



# Strategic Plan

---

2008 to 2013

Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division  
Ministry of Planning



# Strategic Plan

---

2008 to 2013

Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division  
Ministry of Planning

This Five-year Strategic Plan for IMED has been developed with Technical Assistance from the Asian Development Bank under the Strengthening Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation Project (ADB TA 4880-BAN)



# *Content*

Foreword .....	ii
Summary .....	iv
Abbreviations .....	vi
Introduction .....	1
A. Vision .....	2
B. Mission .....	2
C. Strategic Goals and Objectives .....	3
D. Organizational Change Management .....	7
E. Implementation of Strategic Plan .....	9

# Foreword

At the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (held in Paris in March 2005), partner countries and multilateral and bilateral donors endorsed the 'Paris Declaration'. This has meant that Bangladesh and its development partners have committed to a greater focus on development results rather than just the resources that have been allocated to development.

The Government and our development partners are no longer satisfied with just knowing how much money has been invested or even about physical structures completed. We want to see the results of investment. If schools have been built and teachers better trained, are our children better educated? When we spend money on building and maintaining our highways are goods transported more speedily and at lower cost?

The Strategic for IMED is an integral part of Bangladesh's commitment to Managing for Development Results. This five-year plan puts into a place a system for measuring the results of public investment and reporting these to Government and the people of Bangladesh.

The Plan complements a number of Government initiatives including the National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction; a bold plan to tackle poverty through concrete actions. The Medium Term Budget Framework seeks to allocate financial resources against targets defined by key ministries. The capacity of the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics is being strengthened to provide wider and more reliable information about population and poverty. The IMED Strategic Plan examines the link between financial allocations and equitable economic growth by defining and verifying the relationships between expenditure and eventual development results.

The development of this plan has been thorough and thoughtful consulting a wide range of stakeholders from government, the private sector and our development partners. Experiences from several other countries were considered and successful approaches have been adopted in the IMED Strategic Plan.

Finally I would like to congratulate the IMED in putting together a progressive but practical strategy that will make a significant contribution to our understanding of Bangladesh's progress towards its social and economic goals.

Md. Abdul Malek  
Secretary in Charge  
Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division  
Ministry of Planning



# Summary

**VISION:** In 2013 IMED excels in the practice and management of monitoring and evaluation with core organizational competences in programme monitoring and evaluation, mass communications, and project information systems it advises other government organizations on programme design and measurement.

**MISSION:** The IMED monitors and evaluates the performance of revenue and development investment by collecting and analyzing information on project and programme results originating from implementing organizations.

Analysis of the performance of ministries and sectors against agreed targets is provided to Executive Committee of the National Economic Council, line ministries and other concerned parties whenever necessary.

Wherever possible IMED seeks to explain why sector or ministry performance targets have not been met by careful analysis of programme outcomes. This analysis is provided to the relevant bodies so that they can improve their performance if necessary.

## GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

	<b>1</b>	<b>Ensure proper DMFs are included in all DPPs</b>
	1.1	Guidelines issued to executing agencies on formulation of DMFs by September 2008
	1.2	Order issued to all executing agencies instructing that all DPPs must include DMFs with indicators to the standards specified in the guidelines by December 2008
	1.3	Evaluation Wing in conjunction with each relevant sector has begun to review all new DMF indicators and give written feedback by January 2009
	1.4	Order issued requiring IMED to sign off on DMF indicators by June 2009
	<b>2</b>	<b>Outline monitoring framework and evaluation framework for projects and programmes</b>
	2.1	Current responsibilities for M&E systems investigated and analysed in detail by September 2008
	2.2	Effective delineation of roles and responsibilities between executing agencies, line ministries, IMED, Planning Commission, Finance Division and Development Partners in M&E proposed by September 2008
	2.3	Proposals Discussed and agreed with relevant stakeholders by December 2008
	<b>3</b>	<b>Collect data on project inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts according to DMFs</b>
SHORT TERM	3.1	IMED PMIS restructured to include quantitative and qualitative fields on project results as defined in DMF by June 2009
	3.2	IMED PMIS integrated with ADP Database and ERD information on foreign aid by June 2009
	3.3	Project progress Information to be sent by pilot organizations in electronic form to IMED from June 2009
	3.4	National budget codes for all project components included on all relevant IMED forms by June 2009
	<b>4</b>	<b>Verify project information supplied by executing agencies</b>
	4.1	Annual plan for selected output to outcome reviews completed each year by June with first plan in place by June 2009.
	4.2	Guidelines for project output to outcome reviews designed by September 2008 and piloted from October 2008.
	4.3	Guidelines for project impact evaluations designed by September 2008 and in use from October 2008
	<b>5</b>	<b>Produce analytical reports to NEC, ECNEC and ministries</b>
	5.1	Project rating system, based on performance, that will allow ranking of projects and aggregation of project performance to an overall portfolio performance for any sector or ministry developed by June 2009
	5.2	Sector/Ministry Project Portfolio Performance Reports submitted to ministries by June 2009
	5.3	Analysis of ADP and revenue contribution to NSAPR submitted to ECNEC by June 2009
	5.4	Public information on performance of 20 high priority ADP projects included on IMED Web site by June 2009
	5.5	Incorporate other national level data sets from BBS in IMED PMIS by June 2009



