Day 4: Monitoring, Evaluation and Data for Policy Coherence

Module 7: Policy Coherence on Track? Monitoring and Evaluation

Module 8: Data for Evidence-informed Policymaking
Key objectives of Day 3

**Organization**
- Reflect on the importance of the organizational pre-conditions for policy coherence
- Understand how the instruments of planning, budgeting, digital technology, M&E need to change to move towards policy coherence for SDG implementation
- Learn how leadership, HR and mindsets contribute to enabling policy coherence, how to engage effectively with stakeholders for coherent SDG implementation and how data is significant for moving forward.
Individual Activity:
Recap Day 3 –

- Reflect on Day 3
- Reflect on the key lessons of Day 3!
- Write down the two key lessons and select your ‘number-one’ lesson.
- Pitch your key take-away!
Key objectives of Day 4

**Why**

- Concepts

**What**

- Strategy

**Organization**
- Reflect on the importance of the organizational pre-conditions for policy coherence
- Understand how the instruments of planning, budgeting, digital technology, M&E need to change to move towards policy coherence for SDG implementation
- Learn how leadership, HR and mindsets contribute to enabling policy coherence, how to engage effectively with stakeholders for coherent SDG implementation and **how data is significant** for moving forward.
What is module 7 about?

Rationale for monitoring, and evaluation for policy coherence

Challenges for monitoring and evaluation for policy coherence

SDG Monitoring and Reporting

SDG Indicators
What will be achieved through module 7?

- Understand the relevance of monitoring and evaluation for policy coherence
- Reflect on SDG indicator framework
- Discuss how to link monitoring and evaluation to policy coherence
- Explore institutional frameworks for SDG Monitoring
What is module 8 about?

**Significance of data for evidence-informed policy-making and policy coherence**

**Challenges for achieving policy coherence with data**

**Institutional frameworks to integrate data (data governance)**
- National data strategies

**Data to better understand policy synergies and trade-offs**
- Modelling tools
What will be achieved through module 8?

- To understand the relevance of data for evidence-informed policy making and policy coherence
- To be familiar with elements of data governance frameworks
- To discuss tools for moving towards data governance in support of policy coherence
- To be aware of cases and examples of evidence for policy-making and data governance
Policy coherence on Track? Monitoring and Evaluation

Module 7
9:30-12:30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:30-09:45</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Existing understandings, objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45-10:00</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Key concepts: M&amp;E and policy coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:05</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Video on measuring SDGs and interrelated goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05-10:20</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Key concepts: SDG monitoring, Indicator 17.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20-10:45</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Group activity to discuss sub-indicator 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-10:55</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55-11:25</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>UN DESA Readiness Assessment on Governance Capacities and Institutional Arrangements for Policy Coherence, Building Block 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25-11:30</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Tools: How to move towards integrated monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-11:35</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Video on SDG Data Hubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35-11:45</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Examples of SDG monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:15</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Group work on developing a M&amp;E framework for policy coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-12:30</td>
<td>Round table</td>
<td>Wrap-up &amp; Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Round table to check participants` existing understandings

*Examples for lead questions*

- Do monitoring and evaluation frameworks in your working environment include cross-sectoral considerations?
- In your experience: How relevant are results from evaluations for policy-making?
Key objectives of Module 7

Organization

- Learn how monitoring and evaluation contribute to achieving policy coherence.

Concepts

Strategy
“The Goals and targets will be followed up and reviewed using a set of global indicators. These will be complemented by indicators at the regional and national levels, which will be developed by Member States, in addition to the outcomes of work undertaken for the development of the baselines for those targets where national and global baseline data does not yet exist.” – 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The Agenda 2030 and M&E
What is Monitoring & Evaluation?

UN Water (2017, p. 7)
Concepts: Monitoring, Evaluation & Review

**Monitoring**
- "continuous function that uses systematic data collection on specific indicators to provide policy makers and stakeholders with information regarding progress and achievements of an ongoing public policy initiative and/or the use of allocated funds" (OECD 2019, p. 52)
- Keeping track

**Evaluation**
- Systematic, structured assessment of a policy or program to assess if a policy meets the intended goals
- To learn 'what works' (and why)
- Get evidence on how to better achieve policy goals

**Review**
- Based on monitoring and evaluation data, reviews document follow-up and progress, identify problems and report on corrective actions
Monitoring and evaluation: The case for policy coherence

• “sine qua non” for policy coherence (UN DESA 2018, p. 24)
• Essential for SDG implementation strategies
• To monitor and evaluate cross-sectoral policy outcomes and overall impacts
• Reviews should link assessment to learning for strengthening policy coherence including prioritization, resource allocation and policy dialogue
Challenges

Considerable requirements regarding quality data and indicators (see next slide)

Monitoring and evaluation usually address single policies or sectoral programs rather than policy interlinkages or cross-sectoral goals or links

