The role of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) for CLPE in a COSOP

When conducting country-level policy engagement (CLPE) for a country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP), it is important to monitor policy implementation processes, identify gaps, and evaluate impacts (both intended and unintended) starting from a clear identification of policy objectives at the COSOP level. Monitoring is key for learning and to adjust CLPE activities during the course of the COSOP cycle. It is particularly important for mid-term review but should also accompany the country programme on a regular basis.

A framework for M&E of CLPE should focus on six areas of performance

1. **Framing**
   Identify the main policy activities carried out under the country programme and what they sought to achieve.

2. **Strategy and direction**
   Verify whether activities are appropriate for addressing the key challenges identified.

3. **Management and governance**
   Evaluate whether the policy engagement strategy is being implemented as effectively as possible.

4. **Outputs**
   Determine whether the outputs are appropriate for the purpose and meet required standards.

5. **Outcomes and impacts**
   Analyse the effects or changes the activities have contributed to.

6. **Context**
   Review how the changing political, economic, social and organizational climate affects plans and intended outcomes.

The following questions can be posed to evaluate CLPE at country programme level

- **About COSOP design**
  - Which inputs, if any, were earmarked in the COSOP for CLPE?
  - Which CLPE outputs, if any, were considered in the COSOP?
  - Did the COSOP anticipate any synergies between CLPE and the lending portfolio?

---

1 Drawn from the *Country-level policy engagement in IFAD. Guide book.*
• About COSOP implementation
  o Which inputs, if any, were used for CLPE?
  o Which CLPE outputs, if any, were generated?
  o Were there any synergies between CLPE and the lending portfolio?
  o Which CLPE indicators, if any, were used during implementation of the COSOP?

• Guiding questions for assessing the relevance of IFAD's non-lending activities
  o Are CLPE objectives clearly outlined in the COSOP? Are they relevant to the IFAD programme as a whole?
  o Were resources earmarked for CLPE and explicitly outlined in the COSOP?
  o How was the work and role of government and other partners taken into account in selecting the focus of CLPE?

• Selected guiding questions for assessing the effectiveness of IFAD's non-lending activities
  o Did the foreseen activities take place? If not, why?
  o To what extent and in what way did CLPE activities achieve the objectives?
  o Did CLPE contribute to the replication and/or scaling up of innovation promoted by IFAD?
  o How well has CLPE helped ensure a coherent country programme strategy?

An example from IFAD’s experience

2013 COSOP in Nepal
(Country-level policy engagement in IFAD. Guide book.)

IFAD's 2013 COSOP of Nepal determined that previous COSOPs had lacked specific policy engagement agendas because of limited understanding of national context. IFAD's Office of Evaluations determined that in order to transform institutions to be more “inclusive, accountable and sustainable” in the country, the country programme policy agenda should be closely linked to the loan portfolio in order to build on operational lessons learned. This would be accompanied by an M&E system with three operational levels: “(i) an e-library providing user-friendly online access to project and programme documents; (ii) standard IFAD monitoring and evaluation sheets (SIMES) – a common M&E tool – will capture project-level information on both outputs and outcomes and will be complemented by a systematic use of surveys and social accountability mechanisms and by simple household income monitoring; and (iii) knowledge management and communication will be mainstreamed in project and programme management to share achievements, lessons learned and good practices.” (Nepal country strategic opportunities programme page 7).
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