMBER 21-23, 2007
ANNEX 5:	LIST OF PERIODIC PROGRESS REPORTS

I. BACKGROUND

1. In November 2005, ADB approved a grant of \$400,000 to the Kyrgyz Republic¹ to assist the government in developing its Country Development Strategy (CDS), 2006-10² in three areas: (a) monitoring and evaluation; (b) policy advice on selected topics; and (c) public awareness and project management. The activities of this technical assistance project (hereinafter referred to as ADTA 4705) were carefully coordinated with related assistance provided by the UK Department for International Development (DfID), the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), and the World Bank (WB) during the same two-year period (2006-07). This report summarizes the outcome of the ADTA 4705's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) component—the primary objective of which was to advise and assist the Kyrgyz authorities in defining indicators and in designing and establishing a national-level CDS monitoring and evaluation system (MES). For this purpose, the component financed a team of four consultants (one international for about 3.5 person-months intermittently and three national totalling about 36 person-months)³, a modest amount of essential equipment, and associated orientation and training workshops.

2. At its inception in September/October 2006, the component's original timeline envisaged completion of the matrix of CDS indicators by end-January, 2007 and initial setting up of the MES by end-March, 2007—in line with the Kyrgyz authorities' schedule for completion and launch of the CDS itself by end-2006. In reality, the latter did not take place until mid-April 2007, owing *inter alia* to ongoing political developments in the country. Consequently, the matrix could not be completed until early June 2007. Later, since the matrix was not formally approved by the authorities until November 12, 2007, the MES could not be launched until end-November, 2007 and then only in part. However, the two brief lulls in component activity caused by these delays were put to productive use by the two full-time national consultants (Ms. Ten and Mr. Temirov): the first—in February/March—was spent making 2-3 day fact-finding visits to seven oblasts to initiate implementation of a related ADB \$300,000 grant to help develop a regional MES⁴; and, the second—in July/August—was taken up by helping the Kyrgyz authorities, at the request of the President's Administration (PA), to disseminate the CDS nationwide.

3. Against this background, the completion report is arranged as follows. *First*, Section II reviews briefly the M&E principles, policies and practices that have informed the overall design of the Kyrgyz CDS MES; *second*, Section III outlines the approach and specific steps taken by the consultants' team to help develop and launch the MES during the component's 16-month implementation period (September, 2006—December, 2007); and *third*, Section IV summarizes the consultants' team's conclusions and recommendations aimed at ensuring the MES' institutional sustainability.

¹ ADTA 4705—KGZ: *Support to Development & Implementation of National Poverty Reduction Strategy(NPRS) II*

² Formerly known as National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS)

³ Mr. David Pearce, Ms. Liubov Ten and Messrs. Adyljan Temirov and Ulan Sydykbaev

⁴ ADTA 4801—KGZ: *Development of Monitoring and Evaluation System at Oblast Level*

II. M&E PRINCIPLES, POLICIES & PRACTICES

4. In carrying out their assignment, the consultants' team took into account international experience and best practice, in general, and the lessons learned during implementation of Kyrgyzstan's first National Poverty Reduction Strategy, 2003-05 (NPRS-1), in particular. It therefore consulted with a wide range of current and former government officials and representatives of civil society and, in addition, analysed the results of several evaluation studies undertaken during 2004-06.⁵ Based on this process, the following principles, policies and best practices—some internationally recognized and others specific to Kyrgyz conditions and circumstances—informed the overall design of the Kyrgyz CDS MES:

- The complementary, but separate roles of *monitoring* and *evaluation*—the former to measure performance of programs or projects in progress, the latter to analyze *ex post facto* why intended results were, or were not, achieved;
- The distinction between *implementation monitoring* and *results monitoring* and—given the increased focus of governments and civil society on impact and outcomes—the growing preference in recent years for the latter;
- The *ten-step methodology* advocated by the World Bank for designing, developing and maintaining results-based monitoring and evaluation systems;
- The importance of wide-ranging consultations with, and thus of *ownership* by all government agencies, ministries, and officials concerned;
- The need—for reasons of accountability, credibility and transparency—to ensure that an MES is *accessible* to a wide range of users, *i.e.* policy makers, government officials, members of parliament, civil society institutions and, in particular, the public at large;
- The desirability—to enhance the efficiency and quality of public expenditure and as a first step towards the introduction of performance-based budgeting—of *linking* the MES to *the budget*, including the public investment program, the budget calendar and cycle, and the medium-term budget framework (MTBF);
- The necessity—especially where, as in Kyrgyzstan, administrative, financial and/or human capacities may be constrained—of designing a *relatively simple*