Indicators and evaluation criteria often not standardized across government which would be relevant for policy coherence to assess cross-sectoral issues

Monitoring and evaluation for policy coherence requires indicators to assess linkages and policy outcomes in a cross-sectoral perspective

Mainstream monitoring and evaluation as a standard and continuous practice throughout SDG implementation.
Challenge: Data availability for SDG monitoring

Data coverage: proportion of countries or areas with available data (weighted average across indicators), by Goal (percentage)

UN (2020, p. 4)
Key Challenges - Cases
UN DESA Synthesis Report 2018

Data disaggregation
• Armenia stressed that the data gaps need early consideration and action, because effective and timely collection of sex, gender and diversity disaggregated data will be critical for analysis, monitoring, evaluation, and evidence-informed policy making.

Data collection and management
• Guinea and Sri Lanka, among others, also noted that the lack of baseline data for some indicators hinders monitoring efforts.

Mobilizing financial and technical support for data monitoring
• Namibia also highlighted a general society-wide phobia of data (low levels of numeracy) that limits data usage among planners, decision-makers, and legislators.
What`s needed to move to M&E for policy coherence?

To establish cross-sectoral monitoring & evaluation practices

- include different actors from various sectors to discuss and interpret findings and decide on adjustments
- use multiple sources of evidence
- design evaluation criteria to assess cross-sectoral impact
- align strategy building and monitoring & evaluation system
- build an indicator system to monitor interlinkages of policies and related objectives
Videos: Measuring SDGs and interrelated goals

You also could please watch the video via the link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=22vZbZmEX5w&t=11s
Institutional frameworks for M&E: SDG Monitoring

- Institutional frameworks for SDG Monitoring vary
  - National Statistics Offices are responsible in many countries (examples: Colombia, Egypt, Germany, Italy, Madagascar, Korea, Samoa, Switzerland)
  - Some established inter-organizational groups (examples: Belgium, Georgia, Philippines, Turkey)
  - Few assign M&E to the center of government (Moldova, Grenada) (UN DESA 2018, p. 26)
  - Supreme Audit Institutions often audit and review SDG implementation (TAP Network w/o year)

- Need for enhanced coordination across government
- Need for strengthening statistical capacities evaluation
Global indicators for SDG monitoring

• IAEG-SDGs (Inter-agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators) in which the National Statistics Offices are represented, is the key body for developing indicators

• Global Indicator Framework (adopted in 2017) with 231 indicators, continuous further development

• Three tiers of indicators
  • Tier I indicators have established methodologies and data regularly produced by a critical mass of countries
  • Tier II indicators have established methodologies but data are not regularly produced by countries
  • Tier III indicators have methodologies that are under development
UN Water (2017, p. 12)
## Integrated Indicator Framework 17.4.1

**Indicator 17.4.1: Mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development (remember: module 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Institutionalization of Political Commitment</th>
<th>3. Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination</th>
<th>5. Policy linkages</th>
<th>7. Monitoring and reporting for policy coherence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The country has institutionalized its commitment towards policy coherence for sustainable development at the highest political level.</td>
<td>The country has an institutional mechanism in place that periodically brings together relevant ministries and governmental entities to enhance coherence across sustainable development related policies including sectoral policies.</td>
<td>The country has mechanisms in place to integrate the dimensions of sustainable development and systematically assess the policy effects, transboundary effects and cross-sectoral linkages throughout the policy and planning processes.</td>
<td>The country has mechanisms in place to systematically monitor and evaluate the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development as well as cross-sectoral impacts, and to report and inform adaptive action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The country has mechanisms in place to ensure that long-term considerations are integrated into decision-making, policy development and planning.</td>
<td>The country has mechanisms in place to ensure that laws, policies, plans, programmes, and major development projects at different levels of government and including at the overarching/general, sectoral and local level are developed through participatory processes that involve relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td>The country has mechanisms in place for aligning priorities, policies and plans adopted at various levels of government.</td>
<td>The country has mechanisms in place to promote the alignment of private and public finance to policy coherence objectives and to track related expenditures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNEP (2020, no pages)
Indicator 17.4.1: Methodology

**Calculating progress**

A value system, or scoring mechanism was developed to define country progress. This system will enable countries to measure their progress and to accurately report on it. At national level, each country will be assigned a value for each sub-indicator, within a 0-10 range that will enable the reporting country to assess the “strength” of its mechanism (0 meaning no mechanism is in place, 10 indicating that the strongest version of the mechanism is in place). Based on the individual values per sub indicator, a total number out between 0 and 80 will be assigned to each reporting country, which will be translated into a percent value. This is particularly important to enable countries to establish their baseline and measure progress on this indicator and each sub indicator over time, in line with the ambition of the 2030 Agenda to use disaggregated data. The ultimate objective of the proposed indicator is not to rank countries, but to help countries assess where they are and what they can do better to enhance their policy coherence for sustainable development, with a clear trajectory towards 2030.
Text box 1. Guyana example

