

Joint Monitoring Indicators for 2012-2013
CRDB/CDC Discussion Paper
May 2012

Background

The Joint Monitoring Indicators (JMIs) have been initiated and utilized since 2004 by the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) as an effective instrument to enhance mutual accountability between the RGC and its development partners. Based on dialogue between the RGC and its development partners in the Technical Working Groups (TWGs), JMIs are, where possible, derived from the results frameworks established by RGC Ministries/Agencies in the context of sector/thematic/reform strategies and policies. JMIs are used to guide activities that promote development results and mutual accountability.

The [current set of JMIs](#) was endorsed at the 3rd Cambodia Development Cooperation Forum (CDCF) meeting in June 2010. Following a meeting of the TWG Network in February 2012, the RGC has identified the need to revise and update the JMI framework by: (i) strengthening the process for JMI identification and monitoring; and (ii) reviewing and up-dating each of the JMIs. The RGC also identifies that the Government-Development Partner Coordination Committee (GDCC) is a forum for agreeing and endorsing the JMIs as well as for reviewing progress in JMI achievement.

To support the forthcoming JMI revision exercise, this note sets out the principles and objectives of the JMIs together with the process for JMI revision leading up to a proposed GDCC meeting in September 2012. This note builds on the CRDB/CDC discussion paper "Managing for Results: Use of Results Frameworks" that was drafted in March 2012 and shared with RGC, development partners and TWG members in order to operationalise a managing for results approach in the development and use of the JMIs in Cambodia.

Objectives of the Joint Monitoring Indicators

The objectives of the JMIs are as follows:

1. To agree realistic and achievable targets for achieving priority development outcomes and reform goals as outlined in RGC policy documents (principally the Rectangular Strategy and the NSDP) and in line with sector/thematic plans.
2. To build consensus around the activities to be undertaken, the resources to be mobilised, the timeframe for implementation and the respective commitments of RGC and its development partners to achieving the targets.
3. To foster and promote joint efforts to achieve development goals in a results-based manner informed by the principles of partnership and mutual accountability.

Principles for Joint Monitoring Indicator formulation and monitoring

- JMIs should be of a strategic nature linked to the achievement of development outcomes included in the Rectangular Strategy – Phase II, the NSDP or respective sector policies/plans. JMIs should therefore, to the fullest extent possible, be derived from existing RGC results frameworks associated with national or sectoral/thematic policies, strategies and workplans. This will ensure effective ownership and leadership of the Royal Government.
- JMIs should identify a development outcome and a monitorable output and output indicator linked to this outcome. In addition, JMIs must be associated with identified activities, inputs and resources. JMIs should be SMART: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timebound. Responsibilities for implementation are to be clearly associated with each activity.

- JMIs are to be identified and monitored in the TWG. This will ensure that the principles of partnership and mutual accountability are fully respected and translated into actions. Associated actions and responsibilities to promote partnership and development effectiveness may also be included in the JMI matrix as means to further promote mutual accountability for achieving results, for example through the use of programme-based approaches or efforts to strengthen and use country systems.
- Each TWG is encouraged to select only one JMI outcome where possible, although additional JMI outcomes may be added where the TWG members agree that this is appropriate. Similarly, TWGs are encouraged to identify no more than 3 outputs to be monitored as making a contribution to the identified outcome.
- The timeframe for JMI implementation is to be from the next GDCC scheduled in September 2012 to the next CDCF scheduled in the first quarter of 2014. TWGs are responsible for JMI selection, implementation and monitoring while the GDCC/CDCF will lead on JMI approval / endorsement and review.
- Progress in JMI implementation will be reported by TWGs to CRDB/CDC in its capacity as the Secretariat of the policy dialogue meetings. CRDB/CDC will prepare a consolidated JMI Progress Report to be tabled at these meetings where progress and implementation challenges may be discussed.

Process for developing and agreeing a new set of JMIs for 2012-2013

The following process and timeline is anticipated for preparing a new set of JMIs for endorsement at a meeting of the GDCC in September 2012:

1. A meeting of all TWG Chairs, lead development partners and secretariats organized by CRDB/CDC will be held on 14 June 2012. This meeting will be asked to discuss and agree the process and format of the 2012-2013 JMI framework (see Annex One). Together with this note, the March 2012 CRDB/CDC discussion paper "Managing for Results: Use of Results Frameworks" that was shared with RGC, development partners and TWG members will comprise the documentation for the meeting.
2. TWGs will be asked to meet during the period June-September to review their existing JMIs and progress towards achieving them in order to identify a new JMI outcome and associated outputs/indicators/activities/inputs and development effectiveness activities.
3. CRDB/CDC, as part of its commitment to strengthening country systems and promoting development effectiveness, will organise training on Managing for Development Results for all TWGs. This training, directed mainly at RGC staff but also open to development partners, will take place in mid-August (date to be confirmed). TWGs are encouraged to use this training as part of the process of JMI development.
4. TWGs are requested to submit their new draft JMIs to CRDB/CDC by Friday 7 September. CRDB expects to provide facilitators to work one-to-one with TWGs after the mid-August training to support JMI development.
5. A meeting of the TWG Network Retreat will then take place in early/mid-September. This will provide an opportunity to discuss and validate the new JMIs.
6. TWGs are to submit their final JMIs to CRDB/CDC by Friday 21 September 2012.
7. The GDCC meeting in late-September/early-October 2012 will review and endorse the consolidated JMI matrix.

