4 Principles, 4 Instruments / Tools and 4 Practices of 3PCM Benefits Focused Approach to Development Evaluation / M & E / Assessment; Development, Performance Management / Service delivery; Defense / Security; Human Rights in all its Ramifications: Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: HR-PESCR etc

NB: This paper contains a certain number of abbreviations. Their meanings are the following:

3PCM: Integrated Approach to Project / Program / Policy Cycle Management

PCM: Integrated Approach to Project Cycle Management

HR-PESCR: Human Rights in all its Ramifications: Political, Economic, Social, Cultural and Religious Rights

MPCOP-PE&ES: Multidisciplinary Community of Practice on Poverty Elimination and Environmental Sustainability

EAG: Economic Alliance Group

Good Thinking, Good Politics, Good Economic Development, Good M & E

Bad Thinking, Bad Politics, Bad Economic Development, Bad M & E

Oooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo

PCM ORIGIN & INTERVENTION

PCM is a methodological approach with a view to **achieving significant improvements in** relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of projects, programs and policies.

PCM is an Integrated Approach that makes a s*systematic effort* to integrate Planning, Financing, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation into **one** *overall concept*.

PCM recognizes that All Development Cooperation / Agency (Agencies) at sub-national, national and international levels have:-
1. *Similar problems to grapple with and find sustainable solutions to;*
2. *To tackle headlong real and complex human factor, political process, technical process, financial process and consultation process problems on the ground;*
3. *To continue to LEARN Together with all concerned stakeholders operationalizing in practice a "Living Strategy" for (1) and (2).*

PCM is **acronym** for "Integrated Approach to Project Cycle Management" developed within the "Evaluation Division" of which Hellmut Eggers was the Head at the time (the nineteen-eighties). The "Integrated Approach" Component of the Full Name was suggested by Eggers' boss, the Deputy Director of Directorate General VIII "Development"), and the "Project Cycle Management" ccomponent of the full Name was suggested by Eggers. Both suggestions that coined the formulation of the acronym go back to September 1987.

PCM can be applied to:-
  1. *International Development Cooperation between EU and ACP Countries*
  2. *International Development Cooperation between G20 Countries*
  3. *International Development Cooperation between Non G20 Countries*
  4. *International Development Cooperation between G20 Countries and Non G20 Countries,*
  5. *National Development Cooperation within each G20 Country*
  6. *National Development Cooperation within each Non G20 Country*
  7. *Any project / Program / Policy work in general in the Public Sector, Private Sector or Voluntary Sector at Sub National, National and International levels on both G20 and Non G20 Countries sides.*

PCM CONCEPTION

In 1985, the Evaluation Division of DG VIII proceeded to a revision of the effectiveness of the Directorate General for Development's work during the 25 years it had been active in Development Cooperation (that is 1960 – 1985) with the "ACP States": the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries associated with the European Communities.

The Evaluation Division reviewed its own already substantial evaluation work (1960 – 1985) and also the numerous reports of the European Court of Auditors concerning development cooperation with the ACPs. As only orders of magnitude were sought, a rather crude scoring system was applied to this voluminous documentation.

The results were sobering: one third of the projects/programs considered was Judged (Value Judgment) to have been overall successful, the second third showed important flaws and the last third was unceremoniously judged unsuccessful. Reference to the work done by other development cooperation agencies showed that they had obtained more or less similarly disappointing results. To be sure, one could not say, as did many detractors of development cooperation work, that this work had entirely failed, but it was equally certain that it had not been overall successful. The truth was that its results were, to put it mildly, unsatisfactory and in urgent need of improvement.

What has been done since? Although the Evaluation Division suggested a set of improvement measures, 29 years later the picture is still bleak: Indeed, EAG study findings over the past 21 years concerning both, Developed and Developing Countries, indicate that should a similar Evaluation Assignment be undertaken today, the results for EC, World Bank, UK DFID, USAID, UN and other International Development Cooperation Agencies as well as National Development Cooperation Agencies would <u>still produce</u> similar results. This is very sad because the ultimate consequences of the World continuing on this Road to Doom rather than changing quickly to the Road to Boom, would be catastrophic for Citizens in both Developed and Developing Countries.