⁵ “*Analysis of monitoring system in Kyrgyz Republic*”, 2004, Elvira Ilibeozova (financed by UK's DfID); “*Understanding the Institutions for Poverty Monitoring Strategies—Kyrgyzstan*”, 2004, Elvira Ilibeozova and Ekatarine Vashakmadze, World Bank, pp 143-151; “*Kyrgyz Republic: Review & Analysis of Public Expenditure Monitoring & Evaluation Systems in Selected Sectors*”, 2005, Center for Social & Economic Research (CASE); *NPRS 1st & 2nd Progress Reports, 2004 & 2006*, Government of Kyrgyz Republic & related IMF/WB Joint Assessments; and *Diagnostic & Policy Notes*, February 22, 2006, Agulhas (financed by World Bank)

MES at the outset, but with provision for more elaboration and sophistication later, based on experience; and

- The benefit of ensuring that the monitoring and/or reporting obligations and systems of Kyrgyzstan’s key international development partners are *compatible with the MES*.

III. DESIGNING KYRGYZSTAN’S CDS MES

5. Annex 1 presents the timeline of key actions during component implementation, which proceeded broadly in three phases: (a) September, 2006—January, 2007; (b) April—June, 2007; and (c) September—December, 2007.

6. **September, 2006—January, 2007.** The main objectives of the first phase were threefold: (a) to define a conceptual approach for the proposed MES, including a participatory process and timetable; (b) to solicit comments, cooperation and commitment from all government agencies and ministries concerned and, as appropriate, from representatives of civil society and the international development community; and (c) to prepare a first draft matrix of CDS goals, policy measures, baseline and intermediate indicators, and final indicators or targets as the overall framework for the proposed MES. Thus, in addition to detailed bilateral discussions with government officials concerned during this period, the consultants conducted three workshops from October 5-6, 2006 at the Ministry of Finance and Economy and, again, from December 6-7 at ADB’s Kyrgyz Resident Mission—two for government officials and one for representatives of civil society (including consulting firms, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and universities). A summary of the presentation prepared for these workshops is attached at Annex 2.

7. Four strategic judgements and recommendations emerged from these consultations and workshops that subsequently guided the detailed design of the Kyrgyz MES:

- *First*, the MES’ scope would be limited initially to **results monitoring of about 100** baseline, intermediate and final **indicators** at the outset, and its **design** would be **web-based** (*i.e.* accessible through the internet);
- *Second*, the MES’ ***ex-post* evaluation** activities would be undertaken under separate, **competitive ‘contracting out’ procedures** by (*e.g.*) universities, consultants, research institutes and NGOs
- *Third*, the **MES’ coordinating and institutional arrangements** would be kept **light**, *i.e.* overall MES coordination by the President’s Administration (PA), and MES management by the Ministry of Finance and Economy⁶; and

⁶ Following a government re-organization during 2007, responsibility for CDS implementation and the MES was transferred to the Ministry of Economic Development & Trade (MOEDT)

- *Fourth*, monitoring and reporting by development partners—especially by those involved in the Joint Country Support Strategy (JCSS)⁷—would, to the extent possible, be compatible with the MES.

8. **April—June, 2007.** Following the Presidential Decree of April 19, 2007 formally approving the CDS, the second phase of component implementation focussed almost exclusively on finalizing the matrix of baseline, intermediate and final indicators or targets based on the goals and policy measures specified in the CDS. This involved a final round of bilateral consultations with all the government agencies concerned and a third series of three workshops from May 24-25 at the MOEDT—as before, two for government officials and one for representatives of civil society. Against this background, the consultants’ team completed the final draft matrix of recommended MES indicators in early June and submitted it to the Kyrgyz authorities (MOEDT and PA) for approval by mid-June. Meanwhile, the consultant IT specialist proceeded with technical design of the web-based MES, pending delivery and installation of the server and other equipment required to the MOEDT. In this latter connection, following the government reorganization during this period noted below, the MES consultants’ team re-located from the erstwhile MOFE to the new MOEDT in mid-June.

