
PART VI

Q&A—Commonly Asked Questions

Answers are provided in Part VI to a number of questions that commonly arise at national and international conferences on the topic of government M&E. The frequency with which similar issues are raised helps identify key issues that must be addressed when seeking to institutionalize an M&E system.



Q&A—Commonly Asked Questions

Officials, academics, consultants, donors, and others interested in strengthening government M&E systems often raise similar issues about how to do this and how to overcome the perceived challenges. Answers to 21 of the most frequently asked questions are provided here. These issues help highlight the many related dimensions of a government system for M&E and clarify the nature of the trade-offs that may need to be made.

1. How can a governmentwide system for monitoring and evaluation be introduced progressively? It is too big a step for my country to introduce a system all at once.

A good first step is to conduct a diagnosis of existing government M&E functions and systems (chapter 12). This should provide a sound understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of what currently exists. It should also help clarify who needs what M&E information, for what purposes, and when. This in turn should help identify a menu of possible actions to strengthen existing M&E systems or create a new system entirely (chapter 13). Clearly a threshold issue is to clarify the main intended uses of M&E information in the future.

One possible approach is to implement a range of M&E tools and methods in a progressive, whole-of-government manner. Chile did this by implementing a performance information system in

1994, followed by comprehensive management reports in 1996, rapid reviews in 1996, rigorous impact evaluations in 2001, and comprehensive spending reviews in 2002 (chapter 6). Most governments, however, might not have the patience to pursue such a protracted approach.

There are some M&E actions that, while important, can take a long time to achieve—such as extensive improvements to performance monitoring systems or a rigorous impact evaluation—if good data are not already available. Champions for the M&E system may or may not be willing to wait for these actions to be taken; even if they are patient, champions will eventually depart, perhaps unexpectedly.

This is an argument for trying to include some quick wins in the M&E action plan. These might include a range of pilot activities, such as conducting some rapid evaluations to feed into the budget process (by revealing the performance

of individual programs); conducting a public expenditure tracking survey to reveal the extent of “leakage” of government funds; or conducting a rigorous impact evaluation where good data already exist or can be readily collected (see chapter 2).

Such demonstration activities can highlight the value of M&E information and thus help raise awareness of and demand for it. Although it is always a good idea to have a well-prepared action plan, including a number of stages for development of the M&E system, one important lesson from experience is the importance of being able to respond flexibly when new opportunities for M&E arise (chapter 10).

2. Demand within my government for monitoring information and evaluation findings is weak. What should I do about this disinterest if I want to build a government M&E system?

Weak demand is a serious obstacle to building a government M&E system, but there are a number of steps that can be taken to strengthen demand (see chapters 10 and 11). First, it can be helpful to raise awareness of M&E among senior officials: explain what M&E is and the many ways it can be valuable to a government—such as to achieve more informed decision making in the national budget or to improve ongoing management of all government activities. Senior officials can often be persuaded by examples of influential evaluations and well-performing M&E systems in other countries (chapter 3). Finding powerful champions and allies is also important, and they in turn can help advocate and support M&E more widely.

Every government is already conducting *some* M&E work, even if it only comprises ministries’ systems of administrative records, the sector data of national statistics agencies, and the information governments provide to donors. It can be eye opening to conduct a rapid diagnosis of current M&E activities and to discover the extent of duplication and inefficiencies in existing monitoring systems. This can provide the impetus to streamline existing systems and ensure they provide in-

formation that is more useful to the government, as happened in Uganda (chapter 12).

3. How can a performance culture be created in my government’s civil service?

This is difficult to achieve, particularly for civil servants who have spent the whole of their careers conforming to rigid rules and procedures. It is easy for civil servants and their managers to focus only on activities or processes, such as the number of health clinics constructed or the number of checks paid to welfare recipients. But ideally they would focus on the goals and objectives of these activities and specifically on their *results*—the outputs, outcomes, and impacts of their efforts.

There is no simple answer to this issue, but there are a number of steps that can help change the mindset of civil servants. One is the introduction of committed, reform-oriented champions who occupy powerful positions in the government. Another is the use of powerful incentives to encourage a greater focus on results and a greater client orientation—a service culture (see chapter 11, for example). Conducting regular “How Are We Doing?” team meetings for managers and their staff can help clarify objectives, current team performance, and ways to improve it.