It is pertinent to note that should World Political leaders, Heads of International Institutions, Heads of National Institutions and Boards of Global, Regional and National M & E Organizations <u>refuse Ordered Change</u> in the Development, Defense, Diplomacy, Democracy, Procurement, HR-PESCR, Service Delivery and M & E Systems from Village to Global Levels, they <u>make Disordered Change Inevitable</u>.

If the World is to <u>Change, on Time, from Road to Doom to Road to Boom</u>, Evaluation Assignments of One UN Initiative (Delivery as One, DaO), MDG's, International Development Cooperation initiatives, National Development Cooperation Initiatives and Global M & E Initiatives should be <u>undertaken</u> in ways that <u>demonstrate</u> that Lessons that ought to have been learnt when the above Evaluation Assignment was done 29 years ago (2014) were, indeed, <u>actually learnt.</u>

IDENTIFIED FUNDAMENTAL WEAKNESSES

As a first step, the Evaluation Division went back to the documentation it had reviewed in order to identify the reasons responsible for the mediocre outcome mentioned.

A first conclusion asserted itself immediately: errors had accumulated for each program/project judged problematic or unsuccessful, *from the beginning up to the end of the entire project/program cycle, that is to say as of the programming phase, via project/program identification, preparation and implementation up to project/program completion and evaluation.*

The Evaluation Division tried to pinpoint these weaknesses with greater precision and eventually, with the help of professional colleagues around the world, identified what were judged the *three major root causes for the unsatisfactory outcomes* of DG VIII's (as well as the other agencies') work. These *three fundamental weaknesses* subsequently proved to be of major importance for PCM since they were to be turned into the *three fundamental principles* of the approach. They are the following:-

1. Confusion between "Beneficiaries" and "Project".
2. *"Forgetting"* one or several essential aspects in project, program, policy preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and ***Failure to understand Linkages: projects flow from programs, programs flow from policies, policies flow from strategy and strategy flow from vision.***
3. Failing to respect a sound decision making discipline all along the project, program, policy cycle, when passing from a given project, program, policy phase to the next.

CONVERTING THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL WEAKNESSES INTO THE THREE BASIC PCM PRINCIPLES

The Evaluation Division converted these three "Capital Errors" into as many "Fundamental Principles". This exercise consisted simply of turning the "don'ts" into "do's", the negatives into positives. But before turning to the substance of these principles, let us first consider the scope to which the PCM Approach was intended to be applied. If there were not a real risk of sounding like a stutter, one could call PCM also PPPCM (or 3PCM), because *it applies, indeed, to projects as well as to programs and policies.*

Projects and *programs* are sometimes hard or even impossible to disentangle one from the other. If the construction of an individual well, for instance, can certainly be viewed as a small project in its own right, the satisfaction of a country's needs in well construction will probably be called a "program". At which number of wells will a "project" turn into a "program"? Hard to tell and depending on each concrete case! A program is always made up of a cluster of projects, and programs will thus eventually be implemented as a series of interconnected projects. In any case, there are no clear cut limits.

A *policy* usually will, when implemented, turn out to consist of a combination of programs and projects, e.g. the drinking water policy in country C. It will normally (at least in democracies…) be geared to capturing and channeling a growing swell of public preferences and opinions. In any case, a serious policy will not stop at an enunciation of intentions, but will also indicate the measures to be taken in terms of concrete programs.

3PCM is acronym for "Integrated Approach to Project, Program and Policy Cycle Management" within "Trade / Development; M & E / Assessment; Performance Management / Service Delivery; Procurement; HR-PESCR; Diplomacy; Democracy / Elections; Defense / Security; Finance / Banking and ICT / Digital Technology etc" Invented by Lanre Rotimi.