9. **July/September—December, 2007.** During this third and final phase, the three main component activities undertaken were: (a) sample survey of \pm 40 NGOs/Research Institutes’ potential for CDS evaluation—the results of which were presented and discussed at a national forum “*Role of NGOs in CDS Implementation*” arranged by the PA on October 10 at the Akeme Hotel, Bishkek; (b) presentation of the proposed MES to a meeting of the Kyrgyzstan Donors’ Council on November 6 at the offices of DfID; and (c) following the PA’s final approval of the MES matrix on November 12, the launch of the MES itself at three inter-active training workshops—two for national and one for regional (*oblast*) government officials—from November 21-23 at the National Information Technology Center (NITC). The latter involved “hands-on” orientation and training in how to access the MES, the MES’ various technical features including data inputting, manipulation, retrieval and presentation, and the distribution of a draft MES users’ guidelines/manual. These workshops were followed up by one-on-one orientation and training of designated M&E officials in their agencies/ministries by the consultants’ team’s IT specialist. A summary of the consultants’ presentation to the Donors’ Council is attached at Annex 3; and, the agenda for the three training workshops is attached at Annex 4.

IV. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

10. With the formal launch of the MES towards end-November 2007, all ADTA 4705 M&E component objectives narrowly defined—*i.e.* the design and initial implementation of the MES—have been substantially achieved, albeit six months later than originally planned as noted earlier (para. 2). However, the impact of this delay in terms of component objectives was negligible, and all activities and expenditures were

⁷ ADB, DfID, SDC, UN and WB

substantially completed by ADTA-4705's formal closing date of January 10, 2008. In this connection, the national consultants' fact-finding visits to seven oblasts to launch ADTA 4801 last February/March have arguably improved its quality at entry and facilitated its initial implementation now underway.

11. On the other hand, despite its deliberate simplicity and the extensive consultations with, and orientation and training of key government officials concerned during the past year, the MES' institutional sustainability within the newly established MOEDT specifically—and within the government as a whole—remains to be established. Indeed, political will in support of the CDS and its monitoring and evaluation at the presidential level needs still to be translated into bureaucratic commitment and support at the ministerial and senior official level. In this context, there are two key issues. *First*, despite very modest requirements (e.g. 2-3 mid-level specialists/officials), staffing and other financial and physical resources available within the MOEDT are currently insufficient to operate and maintain the MES. *Second*, it is unclear whether the fairly small budget resources needed to contract out and finance selected (e.g. 4-6) *ex post evaluations* of specific CDS issues, programs and/or projects during the second half of 2008—as recommended by the consultants' team in order to reduce the administrative burden on government/public sector institutions and to enhance the independence and objectivity of the evaluations' findings—will in fact be available.

12. These issues were discussed with ADB and with the Permanent Secretary, MOEDT on November 23, who shared the consultants' team's concern. Fortunately, as far as the first issue is concerned, the consultants to be recruited for ADTA 4801, planned for implementation during 2008, will *de facto* be able to provide limited continuing support to MOEDT during, for example, the first half of 2008. However, it was agreed that this interim six-month period should be used by the Kyrgyz authorities to ensure that adequate MES staffing and other financial and institutional resources are in place not later than mid—2008.

13. As regards the second issue, at least two bilateral development partners (KfW and SDC) indicated at the November 6 meeting of the Donors' Council that they may be interested and able to provide modest resources to MOEDT to finance selected CDS *ex post evaluation* activities by non-governmental institutions such as university research institutes, consulting companies, think tanks and other qualified organizations. While externally-financed evaluations should, in principle, be considered supplementary to, not a replacement for, government funds, these external grants, if confirmed, should also be used by the Kyrgyz authorities to ensure allocation of adequate budget resources for CDS evaluation in 2008 and beyond.