Provision of greater autonomy and flexibility to managers who achieve high levels of performance—that is, *results*—can provide powerful incentives, and these can flow down to their staff (World Bank 1998). Such autonomy can include greater access to funding and more power to hire and fire staff on the basis of their performance. Achieving such broad-based reforms throughout an entire civil service is difficult, but it may be feasible to pilot such reforms for selected agencies.

4. My government is already under a lot of workload pressures and stress. Why should we now devote effort to building an M&E system?

See the answer to Question 2. Your government is already devoting a lot of effort to M&E, especially the monitoring efforts of your ministries

and the achievement of donor evaluation requirements. For example, a diagnosis in Uganda discovered 16 monitoring subsystems; another diagnosis in the social development agency in Mexico discovered eight uncoordinated monitoring systems in one agency.

There will almost certainly be potential to reduce inefficiencies and duplication in your existing systems and to produce only the core information you need and can use. There are a growing number of countries around the world that are already devoting significant effort to M&E—they include most OECD countries, some notable middle-income countries (such as Chile and Colombia), and even some of the poorest countries, including Uganda and Tanzania. They are doing this because they understand that an investment in M&E can produce high returns.

5. My government is keenly interested in strengthening our M&E work, but our institutions are weak. How can we proceed?

The short answer is to build incrementally on what you already have. Simplify and rationalize your monitoring systems. Seek donor support and expertise, both for your M&E systems and to access donor funding for some evaluations for demonstration purposes. Prioritize those evaluations in areas (such as health or education) where important government decisions will have to be made in the future. It is best to start modestly, seeking to showcase the benefits from M&E, and to build incrementally on these efforts. It is best to avoid the common mistake of overengineering an M&E system (chapter 10).

6. How much should my government spend on evaluations? How much is enough?

There is a myth that one percent of a program's spending should be devoted to evaluation. Although there is no logical or empirical basis for this number, it is indicative of the scale of effort and resources that should be devoted to evaluating any activity. If a program is evaluated every three to five years, then even a cost of one percent is equivalent to only one-third to one-fifth of

one percent on an annualized basis. Thus, the evaluation would need to result in only a very modest improvement in the effectiveness or efficiency of the program for the evaluation to be cost-effective. Some of the evaluations highlighted in this volume have been much more cost-effective than this (see also IEG 2004b, 2006).

The cost of an evaluation will be substantially lower if there already exist good monitoring data, especially on program beneficiaries and program outcomes. This is an argument for establishing sound administrative data systems and for investing in national statistical systems.

Of course, evaluations should never be conducted for their own sake; the bottom-line measure of success for any evaluation is that it is used intensively. Annex A provides lessons on how to ensure that evaluations are influential.

7. How can we prioritize our evaluations? Our funds are limited, and we cannot evaluate everything we'd like to.

Prioritizing evaluations is a common issue for the managers of an established M&E system. Standard criteria used to help select programs for evaluation include the following: large spending programs; programs of particular policy importance; programs that have suspected major problems with their performance; and pilot programs the government is considering scaling up. Additional criteria to prioritize evaluations include the feasibility of conducting the evaluation, whether the evaluation will provide timely information (such as whether the evaluation findings will be available in time to influence the government's decisions), and whether there are enough resources (funds, staff, and so on) to conduct the evaluation.

As always, when deciding which programs to evaluate, it is a good idea to consider questions such as who needs what evaluative information, for what purposes, and when.

For M&E systems that are not yet established, the challenge is to make every evaluation count—to ensure that they will have high visibility to

senior decision makers and will also be highly influential. It is helpful in this context to try to anticipate important decision points, such as a planned major review of social spending, an incoming government, or preparation of a new national plan. If these decision points can be anticipated sufficiently far in advance, it should be possible to ensure that the evaluation's findings will be available in time to feed into the government's decisionmaking.

The time required for the evaluation will depend on the type of evaluation, the existence of suitable data, and so forth. For such "demonstration" evaluations, it would be prudent to seek to minimize the risk that the evaluation's findings will be judged irrelevant because of poor quality, poor timing, or political sensitivity.¹

8. Who should pay for evaluations? They are expensive, and it is not reasonable to expect poor countries to pay for them.