The "Integrated Approach" Component of the Full Name was suggested by Eggers' boss, the Deputy Director Directorate General of DG VIII and the "Project Cycle Management" component of the full name was suggested by Eggers both in September 1987. The "3P - Project, Program and Policy" component was suggested by Rotimi in 2009. The exchange of ideas between Eggers and Rotimi that led to coining the New Full Name and the Invention of the New Acronym were done in November 2009. In 2012 Hellmut and Lanre's versions of Original PCM were merged into 3PCM. However Lanre Rotimi had lead a team of Nigerian Professionals who undertook a study between 1994 – 2004 in Nigeria and the UK essentially based on 3PCM Principles and Practices but without the Instruments / Tools and the Theoretical Knowledge to explain in clear terms the results and performance being achieved by the Team.

All told, the application modalities of PCM will require constant adaptation as one moves from projects via programs towards policies. Emphasis will shift from detail to strategy, objectives will broaden and implementation mechanics will require diminishing attention *(within the 3PCM Approach – Emphasis will shift from detail to strategy, structure, organization and procedure; objectives will broaden to include specific and overall objectives within a clear political vision effectively linked with a clear economic vision and, implementation, monitoring and evaluation mechanics will require increasing attention*). But the rigor of the first PCM principle will be applicable to the entire continuum in equal measure. It will be the "yeast" that penetrates the entire system and ensures the *mutually reinforcing quality of its different components.*

Let's, then, turn to the PCM principles, i. e. the "positive" version of the three fundamental weaknesses mentioned earlier. To each of these principles corresponds one "basic tool", as we'll see presently:-

The **First 3PCM Principle** *states: "The Specific Objective (or the Purpose) of Development Projects, Programs and Policies must always be expressed in terms of Sustainable Benefits for the "Intended Beneficiaries" (or "Target Group").*

This principle is *the only rigid element* of 3PCM. It is its *Master Principle.* If one cannot express one's project/program/policy objectives in terms of **who** is to benefit and **how,** then something must be seriously wrong indeed with one's intentions. Please note that such benefits will cover a wide range of elements that may concur to durably improve the quality of life of the intended beneficiaries. Thus, benefits will not only comprise such classical advantages as, for instance, increased income, sufficient consumption of potable water or easy access to hospital or education services. Indeed: Less obvious examples as, for example, not contracting aids, enjoying freedom of expression or a diminished probability of getting mugged in a dark street corner at night might claim equal if not greater importance. Thus, everything that will ensure a lasting improvement of the quality of life for people within the target group will be part of their sustainable benefits.

Surely, there cannot be many dissenting voices who would not accept that development cooperation should serve to improve the living standards of the people for whom the entire effort is being organized.

What else is "help to self-help" meant to mean? If this is so, then the first 3PCM principle should command massive support by donors and recipients alike. Everything in 3PCM is "debatable" with the exception of this principle. If there are dissenting voices in that respect - and there always might be… - then it is difficult to imagine how these could be included in an exchange of views on 3PCM. 3PCM simply will not be for them…

3PCM has a very useful grammatical rule to express this concern for rigidity as to the creation of sustainable benefits for the target group, a rule that will help stakeholders to submit to the necessary discipline; *and a rule that all genuinely willing and able to practice the art and science of 3PCM Based Trade / Development; M & E / Assessment; Performance Management / Service Delivery; Procurement; HR-PESCR; Diplomacy; Democracy / Elections; Defense / Security; Finance / Banking and ICT / Digital Technology etc Systems need to learn by heart.*

Within 3PCM Benefits Focused Approach, this Master Principle cannot and should not be unilaterally expressed by a single individual: Internal Consultant, External Consultant or relevant Stakeholder. If this were done, there would always be fundamental issues of Ownership and Inclusion – threatening the project, program, policy and preventing it from achieving optimum success on a sustainable basis for the one third successful projects; while accounting for flaws in the second third and accounting for failure in the last third.