4705—KGZ: Support to Development & Implementation of Country Development Strategy (CDS)—Monitoring & Evaluation System (MES)

Timeline of Key Actions, 2006-07

2006:

Sep 19:	International consultant's ⁸ inception mission (09/17—10/7)
Oct 5-6:	CDS—MES preparatory workshops (3), at Ministry of Finance & Economy (MOEF)
Oct 6	Initial workplan 10/09—11/16
Oct 9	National consultants ⁹ start work
Nov 22:	International consultant's 2 nd Mission (11/22—12/10)
Dec 6-7:	CDS—MES consultative workshops (3), at Asian Development Bank
Dec 9:	Workplan, December—April, 2007

2007:

Feb 12	National consultants visit Chui, Issyk-ul, Naryn, Talas, Djalalabad, Osh, and Batken oblasts (02/12-03/24)
Apr 12-14:	National consultants attend, and present draft CDS—MES to regional conference " <i>Monitoring & Evaluation in Transition Countries</i> ", at Issyk-ul
Apr 19	Presidential Decree approving CDS

⁸ Mr. David Pearce

⁹ Ms. Liubov Ten and Messrs. Adyljan Temirov and Ulan Sydykbaev

May 9:	International consultant's 3 rd Mission (05/09-28)
May 24-25:	CDS—MES consultative workshops (3), at Ministry of Economic Development & Trade (MOEDT)
May 28:	Workplan, June—September
Jul 3—Aug 3	Survey of NGOs/Research Institutes' potential for evaluation of CDS (1)
Jul—Aug:	National consultants visit Chui, Issyk-ul, Naryn, Talas, Djalalabad, Osh, and Batken oblasts (CDS dissemination)
Sep 20-28	Survey of NGOs/Research Institutes' potential for evaluation of CDS (2)
Oct 10:	National Forum " <i>Role of NGOs in CDS implementation</i> ", at Akeme Hotel, Bishkek
Oct 26:	International consultant's 4 th Mission (10/26-11/11)
Nov 6:	MES presentation to Donors' Council
Nov 12	Presidential decree approving CDS matrix of M&E indicators
Nov 19:	International consultant's 5 th Mission (11/19-25)
Nov 21-23:	CDS—MES launch/training workshops (3), at National Information Technology Center
Dec 17	Planned handover of MES to MOEDT

**COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CDS)
2006-10**

RESULTS-BASED MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)

M&E Workshops, December 6-7

[1] Definitions of Key Terms

GOALS:

- Strategic development objectives that a country/government wants to achieve. Often expressed in broad, qualitative terms, such as “*to increase economic growth*” or “*to reduce poverty*”

INDICATORS:

- Variables used to measure progress over time toward achieving agreed goals. When used to measure factors determining an outcome, or whether a goal is achievable, they may be called “input” or “output” indicators, depending on the stage of the process – or, in other words, an “intermediate indicator”

TARGETS:

- Quantitative (mainly) or qualitative (occasionally) “final indicators” that a country/government wants to achieve by a given date, e.g. an infant mortality rate of 8.5/1,000 live births by 2015

[2] Complementary, but Different Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation

MONITORING:

- **Clarifies** program objectives
- **Links** activities and their resources to objectives
- **Translates** objectives into performance indicators and sets targets
- **Collects** data on these indicators, compares actual results with targets
- **Reports** progress to managers and alerts them to problems

EVALUATION:

- **Analyzes** why intended results were, or were not, achieved
- **Assesses** specific causal contributions of activities to results
- **Examines** implementation process
- **Explores** unintended results

•**Provides** lessons, highlights achievements or failures, offers recommendations for improvement

[3] **Key features of Implementation Monitoring versus Results Monitoring**

IMPLEMENTATION Monitoring (typically for projects)

- Analysis of problem or situation before project
- Benchmarks for activities and immediate outputs
- Data collection: inputs, activities, and immediate outputs
- Systematic reporting on provision of inputs and production of outputs
- Directly linked to specific project (or series of projects)
- Designed to provide information on administrative, implementation and management issues, as opposed to broader development effectiveness issues

RESULTS Monitoring (typically for strategies)

- Baseline data to describe problem or situation *ex ante*
- Indicators for outcomes
- Data collection on outputs and how and whether they contribute toward achievement of outcomes
- More focus on perceptions of change among stakeholders
- Systemic reporting with qualitative and quantitative information on progress toward outcomes
- Undertaken with strategic partners
- Captures information on success or failure of partnership strategy in achieving desired outcomes

[4] **Models for Developing Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation**

- Define** overall goals or (time-bound) outcomes
- Specify** policy measures intended to achieve them
- Select** baseline and intermediate indicators to monitor progress
- Set** specific targets (or final indicators) and dates for reaching them
- Identify** agencies responsible for supplying data to assess whether they are being met
- Report** and analyze results

[5] **Ten Steps towards Designing, Developing and Maintaining a Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation System**