In the context of a broader effort to support Guyana to enhance their capacity to mainstream environmental sustainability into their national policies and strategies, the methodology for Indicator 17.4.1 was pilot tested in Guyana. The objective of the pilot testing was to: receive general feedback on the indicator framework as a whole as well as specific feedback on the different sub indicators; identify the various policy coherence mechanisms that exist nationally, and how/whether they fit into the list of 8 types of mechanisms identified by the International Expert Group; assess whether any types of policy coherence mechanisms are missing from the methodology, or whether the methodology is unable to account for existing policy coherence mechanisms; apply the value system in practice and determine its suitability and usefulness to member states; examine the usefulness of the guidance notes; and identify any challenges for member states in applying the methodology. In the case of Guyana the value system was scored as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutionalized political commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Long-term considerations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participatory processes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integration of the three dimensions of Sustainable Development, assessment of policy effects and linkages</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Consultation and coordination across government levels</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring and reporting for policy coherence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Financial resources and tools</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development (%)* 35%
7. Monitoring and reporting for policy coherence

Summary
The country has mechanisms in place to systematically monitor and evaluate the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development and cross-sectoral impacts, and to report and inform adaptive action.

Description
This mechanism could be expressed through a requirement that the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development and cross-sectoral impacts are monitored and evaluated on a regular basis using specific indicators and that the findings are used to inform adaptive action to ensure that such action is coherent. Such a mechanism would be strengthened by the requirement that aspects of policy coherence are integrated into reporting of government entities.

Further, policy coherence would be strengthened if decision making was informed by sets of coherent data, and therefore an accompanying mechanism could be the existence of tools and information management systems that facilitate availability, accessibility and comparability of centralized and harmonized data on the various dimensions of sustainable development, as well as harmonized data within each dimension.⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Monitoring and reporting for policy coherence</th>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation framework for policy coherence for sustainable development.</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspects of policy coherence for sustainable development are integrated into SDG related reporting processes.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data and information management system for sustainable development data.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Activity on Sub-indicator 7

• Discuss in your group the sub-indicator 7 and in particular
  • Description
  • Rationale
  • Scoring

• Discuss the scores for your country with regard to sub-indicator 7.
Individual Activity

Please fill out Building Block 9 of the UN-DESA Readiness Assessment on Governance Capacities and Institutional Arrangements for Policy Coherence on an individual basis!

- Building Block 9: Monitoring, reporting and evaluation for policy coherence
Plenary Round Table

Plenary round table

• Discuss the findings from Building Block 9!
Tools: How to move towards integrated monitoring – GEMI
You also could please watch the video via the link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IDZT8bxS52Q&t=9s
Most countries have now identified national targets and indicators related to the SDGs that are deemed particularly relevant in the national context. In many cases, countries have also identified indicators for monitoring progress in those areas. Many countries have put in place systems to collect and analyze the relevant data.

Monitoring and review of SDG implementation is often overseen by the national statistical agency, which is tasked with identifying, measuring, and reporting back on key indicators.

Lack of quality data places constraints on many countries’ ability to monitor progress made on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. To overcome this problem, Fiji launched a comprehensive data collection initiative, which will be used to establish an SDG baseline and enable effective monitoring and evaluation of progress.
Measures to strengthen national statistical capacity UN DESA Synthesis 2018

Clarification of institutional ownership on data and monitoring for SDGs.
In Uruguay, for example, the Office of Planning and Budget, through the National Directorate of Management and Evaluation is responsible for monitoring and articulating public policies on the SDGs, whereas the Uruguayan Agency of International Cooperation (AUCI) oversees matters related to cooperation, and the National Institute of Statistics (INE) is responsible for the elaboration and the survey of indicators.

Use of technology to improve data collection, analysis, and accessibility.
Digital Earth Australia (DEA), led by Geoscience Australia, translates decades of satellite data into information and insights about Australia’s land and oceans and can help measure and drive progress towards the SDGs.

Involving stakeholders in data collection
Identification of new data sources to guide SDG implementation
To meet growing data requirements, official statistical offices are tapping into new data sources. Jamaica conducted the Women’s Health Survey, the first of its kind in CARICOM, to provide data on the national prevalence.
Group Activity: M&E framework for policy coherence

Develop a national M&E framework for monitoring policy coherence for your country.

Discuss an institutional framework
(1) in terms of structures: whom to include
(2) in terms of processes:
   (1) how to ensure constant monitoring and evaluating
   (2) How to make sure cross-sectoral criteria are taken into account?
Wrap Up

What are the three key insights into policy coherence of the M&E Module to retain for the Action Plan of the country?

Comments and Reflections
Sources, Reading Material, References


Sources, Reading Material, References