The 3PCM Instrument corresponding to the 3PCM Master principle

This instrument has been around for several decades: it is the "Logical Framework Matrix", developed by a US consultancy firm, "Practical Concepts Inc.", around 1970 for the American bilateral aid agency "USAID". Its "vertical logic", linking inputs to outputs, outputs to the project purpose and the project purpose to the overall goal, and its "horizontal logic", linking the categories just mentioned to indicators, their sources of verification and corresponding assumptions, has profoundly influenced 3PCM. But 3PCM uses the "logframe" much less as a project design instrument than initially intended (experience shows that it has important weaknesses in that respect).

In 3PCM, the logframe serves as a tool for checking the project logic and for summing up project content. According to the first 3PCM principle, the text to appear in the square reserved in the logframe for the enunciation of the project purpose must be formulated in terms of the creation of sustainable benefits for the target group. The preceding discussion has shown how this concern can and should find its "grammatical" expression. But a grammatical rule is not only useful for the formulation of the project purpose: such rule should also apply to the formulation of the outputs and to that of the activities:

We find that in reality there is increasing divergence between intention and application of logframe, particularly in the second third of flawed project/ program/ policy results and in the last third of failed project / program / policy work. In 3PCM we seek to significantly improve convergence between intention and application of the logframe in reviewed flawed and failed project/ program / policy work and in new project / program and policy work.

As to the *outputs,* one should distinguish between (a) the period between the beginning and the end of the construction period of the initial investment and (b) the period of functioning of that investment between the latter mentioned point in time   (i. e. after the initial investment is finished) and the beginning of the time after reaching the break even point, i. e. as of the moment when the "hardware" installed starts producing the goods/services planned according to the "software", covering all current functioning, maintenance and depreciation costs. Such covering of current costs will apply to marketable

as well as to public goods and services. In the first case, market prices (for, say, palm oil) will have to be sufficient for cost coverage whereas in the second case (for, say, internal and external security, public transport, education etc…) cost coverage will involve total or partial financing through tax financed public subsidies. Total financial involvement of donor and recipient, for the production of marketable as well as of public goods and services, will have to extend to both periods: (a) and (b). Only then, i. e. after the end of periods (a) *and* (b), will the project be able to "run under its own steam". Only then the intervention will have been "cost-effective".

The end of the "hardware" investment (a) should be indicated using the *perfect tense*, for instance: "Oil Palm Plantation and Palm Oil Factory *installed*"; "Drinking Water and Sewerage Systems *constructed*"; "School Building S *erected"*, etc. The end of the "software" investment and the time thereafter (b) should be marked using the gerund: "Plantation and Factory *selling* palm oil *covering* costs"; "Drinking Water and Sewerage Systems *functioning while covering costs*"; "School S *working* normally"; etc…

Activities, finally, should be specified using the infinitive, for instance: "*Construct* the school building"; "*train* the teachers"; "*inform* parents"; etc…

Practical experience shows how helpful such "grammatical discipline" is when it comes to avoiding muddled thinking…. This point is very important when we appreciate that Muddled Thinking is largely responsible for flaws in the second third of project/ program/ policy work and for failure in the last third. It is clear that all Stakeholders in National and International Development Cooperation Policy, Program, Project Initiative and Policy, Program, Project Intervention Training as One need to be supported to deploy the Art and Science of Thinking in their daily work.

The second, third and fourth 3PCM Principles and the tools corresponding to them

The **second 3PCM Principle** *states: All of the essential criteria for successful development cooperation project / program / policy preparation, implementation and monitoring, evaluation and assessment, as taught by experience, should be considered.*

So as to make sure that professional wisdom guided the choice of these criteria, the DG VIII Evaluation Division set out to learn all it could concerning the most important project/program preparation, implementation/monitoring and evaluation criteria that had necessarily to be taken into consideration with a view to avoiding project/program failure.

It asked the members of the OECD DAC Working Group on Aid Evaluation to provide their manuals/handbooks containing these criteria. It took on board the results of two years' work of the Group on sustainability. And it studied the latest developments in "Logical Framework Analysis" ("LFA"), above all the improvements of this approach as introduced by various DAC members. Most of the inputs as well as the fundamental concepts that made this work possible came, thus, from the Group. Drawing together the knowledge accumulated in this way, the Evaluation Division drafted the "Basic Format" that was henceforth to guide the establishment of the "Terms of Reference" (ToR) for the studies and the other routine documentation pertaining to each phase of the project cycle.