	<b>6</b>	<b>Participate in the formulation and review of MTBF targets, ADP sector plan indicators, NSAPR monitoring indicators (Ensure that all are consistent)</b>
	6.1	Report to Minister for Finance and Planning on consolidated national public performance (results based) management system Prepare by June 2010
	6.2	Facilitate tripartite meeting between Finance Division, Planning Commission and IMED to agree common performance (results based) management system by July 2010
	6.3	Present national public sector performance (results based) management system to Cabinet (or appropriate authority) for endorsement by December 2010
	6.4	Participate in the formulation and review of Medium-Term Budget Framework (MTBF) targets, ADP sector plan indicators, NSAPR monitoring indicators (Ensure that all are consistent)
MEDIUM TERM	<b>7</b>	<b>Prepare and implement evaluations strategy for programmes and sectors/ministries</b>
	7.1	Technical assistance to IMED from Development Partners for capacity building on project, programme and sector evaluation started by July 2009
	7.2	Consultative Committee on public sector evaluation formed by September 2009
	7.3	First annual evaluation plan prepared with support of Consultative Committee and endorsed by Minister for Finance and Planning by June 2010
	7.4	Results of annual evaluation published by June 2011
	<b>8</b>	<b>Provide public sector investment performance reports</b>
	8.1	Report to Secretaries on results of public sector investment by ministry/sector prepared by June 2011
	8.2	Report to Parliament on public sector performance and results prepared by June 2011
	<b>9</b>	<b>Policy on public performance (results based) management implemented by June 2013</b>
	9.1	All relevant public policies on public information reviewed by December 2011.
	9.2	Draft of act on public performance improvement reporting and accountability agreed by June 2012
LONG TERM	<b>10</b>	<b>Formulation of communications strategy on public sector results (to media, public, development partners)</b>
	10.1	Briefings and public addresses for Prime Minister/Ministers (Chief Advisor/Advisors) prepared from January 2012
	10.2	Information on public sector performance provided to public through mass media from July 2012
	10.3	Partnership with civil society to discuss and report on perceptions of public sector performance formalized by December 2012

# Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADP	Annual Development Plan
ASICT	Assistance to Support to Information Communications Technology
BBS	Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics
BWDB	Bangladesh Water Development Board
CAG	Comptroller and Auditor General
CPTU	Central Procurement Technical Unit
DMF	Design and Monitoring Framework
DPP	Development Project Proforma
ECNEC	Executive Committee of the National Economic Council
ERD	Economic Relations Division
FD	Finance Division
FMRP	Financial Management Reform Project
GED	General Economics Division
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
IMED	Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division
LGED	Local Government Engineering Department
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MfDR	Managing for Development Results
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoP	Ministry of Planning
MTBF	Medium – Term Budget Framework
NSAPR	National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction
PC	Planning Commission
PMIS	Project Monitoring Information System
RBM	Results Based Management
RBME	Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation
REB	Rural Electrification Board
RHD	Roads and Highways Department
RoB	Rules of Business

# Introduction

This Strategic Plan for the Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division (IMED) covers a period of five years to June 2013 divided into short, medium and long-term periods. Ten strategic goals are proposed for IMED each supported by specific objectives.

At a conceptual level the strategic goals are broadly in line with best practice in Results Based Management (RBM) as exemplified by the experiences of four countries, namely Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Colombia.

Drawing on both an assessment of IMED capacity and a review of the policy and institutional environment, the Strategic Plan aligns internal strengths and weaknesses with external opportunities and threats.