It is true that very few evaluations are commissioned and paid for by African countries, for example. Although evaluations do not have to be expensive—as outlined in chapter 2, rapid reviews and similar types of evaluation can be conducted quite cheaply, costing even just a few thousand dollars—many evaluations are much more expensive than that. There does appear to be a public good argument to have evaluations in poor countries funded by international donors, partly because of the poverty of the countries and partly because the findings from evaluations may well be of benefit to other countries in the Region.²

In addition to funding, donors can also bring their technical expertise in evaluation. The downside, however, may well be a much lower level of government ownership of the evaluation findings if senior officials have played no role in the choice of program to evaluate, the management of the evaluation, or its funding. This provides a strong argument for a collegiate approach to evaluation, involving a government-donor partnership.

9. Aren't rigorous impact evaluations, particularly those involving randomized control trials, the gold standard for evaluation? Isn't any other type of evaluation relatively weak and perhaps even not worth doing?

This is a highly controversial issue.³ Some proponents of rigorous impact evaluations do appear to argue this. It is certainly the case that a randomized control trial, if performed well, can provide strong evidence of the impacts of a program; this is the standard experimental method for measuring the effects of new medicines, for example. A serious limitation of such rigorous impact evaluation methods, however, is that it is often not possible to apply them to sectorwide or nationwide interventions. These evaluation methods are also typically very expensive, which makes it harder for governments to fund them. Chile, for example, conducts a limited number of impact evaluations each year, while it also conducts a greater number of inexpensive desk reviews (chapter 6).

10. Shouldn't evaluations always be conducted externally to the entity whose work is being evaluated?

In Latin American countries it is usual for evaluations to be commissioned by government departments but conducted externally. The advantage of this approach is that it avoids a potential conflict of interest. It helps to ensure that the evaluations are more objective and "independent" than if they had been conducted within the government. This increases their perceived credibility and reliability.

Chile's M&E system has experienced the downside this approach can have—the ministries whose programs are being evaluated generally have little "ownership" of the evaluation findings and thus do not make much use of them. Colombia has combined the advantages of external evaluations with the advantages of sector ministry own-

ership; they are full partners in commissioning and managing the external evaluations (chapter 7).

In OECD countries, it is more usual for evaluations to be conducted internally; this helps ensure that the evaluations draw on the program expertise of the agency's staff. It also encourages agencies to use the evaluations (Currstine 2005). In Australia, sector ministries evaluated their own programs, but the central ministries would usually play some role in overseeing the evaluations and reviewing the evaluation reports (chapter 8).

11. How many performance indicators should my government/ministry/agency/program collect?

There is no simple answer to this question. It depends on who in government needs performance indicators for their work, how many indicators they can make use of, and their cost. Chile's finance ministry collects 1,550 performance indicators, which is a large number by international standards; the finance ministry would like to have even more information but realizes that this number is at the limit of what budget analysts can meaningfully use. In contrast, Colombia's system for monitoring the 320 presidential goals comprises some 600 indicators; this information is publicly available on a Web site (annex B).

It is perhaps more meaningful to view a system of performance indicators as being like a pyramid—with a small number of high-level, strategic indicators focusing on outputs and outcomes at the top, for use by senior officials. For mid-level officials it would be appropriate to provide a greater number of operational indicators, focusing on inputs, processes, and outputs. And at the bottom of the pyramid it would be appropriate to provide a much larger number of operational indicators focusing on processes and services, for use by line managers and their staff at the agency and facility levels. Any individual line manager would only be interested in a small subset of these latter indicators, that is, those directly relevant to that work unit.

A common mistake with performance monitoring systems is collecting too many indicators—which leads to a situation of too much data and not enough information (chapter 10). Unused data can provide a disincentive to data providers to ensure the data are of high quality, and this can lead to a vicious circle of low data utilization and low data quality.

12. Would it be best for a governmentwide M&E system to be designed and managed by the finance ministry?

Not necessarily. It is true that a number of countries have anchored their whole-of-government M&E systems in the finance ministry—such as Australia, Canada, Chile, and the United States. But there are advantages and disadvantages to this approach. Finance ministries typically have a great deal of power, particularly on matters concerning budget funding. These ministries may well be able to create incentives for sector ministries to actively support the M&E system. In some countries they also play an important role as an architect or overseer of public sector reforms. Their powerful position allows them to initiate actions to strengthen M&E in the government, particularly in pursuit of PBB.