The "Basic Format" was to combine top quality with extreme conciseness: concentration on the essentials seemed, indeed, vital as it would guarantee that at least the really important aspects were never neglected. The resulting format was included in the "Manual on Project Cycle Management,

Integrated Approach and Logical Framework, Commission of the European Communities, February 1993".

A revised version of this text has been produced. The revisions were included subsequent to the results of the ongoing professional debate on the issues in question up to the present. Here again, the lessons drawn from material made available by the Group (meanwhile called "Working Party") were essential. Later periodic revisions, should allow keeping in step with new insights as they become available. ***The "2009 version" of the "Basic Format", is the "instrument" Eggers considers up to date, corresponding to the second 3PCM principle.***

We find that in reality there is increasing divergence between intention and reality of earlier versions up to the 2009 version: the evidence being that real and complex human factor, political process, technical process, financial factor and consultation process problems on the ground hinder achieving Global Solutions to Global Problems Initiative Ambition and are still the same or worse than when the 1985 Evaluation Assignment was done. To avoid or substantially reduce these flaws, that is more substantially increase convergence between intention and reality in the second and third categories, that is substantially reduce the number of flawed projects / programs/ policies and failed projects / programs / policies, the way Evaluation Assignments are commissioned and executed today will have to change.

The point we are making is that there is urgent need to review the 2009 version, if this Instrument is to contribute meaningfully to tackling headlong all real and complex M & E Advocacy, M & E Innovation, M & E Politics and M & E Protection Problems on the ground from Village to Global levels.

The **Third 3PCM Principle** *states: There should be sound decision making discipline all along the development cooperation project / program / policy cycle.*

Decision making not geared towards the creation of sustainable benefits for the target group was recognized by the Evaluation Division of DG VIII as one of the major reasons for project failure. As underlined earlier, political pressure on both, the donor and the recipient sides, were found to be mainly responsible for this situation:

Indeed, in an atmosphere were staff in funding agencies and in recipient countries are judged predominantly by the speed of their "financial throughput", it becomes exceedingly difficult to care for and to achieve the creation of sustainable benefits for target groups who tend to be forgotten in spite of the fact that the entire enterprise should exclusively serve their ends and interests. Converting outputs into outcomes becomes less important than converting inputs into outputs, and in turn, converting money into inputs becomes more important than converting inputs into outputs, and that will be the end of any rational project/program work…

An application of the third 3PCM principle will make this haphazard (while opportunistic!) decision making impossible. Its corresponding "tool" is the "Format of Phases and Decisions". If not applied, this Format is just another piece of paper, and it must be admitted, of course, that it will not be easy to convince political decision makers to change their ways and to put target group interests first (which cannot be served by the usual "quick-and-dirty approaches"). But it does not seem impossible. Often, these decision makers have perfectly respectable intentions and simply do not know any better. If they care to, they will quickly understand the rules of sound 3PCM decision making as spelt out in the

Format. They will be all the more willing to learn when they realize that the third 3PCM principle, far from curtailing their prerogatives to spell out the political choices and priorities, actually help them to achieve their (legitimate) political goals.

The six project/program phases defined in the Format have indeed been chosen in such a way that the decisions to be taken (when passing from a given phase to the next or within a given phase) represent the decisive junctures that condition project success in terms of the creation of sustainable benefits for the target group.

We find that in reality there is still no framework for tackling headlong fundamental issues of political pressure on both the donor and recipient sides. The Format is in reality just another piece of paper. However, the real problems on the ground are DIFFICULT but Not IMPOSSIBLE to solve on a successful and sustainable basis. If concerned Stakeholders are willing, the Format could, instead of being just another piece of paper, achieve the purpose for which it has been conceived.