While moving IMED strategically forward, the plan is grounded in its current functions as expressed in the Rules of Business. A mission statement for IMED has been drafted reflecting the both the current function and the function envisioned by the strategy. The future organizational state required to execute IMED's mission and strategy is captured in a brief vision statement.

The early draft of the Strategic Plan was reviewed, developed and refined through an extensive participatory process known as the Road Map. This consisted of interviews with the secretaries of key ministries, five focus group discussions with stakeholders, coaching sessions on strategic planning, dissemination of best practices in monitoring and evaluation, and participatory strategic planning sessions.

Best practices were drawn from case studies of the operational approaches to monitoring and evaluation of India, Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam. Participants from across government analysed these cases, applied them to the context of Bangladesh and incorporated insights into the IMED Strategic Plan.

Reviews of later drafts were carried out by Profession Niaz Ahmed Khan of Dhaka University and two teams led by Mr Fazul Karim (Director General, CPTU at that time) and Mr Md Abdul Hye Talukder (Project Director, RBME and Director General, IMED) respectively.

The Draft Strategic Plan was presented at an inter-ministerial seminar presided over by the Secretary IMED with the Finance and Planning Advisor and ADB Country Director as Chief and Special Guests respectively. Their comments and the recommendations from the reviews were incorporated into the final Strategic Plan.

With the aim of receiving a final round of comments a Draft Final Strategic Plan was sent to 16 ministries. The Finance Division's comments were particularly thoughtful and comprehensive and therefore a careful analysis of these comments was carried out responding to each of the Finance Division's observations.

Finally in August 2008 the Finance and Planning Advisor approved this Strategic Plan for IMED.

## A. Vision

For the purposes of this Strategic Plan the organization vision describes a desired capacity for the organization. It responds to the question, “What do we aspire to be as an organization?” The vision and mission are related; achieving the vision realises the mission.

- In 2013 IMED excels in the practice and management of monitoring and evaluation with core organizational competences in programme monitoring and evaluation, mass communications, and project information systems it advises other government organizations on programme design and measurement.

## B. Mission

In this Strategic Plan the organizational mission is a statement of purpose. It responds to the question, “Why are we here as an organization?” In public administration the mission statement of an organization should be related to the established rules of business. The mission statement proposed below aligns with the current rules of business for the most part. However, it diverges in one significant aspect. Currently the IMED is mandated to monitor projects under the development budget but the mission of IMED proposes a monitoring and evaluation function that encompasses both the development and revenue budgets. The proposed mission is:

- The IMED monitors and evaluates the performance of revenue and development investment by collecting and analyzing information on project and programme results originating from implementing organizations.
- Analysis of the performance of ministries and sectors against agreed targets is provided to Executive Committee of the National Economic Council, line ministries and other concerned parties whenever necessary.
- Wherever possible IMED seeks to explain why sector or ministry performance targets have not been met by careful analysis of programme outcomes. IMED provides this analysis to the relevant bodies so that they can improve their performance if necessary.

## C. Strategic Goals and Objectives

These strategic goals for IMED have been developed through an extensive process of analysis, discussion and consensus building. The goals are derived from an analysis of strategic opportunities, threats, strengths and weaknesses and formulated to better align internal capacity with the external environment. Divided into short, medium and long-term goals to be accomplished by 2013, each goal is supported by specific objectives. The goals are additive with later goals building on rather than replacing earlier ones.

Short-term goals focus on building internal capacity to define project outcomes and impacts, to collect and verify information efficiently and, most importantly, to use this information as the basis of analysis. In brief this period of the strategy is about measurement and analysis; it is concerned with establishing IMED's value and unique contribution within Government. Setting goals and measuring progress towards those goals are the foundation for a results based approach to monitoring and evaluation.

Building on but not replacing earlier goals, the medium-term goals center around using organizational capacity in measurement and analysis to coordinate resource allocation and support policy making. By this stage IMED should have established enough credibility to coordinate the creation of a national set of performance indicators that take into consideration the Medium-Term Budgetary Framework (MTBF), the National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction (NSAPR) and the Annual Development Plan (ADP) sector plans. This agreed set of national indicators represents the fundamental step towards RBM.

At the same time IMED will continue to build more advanced skills in large scale evaluation. This will undoubtedly require external assistance and will also involve the creation of a national consultative committee on evaluation drawn from across government, academia and civil society.

Expanding its reporting brief to even higher levels and to more exacting standards, IMED will be able to comment on the results of public sector investment. In the longer term IMED will respond to a greater public demand for information on public sector performance. It is anticipated that citizens will hold government accountable for performance and IMED will play a key supporting role in providing information to the public in a clear and transparent manner. The results based approach needs to be institutionalized through the passing of appropriate legislature and the reform of laws that hamper public access to information.