Annex A

Proposed JMI Template for the period 2012 – 2013

Note - TWGs are encouraged to select one outcome

Results: outcome, output & indicators			Activities: milestone actions		Inputs: management, coordination & resourcing			
Immediate outcome	Output	Output indicator	Activity	Associated partnering actions	Coordinating Institution	Implementing Institution	Timeline	Funding and other inputs
<p>Definition The intermediate outcome is the development result that can be expected to be achieved or advanced within the lifetime of the JMIs</p>	<p>Definition The verifiable result of the activity (and focus for routine monitoring)</p>	<p>Definition Indicators can quantify/confirm the delivery of the output. To be informed by (and derived from) NSDP M&E framework or sector results framework</p>	<p>Definition The actions required to achieve the identified output.</p>	<p>Definition Relevant / priority actions that are required to build partnership and strengthen development effectiveness</p>	<p>Definition The RGC or TWG body which defines the activity and leads on dialogue and monitoring</p>	<p>Definition This is the body(ies) that implements the activity (if different from the coordinating institution)</p>	<p>Definition The timeline for delivering the output.</p>	<p>Definition This may be limited to indicating the source of funding (costing is not required) and other inputs that are required to ensure activities can be implemented.</p>
<p>Guidance The immediate outcome is to be associated with NSDP, CMDGs or sector plans.</p> <p>Monitoring by the routine M&E process during, and immediately after, the JMI period should be possible (so that baselines and achievement can be recorded).</p>	<p>Guidance Emphasis on being feasible, realistic in timeframe, & within RGC/DP influence.</p> <p>Each JMI should identify <u>one</u> output from its routine M&E framework to be elevated to JMI status.</p>	<p>Guidance To be: Specific Measurable Achievable Relevant Time-bound</p> <p>To include baseline & target & timeline (if not to cover whole period)</p>	<p>Guidance These should be at a sufficient level of ambition to ensure the output will make a contribution to the higher-level outcome (and achievable within the JMI timeframe). Only "milestone" activities need be explicitly identified.</p>	<p>Guidance Should include practices that strengthen and/or encourage use of RGC systems, promote ownership, coherent capacity development (use of TC) etc.</p> <p>NB PBAs are promoted as RGC policy</p>	<p>Guidance The distinction between coordinating and implementing agencies is relevant to many cross-cutting issues in which activities are implemented by agencies other than those creating and monitoring the JMI.</p>		<p>Guidance Intermediate timelines may be identified for different steps but the total time to achieve the output is to be equal to the period of the JMIs lifetime.</p>	<p>Guidance Only key inputs required/mobilised to be identified.</p> <p>Preference is to indicate "Yes" if all resources are mobilised, or to indicate only those that are not secured.</p> <p>RGC & DPs inputs may be identified based on AOP/BSPs</p>
<p>Scope for discretion The outcome may be adapted from RGC policy documents to suit the agreed needs of the TWG, based on established plans and strategy documents.</p> <p>TWGs are encouraged to select <u>one</u> outcome</p>	<p>Scope for discretion TWGs are encouraged to identify no more than 3 monitorable outputs (although TWGs have some discretion to assess their own needs).</p>	<p>Scope for discretion Although one indicator per output is preferred, multiple indicators (or intermediate targets with dates) are permitted if relevant</p>	<p>Scope for discretion May include dates for key milestones.</p> <p>Based on a workplan, this text may simply refer to the plan (detail not required)</p>	<p>Scope for discretion To be guided by current principles of effective partnerships and aid effectiveness, incl the Busan outcome document and TWG Partnership Principles</p>	<p>Scope for discretion In many cases the coordinating and implementing agencies are the same, or there may be a single lead agency. In which case not all agencies need to be explicitly identified.</p>		<p>Scope for discretion Multiple timelines for milestone activities or intermediate outputs may also be identified.</p>	<p>Scope for discretion Only priority resources/inputs not yet mobilised need to be identified. "Yes" is sufficient if all satisfactory.</p>

Notes

1. While the outcome should be identified as the starting point (and should be measurable), the focus of JMI monitoring is on the output. This will ensure that identified outputs are within the influence of RGC and its development partners to deliver, and can be more easily monitored/verified using routine M&E arrangements.
2. Joint can mean either jointly identified, formulated, implemented, monitored – based on the principles of partnership and mutual accountability
3. Funding source is to indicate mobilisation of resources (Yes/No & source, amount not required).