In 3PCM, there is a Single Conceptual Framework for tackling headlong all real and complex human factor, political process, technical process, capacity building, financial factor, consensus building and consultation process problems on the ground, hindering achieving Global Solutions to Global Problems Initiative Ambition, One UN Initiative Ambition, One MDG Ambition, One International Development Cooperation Ambition, One Global M & E Initiative Ambition and National Vision Ambitions on International Institutions, Developed Countries and Developing Countries sides.

This Single Conceptual Frameworks of Dialogue, Cooperation and Reform, accepted by all concerned Stakeholders would ensure that all Stakeholders genuinely commit to working towards achieving significant improvement in convergence between intention and application of the logframe within a redesigned project/ program / policy concept, particularly concerning the second flawed project/ program/ policy and the last failed project/ program / policy categories.

The fourth **3PCM Principle** *states: All stakeholders relevant for successful development cooperation project / program / policy research, planning, statistics, implementation monitoring, evaluation and assessment, as taught by experience, should be fully included as soon as possible from inception right through all relevant stages up to completion and closure.*

The non inclusion of one or more stakeholders for whatsoever reason was recognized by EAG as one of the major reasons for project failure. An application of the fourth 3PCM Principle would eliminate or significantly reduce this exclusion whether due to acts of omission or commission.

Its corresponding "tool" is the "Master Assessment Framework, MAF". If not applied, this MAF is just another piece of paper, and it must be admitted, of course, that it will not be easy to convince political decision makers, commissioners and managers of evaluation to change their ways and to ensure that no stakeholder group is excluded. But it does not seem impossible. Often, as is the case with the third 3PCM Principle, these decision makers / managers have perfectly respectable intentions and simply do not know any better. If they care to, they will quickly understand the rules of sound 3PCM decision making as spelt out in the MAF. They will be all the more willing to learn when they realize that the fourth PCM principle, far from curtailing their prerogatives to spell out the political choices and priorities, actually help them to achieve their (legitimate) political and economic goals.

The four Main 3PCM Practices

There are four more 3PCM "cardinal points". The "**Four Main 3PCM Practices**". They constitute the bridge between theory and hands-on practice.

The First Main 3PCM Practice

To begin with, the essential message conveyed by the four 3PCM principles and its four tools and the four 3PCM Practices; should be familiar to ALL of the agents bearing responsibility along the chain of service delivery of development cooperation projects, programs and policies; no matter whether that responsibility pertains to policy setting, to technical, to financial, to political, to human resources, to consultation, to negotiation or to any other operational or management functions, and irrespective of whether these agents belong to donor or recipient countries.

Voluminous handbooks will not be able to transmit this essential message: many people who should will simply not read them, even less absorb their contents and still less apply them. So, if the complex development cooperation machinery is to speak with one voice and to pursue a common purpose, the "creation of sustainable **benefits** for the target groups", then concentration on the essentials is a "sine qua non". The 3PCM principles, tools and practices can be summed up on less than five pages.

Eggers underlined this issue when giving a seminar on 3PCM, some years ago, to employees of the biggest Spanish non-governmental development cooperation agency, called "Manos Unidas". There was a young man who held up his hand and said: "I can express this message not on five pages but in five words: 'Beneficios Sostenibles para Grupos Destinatarios". There was a moment's silence, and then there was a young lady who held up her hand and said: I can express this message not in five words but in five letters: "BESOS" (BE neficios SOS tenibles), which means, of course, KISSES, (and this is the reason why this mnemotechnical gimmick works in Spanish only). There was another little pause, and then someone started to sing: "Besame, besame mucho…", with the whole group joining in. So much for the first main 3PCM practice: concentration on the essentials.

Without taking anything away from the excitement demonstrated by the Spaniards, Is this 5 Page Summary TRUE in Reality and helpful in achieving Spanish 3PCM Ambitions on a successful and sustainable basis? If yes, why is Spain not leading the World in the deployment of 3PCM towards the solution of Spain's National Development and International Development Complex Problems on the ground?