On the other hand, finance ministries can be bastions of conservatism and resistance to change, both at senior levels and at the level of the budget sections that oversee each sector ministry and agency. In Australia the leadership of the finance ministry was committed to reforms, including the development of a governmentwide M&E system. This leadership wanted to reorient the work of the budget sections to focus less on spending details of line items and much more on big-picture issues of policy relevance and the efficiency and effectiveness of government spending. The ministry leadership therefore embarked on a process of cultural change within the ministry, seeking to influence division heads, section heads, and their staff. This involved some focused recruitment, promotion, on-the-job training, proactive turnover of staff, and recognition of good

practice use of M&E information in the ministry's policy advice (chapter 8; Mackay 1998a).

In some countries, finance ministries have acted as roadblocks to reforms like strengthening national M&E systems. For this reason, it is important to have the cooperation of the finance ministry in these efforts, or at the very least to avoid any active opposition on their part. The support of other central ministries, such as the president's office and the civil service ministry, can also be expected to be a success factor—particularly if the central ministries act in a collegiate manner to support a national M&E system. A diagnosis can identify the extent of support or opposition of each of the powerful central ministries to the strengthening of the M&E system; this can also act as a vehicle to achieve shared understanding of the benefits of M&E and help foster a consensus on an action plan to strengthen the system.

13. Don't sector ministries resent having formal requirements for M&E—designed by one of the central ministries—imposed on them?

No one likes being told what to do, particularly if he or she has no say in the decision to create the formal requirements and if there is no obvious benefit from the M&E information produced. This has been the case in Chile, where the powerful finance ministry has in effect imposed a set of M&E requirements on sector ministries and agencies; the sector entities make little use of the evaluation findings the system produces.

It can be difficult to achieve consensus on the merits of M&E reforms, but it is well worth making the effort. Lack of agreement might cause sector ministries and agencies to not comply with centrally imposed M&E requirements, or at least to provide only lip service. It is these entities that usually have the main responsibility of providing the monitoring data the M&E system requires. If these entities consider they have no incentives to ensure good quality information, then the whole system will suffer (including the quality of evaluations, to

the extent that these rely on data supplied by the ministries). This is one of the key lessons to emerge from the diagnostic work conducted for Uganda (chapter 9).

Another lesson is to avoid the dangers of multiple, uncoordinated monitoring systems at the central and sectoral levels. These place a considerable burden on data suppliers, particularly at the ministry, agency, and facility levels.

Negative incentives—"sticks" imposed by central ministries—are not likely to be appreciated by sector ministries, although they may still be necessary. Positive incentives—carrots such as the certainty of greater funding for those ministries able to demonstrate their performance—are more likely to win hearts and minds (chapter 11).

14. Is there any way to ensure that monitoring information and evaluation findings will be used in the budget process?

There is no way to guarantee use of M&E information in the budget process, but there are ways to increase the probability of this happening. Clearly it is important that the key stakeholders in the budget process and in budget decision making—including the president or prime minister, the finance minister, other key ministers, and the finance ministry, among others—have demanded M&E information so they can better develop policy options and make better decisions. If that demand is weak or absent, then steps can be taken to improve awareness of M&E, in terms of what it encompasses and what it can offer.

And there may be options for key stakeholders to provide incentives—carrots, sticks, or sermons—to encourage use of M&E information in the budget (chapter 11). These incentives could include, for example, strong statements of support for M&E from influential champions within government; regular feedback from ministers to policy analysts concerning the quality of policy advice provided (including the extent to which that advice makes good use of available M&E information); inclusion of ratings of program performance

in published budget documents; and provision of support to the finance ministry to pilot some rapid evaluations in order to demonstrate their usefulness.

15. Doesn't PBB imply that less money should be spent on poorly performing programs?

Not necessarily. The overriding consideration will be whether the program is a priority for the government. Some programs—such as primary education—are simply too important to be abolished or even to have their funding cut. In these cases, the challenge will be to fix the performance problems that monitoring information and evaluation findings have identified, for example, inefficient service delivery or poor targeting to the intended beneficiaries. Thus it might well be necessary to spend more money on the program, at least in the short term, to fix these problems.

Finance ministries in countries such as Australia have used resource agreements with agencies in such situations; these provide short-term increased funding for a priority program, in exchange for a medium- to long-term overall reduction in funding. They require that specific actions be taken to improve performance (OECD 1997a).