## *Short-Term (July 2008 to June 2009)*

### **"MEASUREMENT AND ANALYSIS"**

1. Ensure proper Design and Monitoring Frameworks (Logical Frameworks) are included in all Development Project Proformas (DPPs)
  - 1.1. Guidelines written and issued to all executing agencies on formulation of Design and Monitoring Framework indicators (to include sample frameworks for at least two sectors) by September 2008
  - 1.2. Order issued to all executing agencies instructing that all DPPs must include Design and Monitoring Frameworks with indicators to the standards specified in the guidelines from December 2008
  - 1.3. Evaluation Wing in conjunction with each relevant sector has begun to review all new Design and Monitoring Framework indicators and give written feedback from January 2009
  - 1.4. Order issued (by appropriate authority) requiring IMED to sign off on Design and Monitoring Framework indicators before DPP can be processed from June 2009
2. Outline monitoring framework and evaluation framework for projects and programmes
  - 2.1. Current responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation systems and processes investigated and analysed in detail by September 2008
  - 2.2. Effective delineation of roles and responsibilities between executing agencies, line ministries, IMED, Planning Commission, Finance Division and Development Partners in the processes of project and programme monitoring and evaluation (recognising that monitoring and evaluation are distinct processes) proposed by September 2008
  - 2.3. Proposals Discussed and agreed with relevant stakeholders by December 2008.
3. Collect data on project inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts according to Design and Monitoring Frameworks
  - 3.1. IMED PMIS restructured to include quantitative and qualitative fields on project results (outcome and impact) as defined in Design and Monitoring Framework by June 2009
  - 3.2. IMED PMIS integrated with ADP Database (Programming Division) and ERD information on foreign aid by June 2009
  - 3.3. Project progress Information to be sent by RHD, LGED, REB and BWDB in electronic form to IMED from June 2009
  - 3.4. National budget codes for all project components included on all relevant IMED forms by June 2009
4. Verify project information supplied by executing agencies
  - 4.1. Annual plan for selected output to outcome reviews (detailed project monitoring) completed each year by June with first plan in place by June 2009.
  - 4.2. Guidelines for project output to outcome reviews (detailed project monitoring) designed by September 2008 and in use from October 2008.
  - 4.3. Guidelines for project impact evaluations designed by September 2008 and in use from October 2008.
  - 4.4. Quality assurance system for in-house and outsourced reviews and evaluations in place by June 2009

5. Produce analytical reports (ie reports explaining progress or lack of progress) to NEC, ECNEC (special meetings dedicated to monitoring and evaluation issues) and ministries
  - 5.1. Project rating system, based on performance, that will allow ranking of projects and aggregation of project performance to an overall portfolio performance for any sector or ministry developed by June 2009
  - 5.2. Sector/Ministry Project Portfolio Performance Reports submitted to ministries by June 2009 and every year thereafter
  - 5.3. Analysis of Annual Development Programme (ADP) and revenue contribution to National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction (NSAPR) submitted to ECNEC by June 2009 and every year thereafter
  - 5.4. Public information on performance of 20 high priority ADP projects included on IMED Web site by June 2009
  - 5.5. Incorporate (or link) other national level data sets from Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (eg Household Income and Expenditure Survey) in IMED PMIS by June 2009

## *Medium-Term (July 2009 to June 2011)*

### **“COORDINATING RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND SUPPORTING POLICY MAKING”**

6. Participate in the formulation and review of Medium-Term Budget Framework (MTBF) targets, ADP sector plan indicators, NSAPR monitoring indicators (Ensure that all are consistent)
  - 6.1. Report to Minister for Finance and Planning on consolidated national public performance (results based) management system Prepare by June 2010
  - 6.2. Facilitate tripartite meeting between Finance Division, Planning Commission and IMED to agree common performance (results based) management system by July 2010
  - 6.3. Present national public sector performance (results based) management system to Cabinet (or appropriate authority) for endorsement by December 2010
7. Prepare and implement evaluations strategy for programmes and sectors/ministries
  - 7.1. Technical assistance to IMED from Development Partners for capacity building on project, programme and sector evaluation started by July 2009
  - 7.2. Consultative Committee on public sector evaluation formed by September 2009
  - 7.3. First annual evaluation plan prepared with support of Consultative Committee and endorsed by Minister for Finance and Planning by June 2010
  - 7.4. Results of annual evaluation published by June 2011
8. Provide public sector investment performance reports
  - 8.1. Report to Secretaries on results of public sector investment by ministry/sector prepared by June 2011
  - 8.2. Report to Parliament on public sector performance and results prepared by June 2011