The fundamental issue of Communication of 3PCM Principles, Instruments and Practices; Communication and Utilization of 3PCM Reports, is a Challenge that needs to be professionally tackled. While summaries of up to five pages with translations in relevant local languages are useful to certain categories of stakeholders, it would be trivializing 3PCM, if 3PCM Principles, Instruments and Practices and 3PCM Reports are Not Fully Understood and Championed by ANY Agent BEARING Responsibility along the Chain of 3PCM Service Delivery.

ALL Agents with responsibility to bear, along the chain of 3PCM Service Delivery should be given Data and Information appropriate to his / her office and authority and this for many would certainly be more than 5 Pages. That people in Office with Authority over specific components within the Chain of 3PCM Service Delivery may be unwilling or unable to read appropriate documents on the

excuse that they may consider the documents to be too voluminous, rigorous or complex, is essentially Time Management, Delegation and Competencies Problems that need to be tackled headlong, rather than avoided or evaded through an attempt to reduce important information and data into 5 pages or less.

It is clear that once any Agent in his / her Office and Authority, along this Chain is operating at levels of Incompetence – Learning, Skills, Character, Courage and Mindset, the chain can only be as strong as its weakest link. Below minimum levels of strength, the Chain would simply be unable to fulfill 3PCM Service Delivery Ambitions.

The Second Main 3PCM Practice

However, and that goes really without saying, real life situations are so complex, so unpredictable, so utterly elusive that even a million pages won't do justice to them, let alone five *(confirming the point we have made above)*. Therefore, there must be a way to bridge the gulf between the essential message of 3PCM, on the one hand, and operational real life practice, on the other.

That bridge is provided by the second Main 3PCM Practice, the "Terms of Reference" (ToR). Each project, each program, each policy is a unique case that has never existed before, that will never exist again and that, moreover, will change constantly all along its cycle: it will be different today from what it was yesterday, it will be different tomorrow from what it is today.

The formulation of the ToR for each individual project/program at each phase of the cycle, to fit the uniqueness of each case at each moment in time, is thus an operational necessity that will ensure the practical relevance of 3PCM. The ToR will specify what are the detailed criteria to be observed and what are the specific decision making modalities to be chosen for each concrete intervention.

The enunciation of these criteria and of these modalities, structured according to the two "Formats" mentioned above and checked by a proper "Logical Framework Analysis" (LFA), will be the result of a thorough problems and possibilities analysis to be undertaken, involving all interested stakeholders, notably the intended beneficiaries. The ToR. can thus be thought of as the commented table of contents of each of the routine documents accompanying the project/program cycle, notably project/program identification sheets, pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies, formal financing documents like financing proposals and conventions, monitoring and progress reports and, last but not least, evaluation reports.

The ToR are, thus, the bridge connecting intentions (the future) to realizations (the past). More specifically, they are the links, always to be kept up to date and directed at the specific tasks at hand at each given moment, that link Planning to Evaluation in the medium and long term, and link Implementation to Monitoring in the short term. Irrespective of whether they pertain to the future or to the past, their structure will always be essentially the same.

In reality, are ToR used in the way set out above? In 3PCM Benefits Focused approach, we seek to ensure that ToR are used in this way as again evidenced by thoughts set out in many of our Development and Evaluation Working Papers.

The Third Main 3PCM Practice

Concerning the third of the three main 3PCM practices, it is important to recall, first of all, a fundamental lesson taught long ago by LFA (logframe analysis): given certain assumptions, each output is due to a series of activities, and the project purpose is, in its turn, achieved through a series of outputs.

It should, thus, be well understood that it is not sufficient to *teach* 3PCM. Training, indeed, is only one of the necessary activities leading to one of the necessary outputs, to wit the acquisition of the required project/program/policy design, execution and evaluation competencies – Hard Competencies – Learning and Skills and Soft Competencies – Character, Courage and Mindset: *necessary* but *not sufficient.* This type of training – Continuing Professional Education, appropriate to each Professional level, is a "project" in its own right and not just as another training exercise. That is within 3PCM, the 3PCM Initiative is an Integral part of 3PCM Training / Continuing Professional Education and 3PCM Training / Continuing Professional Education is an integral part of 3PCM Initiative.