For low-priority programs, however, evidence of poor performance is more likely to lead to a government decision to cut the program or even abolish it entirely. Chile is one country that may abolish a program if there is evidence of poor performance, but it is an exception; the finance ministries of most OECD countries rarely abolish programs when M&E information reveals poor performance (Curristine 2005).

16. Is it possible to introduce PBB on a pilot basis, or does it have to be introduced all at once for the entire budget?

PBB can be introduced on a pilot basis. There are three types of PBB (box 3.1, p. 10). The first involves a direct relationship between budget funding for a program and its performance. This approach is used in only a few rather narrowly de-

finied cases such as formula-based funding for hospitals or university education. Thus, it is possible to introduce such direct performance budgeting on a pilot basis for specific programs.

The second type of PBB is indirect performance budgeting, where M&E information provides an input into budget funding decisions. It might seem odd to consider using M&E information as one input to budget allocation decisions for only a handful of pilot programs. Governments may have reasonably good performance information available for all programs, but few governments have good evaluation findings available for all programs in all sectors. Thus, it is necessary to use whatever information is available, however piecemeal or imperfect that information might be. In other words, budget decisions have to be made irrespective of whether there exists good M&E information available on the performance of a program, or little information at all.

So, yes, it is also possible to pilot the use of M&E information to assist in budget allocation for only some programs. Whether PBB is introduced on a pilot basis or for the entire budget, it is inevitable that there will be disparities in the amount of M&E information available for different programs. And this in turn places a priority on sound evaluation planning, to ensure that evaluation findings will be available to help budget decision making for key government programs. One strategy when piloting this type of PBB is to commission strategic evaluations of “hot” policy issues to try to ensure utilization of the evaluation findings in the budget—to achieve a demonstration effect.

The last type of PBB is presentational performance budgeting, whereby the government reports publicly its past or expected performance for each program. Again, the level of M&E information available for different programs is likely to vary widely,⁴ so again it is possible to pilot this type of PBB. In Colombia, for example, this type of PBB has been piloted for the investment budget but not for the recurrent budget (annex B). The government of Guatemala is currently piloting performance-based budget allocations for the education and health ministries.

17. Does program budgeting help in creating an M&E system?

Yes. Program budgeting typically groups all activities with the same objective—such as achieving a specific improvement in infant nutrition—into a single program.⁵ This makes it much easier to estimate the total amount the government is spending to achieve the objective. It also facilitates both the measurement of the total volume of outputs of these related activities (that is, baseline measures) and the setting of performance targets.

This clarity contrasts strongly with the more traditional, line-item budgeting, which identifies the total amount spent by an agency on all activities, with information only on the types of expenditure, such as salaries, office rents, telephones, travel, and so forth. Knowledge of how much is being spent to try to achieve each government objective is very useful for senior officials and budget analysts, as it helps them assess whether the amount of that spending is commensurate with the level of importance of the objective; this is essentially a results-based management perspective. It also helps them assess whether the results of that spending are likely to justify the expense, as well as to compare alternative spending options for achieving the same objective.

But before these assessments can be made there needs to be M&E information available concerning the effectiveness of the spending (that is, the outputs, outcomes, and impacts achieved by that spending). A final advantage of program budgeting is that it encourages a longer-term focus on goals and objectives, and on the intermediate steps needed to achieve them.⁶

The alignment of program budgeting with M&E requires alignment of information systems. Thus, a financial management information system and a performance monitoring system would need to be harmonized. This would require a significant effort.

Chile has been able to construct a robust M&E system without having program budgeting in place (although it is now working to build a pro-

grammatic structure). But the disadvantage of the lack of structure has been that the evaluators of Chile's programs have to try to decide which government activities should be considered as part of the program being evaluated. This is a time-consuming and ad hoc approach. Most OECD countries have implemented program budgeting.

18. What role should the national audit office and the Congress or Parliament have in M&E?

In principle, both the national audit office and the legislative arm of government—the Congress or Parliament—should play leading roles in M&E. National audit offices are the fiduciary watchdogs of the legislature. They traditionally conduct compliance audits of the financial management practices of ministries and agencies. An increasing number of national audit offices also conduct performance audits, a type of evaluation that focuses on the efficiency and effectiveness of government spending. And in some countries they have reviewed the performance of the government's M&E system and have thus prompted the government to make needed improvements to the system (chapter 12).