## *Long-Term (July 2011 to June 2013)*

### **“COMMUNICATING RESULTS TO THE PUBLIC”**

9. Policy on public performance (results based) management implemented by June 2013
  - 9.1. All relevant public policies on public information reviewed by December 2011.
  - 9.2. Draft of act on public performance improvement reporting and accountability agreed by June 2012
  
10. Formulation of communications strategy on public sector results (to media, public, development partners)
  - 10.1. Briefings and public addresses for Prime Minister/Ministers (Chief Advisor/Advisors) prepared from January 2012
  - 10.2. Information on public sector performance provided to public through mass media from July 2012
  - 10.3. Partnership with civil society to discuss and report on perceptions of public sector performance formalized by December 2012



## D. Organizational Change Management

Organizational change management (OCM) is the management of communication and feedback regarding any significant change in an organization and addresses resistance to change, stakeholder confusion or anxiety, and potential negative impact of change on the various stakeholder communities. An OCM communication strategy involves feedback upward to inform managers about concerns stakeholders have before, during and after the change effort.

The IMED stakeholder communities are the sector Directors Generals, other IMED officers, project directors, the Executive Committee of the National Economic Council (ECNEC), the National Economic Council (NEC), executing agencies (EAs), ministries, and others that will have a vested interest and will be impacted by any changes in IMED procedures.

This discipline requires that IMED develops a rationale for why the changes set out in the Strategic Plan are going to take place and how it will improve the process and benefits of monitoring and evaluation. The benefits or better monitoring and evaluation are likely to be improved project results.

In addition to the OCM and communications strategy described above, a number of specific structural and human resource issues have already arisen from the formulation and development of the Strategic Plan. Some of these issues result from insights drawn from the approaches of other countries to results based monitoring and evaluation.

### *A Field Presence for IMED*

The Malaysian Implementation Coordination Unit (an organization with a similar function to IMED) has offices in each of Malaysia's 14 states. The Programme Evaluation Organization of the Indian Planning Commission also has offices based throughout India. Decentralised offices have a number of advantages including the ability to verify information provided by project directors quickly; the opportunity to develop a closer advisory relationship with project directors and the facility to dedicate more time to monitoring and evaluating key projects (by reducing travel time to projects).

#### **IMED FIELD OFFICES**

Although far more detailed analysis will be required in the implementation of this Strategic Plan, an earlier proposal suggested that field offices would be located at each of the Divisions and would be headed by a Director General with support from two Directors and five Deputy/Assistant Directors with logistics and offices.

## *Reorganizing the Evaluation Function*

The Strategic Plan will place a greater emphasis on evaluation research initially emphasising project outcome and impact evaluation but later focusing on complex programme evaluation.

This surely indicates the need for a specialised research unit within IMED capable of

- managing evaluation research by planning evaluation research programmes,
- contracting the necessary evaluators from the private sector consulting industry and academia,
- ensuring quality of evaluation reports and
- communicating findings to the relevant parts of government, to civil society and the public in general.

IMED has an evaluation wing that carries out formative project evaluation and impact evaluation. However, the capacity of the Evaluation Wing will need to be reorganized and strengthened to take on the additional responsibilities implied by the Strategic Plan.

## *Human Resource Issues*

### **TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT**

The Strategic Plan implies a need for capacity building and training within IMED. A Capacity Building and Training Plan has been drafted for IMED officers (as part of the Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation Project). The execution of this plan will impart skills and knowledge in results based management, monitoring, evaluation and change management during the project period. However, due to the rotation and promotion of officers such training will need to be delivered on a periodic basis so that all new entrants to IMED have the requisite competences. An appropriate training course should be part of an orientation programme for all officers joining IMED.

### **SECONDMENT OF PROFESSIONALS TO IMED**

The Malaysian Implementation Coordination Unit has a few (around five) professionals seconded to offer specific advice in key sectors and skills. This includes civil engineers, an accounts and audit specialist and a university professor to advise on evaluation research and statistical methods. IMED would benefit from the expertise of such professionals drawn from specific government departments, academic institutions or the private sector.