- Conducting a Readiness Assessment
- Agreeing on Outcomes to Monitor and Evaluate
- Selecting Key Indicators to Monitor Outcomes
- Baseline Data on Indicators – Where are We Today?
- Planning for Improvement – Selecting Results Targets

- Monitoring for Results
 - Role of Evaluations
 - Reporting Findings
 - Using Findings
 - Maintaining/Institutionalizing M&E System
- [6] **Five Steps towards Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation of Kyrgyzstan's Country Development Strategy (CDS), 2006-10**
- Define** overall CDS goals or outcomes, 2006-10
 - Specify** CDS policy measures intended to achieve them
 - Select** CDS baseline and intermediate/periodic indicators required to monitor progress
 - Set** CDS final indicators or targets 2010
 - Identify** Kyrgyz agencies responsible for supplying data to assess whether targets (or final indicators) are being met
- [7] **Developing Kyrgyzstan CDS's monitoring and evaluation system: some basic principles**
- Incorporate** lessons of experience with monitoring under National Poverty Reduction Strategy, 2003-05 (NPRS-1)
 - Involve** all interested parties or stakeholders in its design and preparation – within government and outside
 - Start** out with relatively simple, basic system, allowing for increased complexity later in light of experience
 - Link** results monitoring to annual budget allocation (and medium-term budget framework)
 - Encourage** donors to align their monitoring and reporting requirements to CDS monitoring system
 - Keep** coordinating and institutional arrangements light and manageable (PA, MOEF and NSC)
- [8] **Kyrgyzstan: Country Development Strategy, 2006-10**
- Overall Framework**
- Three key sections:** IV - Improvement of Development Environment; V – Development Priorities; IX - Annexes
 - Section IV:** five related topics (macroeconomic policy, investment climate/strategy, financial sector, fiscal reform, export development), plus environmental safety
 - Section V:** three clusters (and 18 topics) – economic capacity building (8), corruption control (5), and human and social development (5)
 - Section IX:** seven tables of quantitative indicators, mainly baseline

[9] Define overall CDS goals or outcomes, 2006-10
[Example for macroeconomic policy]

Two inter-related goals (CDS, Section 4.2, para. 69):

- Improve the economy's efficiency, competitiveness and investment climate, through higher productivity, stabilization, reduced labour unit costs
- Maintain and deepen economic growth through increased employment creation and labour incomes, thereby by reducing poverty

Specify CDS policy measures intended to achieve them (CDS, Section 4.2, paras. 70-74):

- Maintain monetary policy at targeted inflation rate
- Reduce fiscal deficit further
- Limit foreign borrowing (including guarantees) and decrease public investment (PIP)
- Continue efforts to re-structure external debt
- Increase total investment as % of GDP through increased private investment, strengthened financial sector development, and favorable customs and tax policies

[10] Select CDS baseline and intermediate indicators required to monitor progress (CDS Appendix IX.1)

- GDP growth rate averaging 7.5% *per annum* (from \$2,442 million in 2005)
- GDP *per capita* income increasing (from \$475 in 2005)
- Average monthly wage increasing (from \$63 in 2005)
- Inflation averaging 5.7% *per annum*
- International reserves averaging 3-4 months' imports
- Declining fiscal deficit (from 4.2% of GDP in 2005)
- Declining public investment (from 3.9% of GDP in 2005)
- Increasing investment/GDP ratio (from 22% of GDP in 2005)

[11] Set CDS final indicators or targets 2010

- GDP (US\$ equivalent): \$4,194 million
- GDP *per capita* income: \$757
- Average monthly wage: \$154
- Poverty level: 30.2% of population
- Fiscal deficit: 3.7% of GDP
- Public investment: 1.9% of GDP
- Investment/GDP ratio: 38.4%

**[12] Identify Kyrgyz (and other) agencies responsible for supplying data
Official, government agencies or sources**

- National Statistics Committee (NSC), Ministry of Finance & Economy (MOEF), and National Bank of Kyrgyzstan (NBK)

- Family Budget Surveys (NSC)

- Kyrgyz Integrated Household Surveys (NSC)

Non-governmental agencies or sources

- NGO surveys

International agencies or sources

- IMF, IBRD, UNDP

**KYRGYZ REPUBLIC
COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CDS), 2007-10**

RESULTS-BASED MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)

Presentation to Donors' Council, November 6

[1] Definitions of Key Terms

GOALS:

•Strategic development objectives that a country/government wants to achieve. Often expressed in broad, qualitative terms, such as “*to increase economic growth*” or “*to reduce poverty*”

INDICATORS:

•Variables used to measure progress over time toward achieving agreed goals. When used to measure factors determining an outcome, or whether a goal is achievable, they may be called “input” or “output” indicators, depending on the stage of the process – or, in other words, an “intermediate indicator”

TARGETS:

•Quantitative (mainly) or qualitative (occasionally) “final indicators” that a country/government wants to achieve by a given date, e.g. an infant mortality rate of 8.5/1,000 live births by 2015

[2] Complementary, but Different Roles of Monitoring and Evaluation

MONITORING

- Clarifies** program objectives
- Links** activities and their resources to objectives
- Translates** objectives into performance indicators and sets targets
- Collects** data on these indicators, compares actual results with targets
- Reports** progress to managers and alerts them to problems

EVALUATION

- Analyzes** why intended results were, or were not, achieved
- Assesses** specific causal contributions of activities to results
- Examines** implementation process
- Explores** unintended results
- Provides** lessons, highlights achievements or failures, offers recommendations for improvement

[3] **Key features of Implementation Monitoring versus Results Monitoring**

IMPLEMENTATION Monitoring (typically for projects)

- Analysis of problem or situation before project
- Benchmarks for activities and immediate outputs
- Data collection: inputs, activities, and immediate outputs
- Systematic reporting on provision of inputs and production of outputs
- Directly linked to specific project (or series of projects)
- Designed to provide information on administrative, implementation and management issues, as opposed to broader development effectiveness issues

RESULTS Monitoring (typically for strategies)

- Baseline data to describe problem or situation *ex ante*
- Indicators for outcomes
- Data collection on outputs and how and whether they contribute toward achievement of outcomes
- More focus on perceptions of change among stakeholders
- Systemic reporting with qualitative and quantitative information on progress toward outcomes
- Undertaken with strategic partners
- Captures information on success or failure of partnership strategy in achieving desired outcomes

[4] **Five Steps towards Results-Based Monitoring & Evaluation of Kyrgyzstan's Country Development Strategy (CDS), 2006-10**

- Define** overall goals or outcomes, 2007-10 (CDS)
- Specify** CDS policy measures intended to achieve them (CDS)
- Select** CDS baseline and intermediate/periodic indicators required to monitor progress (2006)
- Set** CDS final indicators or targets (2010)
- Identify** Kyrgyz agencies responsible for supplying data to assess whether targets (or final indicators) are being met (SSC and line ministries and/or local authorities)

[5] **Developing Kyrgyzstan CDS's monitoring and evaluation system: some basic principles**

- Incorporated** lessons of experience with monitoring under National Poverty Reduction Strategy, 2003-05 (NPRS-1)

- Involved** all interested parties or stakeholders in its design and preparation—within government and outside
 - Started** out with relatively simple, basic system, allowing for increased complexity later in light of experience
 - Linked** results monitoring to annual budget allocation (and medium-term budget framework)
 - Encouraged** donors to align their monitoring and reporting requirements to CDS monitoring system
 - Kept** coordinating and institutional arrangements light and manageable (PA, MOEF and NSC)
- [6] **Kyrgyzstan: Country Development Strategy, 2007-10**
- Overall Framework for Monitoring & Evaluation**
- Three key sections:** IV—Improving Overall Development Environment; V – Development Focus & Priorities; IX – CDS Action Plan
 - Section IV:** 8 related topics—social and political stability, macroeconomic policy, external debt mgt., investment policy & climate, financial sector, fiscal reform, export promotion, and gender policy
 - Section V:** 4 clusters (and 19 topics)—enhancing economic potential (9), combating corruption(5), human and social development (5), and environmental sustainability
 - Section IX:** CDS Action Plan—*i.e.* policy measures, agencies responsible, implementation period, expected outcomes
- [7] **Launching Monitoring & Evaluation System—November 2007**
- Matrix of indicators finalized mid-June and, after final round of consultations (PA) July-August, awaiting final approval very shortly
 - Equipment (server) delivered August, matrix and base-line data being formatted electronically
 - Half-day inter-active training workshops planned for 2nd half November in National IT Center for designated M&E ministry officials—and, in January/February for ministers and other senior officials (permanent/state secretaries)
 - M&E guidelines/handbook to be finalized after November workshops, in light of feedback received
- [8] **Launching Monitoring & Evaluation System—November 2007 (2)**
- Process and procedures for “contracting out” evaluation tasks (e.g. 4-5 annually, commencing 2nd half 2008) to universities, consultants, research institutes, NGOs. etc. to be finalized early December