The legislative arms of government are also, in principle, concerned with the performance of the executive arm. It is the legislature that usually has the legal power to approve—or not—the government's funding requests; it often has the power to modify these requests as it sees fit. In considering funding requests it also has the opportunity to review the past performance of the government—its stewardship of public monies. That said, however, it appears that legislatures are generally not well equipped for the task of reviewing government performance; they usually do not have the skills, the resources, or the time to perform this function.

19. Isn't M&E for PRSPs just another type of donor conditionality?

In many ways, yes. One important reason that PRSPs emphasize M&E is to ensure that govern-

ments as well as donors focus on country results, as well as on the amounts spent to achieve these results. This has become even more important since the World Bank initiated the debt relief initiative for heavily indebted poor countries (chapter 4). A common defect of most PRSPs is that they focus on *country* performance but give little attention to the specific contribution of the government—or individual sectors of the government or subnational governments—or donors (or the private sector) to those results (chapter 9). Reasons for this deficiency include the weakness of government M&E systems and the weakness of donor support for these systems. But in some countries, such as Uganda and Tanzania, the government’s concern with M&E predates the PRSPs; in other words, these governments realized the value of investing the time and effort to build a government M&E system to support better national planning and better budget resource allocation.

20. Don’t donors make M&E harder—not easier—for developing countries?

It is certainly the case that donors have failed to harmonize the M&E requirements that they expect countries to meet. This situation has created a significant burden on some countries. One conundrum is that the weaker government capacities and systems are, the more donors apply their own systems and conditionalities, which can undermine governments’ efforts to strengthen their own systems. However, donors are able to offer a number of different types of capacity-building support to governments to strengthen existing M&E systems. In addition, donor evaluation offices have undertaken a large number of evaluations over many years, and these collectively offer a goldmine of information—a library of evaluation findings—that governments could use to good effect.

21. What are the main dangers and pitfalls to avoid when trying to strengthen M&E in a country?

There are many. Six main challenges are discussed in this volume:

- **The belief that M&E has intrinsic merit**—an “M&E mantra.” This argument is particularly unconvincing to skeptical, overworked government officials. Rather, the way to persuade is to be able to point to particular evaluations that have been highly influential and to other, similar governments that have devoted considerable effort to building an M&E system and become strong proponents of M&E. This perspective stresses that M&E is worthwhile only to the extent that it is actually used to improve government performance (chapter 3 and Part II).
- **A technocratic approach to capacity building** that focuses solely on creating monitoring systems, conducting evaluations, and providing M&E training. These supply-side activities are necessary but are far from sufficient for successful M&E systems. Demand-side issues are crucial, particularly the nature and strength of incentives to conduct and to use M&E information (chapters 10 and 11). Training that raises awareness of the uses and value of M&E—its strengths and limitations—can help strengthen demand for M&E.
- **Rigid adherence to a predetermined action plan** for building an M&E system. It is always worthwhile to start with a good vision for the M&E system, how it will operate, and the uses that will be made of the information the system will produce once it has been fully built. Yet experience reminds us that most successful M&E systems have developed in an opportunistic, nonlinear manner, as roadblocks are encountered and new opportunities emerge (chapter 10). These unforeseen developments may reflect, for example, the departure of key champions, changes in government, or fiscal crises that increase the premium placed on having M&E information available. Thus, developing an M&E system can best be viewed as an evolutionary process, and one that needs to be adjusted and managed carefully. Regular M&E of progress in developing a system will provide the understanding necessary to make these necessary adjustments (chapter 12).

- **The limitation of relying on laws, decrees, and regulations** as the main means to institutionalize M&E within government. A strong legal basis can provide partial aid to the institutionalization of an M&E system, but much more is needed (chapters 10 and 11).
- **The danger of overengineering an M&E system**, particularly through multiple monitoring systems with an excessive number of performance indicators (chapters 9 and 10).
- **The search for the ideal government M&E system** among other countries. Some officials seek exemplary systems, such as Chile's, with a view to replicating it in their own countries. This is a mistake: not only are the starting points faced by each country unique, but so are the destinations—depending on the actual or intended uses of the information their M&E system will produce (chapter 12).