### **REWARDS AND INCENTIVES**

Outstanding performance as measured by reports that are well written, contain careful analysis and communicated to the appropriate authorities quickly and clearly should be rewarded. Rewards could include recommendations for training, prizes and other forms of recognition and appreciation.

## E. Implementation of Strategic Plan

With the formal approval of the IMED Strategic Plan by the Advisor for Finance and Planning, detailed actions will be developed to implement the Strategic Plan. This will be accompanied with a Capacity Building and Training Plan to impart the necessary organizational capabilities.

The objectives under each of the strategic goals are specific enough to represent a means of monitoring progress of implementation over the next five years.

### *A Pilot Process*

A pilot approach to change is usually perceived to be less risky and more manageable given the limited resources that are available to support the kind of transformations implied by the strategy. Ultimately the changes implied by the IMED Strategic Plan affect all sectors, all ministries (and their agencies) and all geographic regions of Bangladesh.

However, in the early stages of implementing the strategy only certain sectors, ministries and regions will be piloted. One infrastructure sector (e.g. transport, or rural infrastructure) and one social sector (e.g. primary education) will be chosen as pilots. This implies that guidelines for the formulations of DMFs (objective 1.1) will be written initially for two sectors. Similarly the ministry portfolio reports (objective 5.2) might be developed for just the ministries under the two pilot sectors.

It has already been established that the electronic linkage between the executing agencies and the propose IMED MIS would be established with just four agencies initially. However, this depends on the progress of related projects such as the second phase of the Public Procurement Reform Project and the UNDP funded ASICT project.

Finally, if field level units for IMED are institutionally viable then possibly only one or two would be established on a pilot basis rather than one in each Division.

## Implementation Matrix

The table below sets out the responsibilities for each of the objectives under the ten strategic goals. (RBME 2 refers to a recommended follow up project to RBME but does not currently represent an agreement between the Government of Bangladesh and the Asian Development Bank).

Ref.	Objective in brief	By when	Responsibility	With	TA
1.1	Indicator guidelines	9/08	IMED		RBME (2 pilot sectors)
1.2	Order on DPPs	12/08	PC		
1.3	Review DPP indicators	1/09	IMED	PC	
1.4	Order on IMED role	6/09	PD	PC	
2.1	GoB M&E System	9/08	IMED, MoF, PC		RBME
2.2	M&E roles	12/08	IMED, MoF, PC	LMs, EAs	UNDP, FMRP, RBME
2.3					
3.1	PMIS fields restructured and integrated	6/09	IMED (MIS)	PD, Prog. Div., ERD	RBME, ASICT
3.2					
3.3	Information sent online	6/09	IMED (MIS)	RHD, LGED, REB, BWDB	RBME, ASICT
3.4	Budget codes included	6/09	IMED (MIS)	FD	
4.1	Plan for output to outcome review	9/08	IMED	LMs	
4.2	Output to outcome reviews	10/08	IMED		
4.3	Guidelines for project impact evaluations	9/08	IMED (EW)		
4.4	QA for evaluations	6/09	IMED (EW)		
5.1	Project rating system	6/09	IMED (MIS)	LMs	
5.2	Portfolio reports	6/09	IMED	LMs	
5.3	ADP/revenue to NSAPR	6/09	IMED	PC	UNDP
5.4	Projects on Website	6/09	IMED		ASICT
5.5	Links to data sets	6/09	IMED	BBS	
6.1	Public performance system	6/10	IMED	FD, Prog. Div.	RBME 2
6.7	Tripartite meetings	7/10	IMED	FD, Prog. Div.	RBME 2
6.3	Performance system to Cabinet	12/10	Advisor/Minister	IMED, FD, PC	
7.1	RBME 2 in place	7/09	IMED	ADB, ERD	RBME
7.2	Consultative Committee	9/09	ECNEC	IMED	RBME 2
7.3	Evaluation Plan	6/10	Consultative Committee	IMED	RBME 2
7.4	Evaluation Results	6/11	IMED	Consultative Committee	
8.1	Report on sector performance	6/11	IMED, FD, PC		RBME 2
8.2	Report on national performance to ECNEC/Parliament	6/11	Advisor/Minister	IMED, FD, PC	RBME 2
9.1	Policy review	12/11	ECNEC	IMED	RBME 2
9.2	Draft Act	6/12	IMED	All stakeholders	RBME 2
10.1	Briefings	1/12	IMED	LMs	
10.2	Communications	7/12	IMED	Ministry of Information	
10.3	Civil society participation	12/12	IMED		