- Hand-over of responsibility for M&E system by ADB TA 4075 consultants to MOEDT—during December
- Completion of draft CDS M&E brochure for dissemination to general public—during December
- Completion and closing of ADB TA 4075—January 2008

[9] Risks to effective implementation of CDS monitoring & evaluation

- Institutional capacity**—varies greatly between different agencies, ministries and sometimes within them
- Coordination**—everyone favors in principle, but nobody likes in practice: lead agencies PA, MOEDT and SSC need to show the way—and Donor Council as well!
- Commitment**—political will at presidential level requires bureaucratic commitment and support at minister and senior official level
- Resources**—very limited *inter alia* by fiscal constraints, especially for evaluation

[10] Remedies to mitigate these risks

- Technical assistance**—modest amounts may still be needed, especially during initial 2008 start-up (ADB's TA- 4801 (M&E in oblasts), may help informally, plus donor-financed ongoing sector-specific activities
- PA/MOEDT leadership**—for example, monthly M&E coordination meetings, possibly with Donor Council participation
- Financing**—for example, small grants (\$5,000) for 4-5 evaluations annually to be undertaken by universities, research institutes, consultants, NGOs, commencing mid-2008

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC: COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY, 2007-10

Monitoring & Evaluation System (MES)

Training Workshops for M&E Officials

Dates: November 21, 22 & 23, 2007

Location: National Information Technology Center
265a Chui Avenue, Bishkek (Academy of Sciences Building)

Participants: November 21: ±25 CDS M&E Officials of Sector Ministries, Agencies, & Committees

November 22: ±25 CDS M&E Officials of Ministries of Finance, Economic Development

& Trade, State Statistics Committee, and National Bank of Kyrgyzstan

November 23: Oblast CDS M&E Officials and Consultants

Objective: to introduce and train participants to access and utilize CDS Monitoring and Evaluation System

Time	Activity	Moderator
9:00	Registration	
9:30	Opening Remarks: Goals and Objectives	Aziz K. Aaliev , Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Economic Development & Trade
9:40	Opening Remarks: ADB Role in M&E.	ADB Representative
9:45	Introduction to M&E: Principles & Approaches	David Pearce , Team Leader, ADB TA 4075
10:00	Questions & Answers	
10:10	Kyrgyzstan's CDS Monitoring and Evaluation System—Background, Preparation and Launch	Liubov Ten & Adyljan Temirov , M&E Consultants, ADB TA 4075
10:45	Questions & Answers	
11:00	Coffee	
11:20	Launch of CDS M&E, including "hands-on" training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access—who, how, and when • Technical aspects—internet: www.mes.gov.kg • Data aspects—and its presentation • M&E user guidelines/manual 	Ulan Sydykbaev , IT Consultant, ADB TA 4075
12:30	Questions & Answers	
12:40	CDS Monitoring: Sustainability—Potential and Risks.	Aziz K. Aaliev - Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Economic Development & Trade
12:50	What have we learned—next steps	Aziz K. Aaliev - Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Economic Development & Trade

**4705-KGZ: Support to Development & Implementation of Country
Development Strategy (CDS)—Monitoring & Evaluation System (MES)**

List of periodic progress reports
prepared by national consultants¹⁰

2006:

01. October 9-20
02. October 23-November 3
03. December 25-January 5

2007:

04. January 8-19
05. January 22-February 2
06. February 5-16
07. February 19-March 2
08. March 5-16

09. June 25-July 6
10. July 9-20

11. October 1-12

12. November 26-December 7

In addition to these progress reports, two special reports were prepared—the first comprising an assessment, undertaken between February 12-March 24, 2007, of monitoring and evaluation capacity in the seven oblasts in connection with the planned ADB TA 4801; and, the second being a two-stage survey, undertaken between July 3-August 3 and September 20-28, of the potential of 40 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and research institutes to undertake independent evaluations of the Country Development Strategy.

¹⁰ Ms. Liubov Ten, Messrs. Adyljan Temirov and Ulan Sydykbaev