The most promising procedure of introducing 3PCM into the operational practice of an organization or several cooperating organizations would therefore require the recognition be relevant authorities of the dynamic linkages between the 3PCM Initiative and the 3PCM Training / Continuing Professional Education.

In other words, **3PCM has to be applied to the "project"** of its own introduction of both, **the 3PCM Initiative and the 3PCM Training / Continuing Professional Education;** into development cooperation organizations, grounded on its own four Principles, guided by its own four Tools (or Instruments) and rendered operational by its own four Main Practices.

As such **project would be "people-focused", i. e. of a "soft-ware" rather than of a "hard-ware" nature, a "process approach" rather than a "blue-print approach"** would be adequate for project preparation, implementation and evaluation. This means that **participation, dialogue, mutual learning, a constant willingness to challenge and to improve 3PCM itself**, would be the dominating elements of this process.

An **operational application of 3PCM** by participating organizations in donor and partner countries alike would lead to a **common thrust of their activities** giving rise to a **visible, general improvement of development cooperation effectiveness** and to a **considerable easing of the administrative burden** to be borne by recipient countries' administrations. An **ongoing exchange of views** conducted in a **spirit of a creative debate** among such organizations could, moreover, be instrumental in achieving further improvements in 3PCM, **enriching it by important new insights** already gained or becoming available in the future, **flowing from common endeavor and mutual learning**. That would **give 3PCM the dynamic nature it needs to be and to remain relevant for successful development cooperation.**

The "International Development Evaluation Association" ("IDEAS") might be expected to take up and promote such constant dynamic change and improvement. IDEAS past and current leadership appears to be unwilling to take up such challenge at this time. This is regrettable, given the fact that impact of world food, fuel, finance and terrorism problems and reoccurring global recessions, present bright

prospects of success in the work towards deploying 3PCM to help achieve increasing convergence between National and International Development Vision Intention and Reality. IDEAS can do much more to help all relevant stakeholders on Developed Countries, Developing Countries and International Institutions sides to more effectively tackle the challenge of solving these world problems, if IDEAS leadership become willing to support 3PCM in promoting dynamic change and improvement worldwide.

MPCOP-PE&ES is willing to help these stakeholders to more effectively tackle the challenge but need empowerment to be in good position to make meaningful contribution through Professionals that deploy the art and science of Original PCM within 3PCM to support these stakeholders in the work towards achieving increasing convergence between national and international development cooperation goals and targets and on schedule.

The Fourth Main 3PCM Practice

Concerning the fourth main 3PCM practice, it is important to recall, first of all, the third and fourth main 3PCM Practices are essentially two sides of the same coin and have been separated for emphasis. The third main 3PCM Practice focuses on Policy, Program and Project Cycle Management while the fourth main 3PCM Practice focuses on Comprehensive Systemic Reform (CSR). The two are similar but not the same. While the fourth 3PCM practice focuses on Pro Poor Institutional Reform and Pro Poor Economic Growth Issues, the third main 3PCM practice focuses on Strategic Management of Complex Policy, Program Project Process Issues.

That is the Fourth 3PCM practice focus on creating Sound Political, Economic, Social, Security, Cultural and Religious Space for effective and efficient Pro Poor Institutional Reform and Pro Poor Economic Growth, within Chain of Service Delivery of National and International Development Cooperation Policy / Program / Project Initiative and Policy / Program / Project Initiative Training as One – an essential condition for achieving success on sustainable basis.

Again, the "International Development Evaluation Association" ("IDEAS") might be expected to take up and promote such constant dynamic change and improvement. As noted above, IDEAS past and current leadership appears to be unwilling to take up such challenge at this time. The point made earlier regarding MPCOP-PE&ES willingness to take up the challenge, given adequate empowerment is hereby restated. It is clear that without a Professional Body – a Consortium of over 15 Disciplines relevant to Design and Delivery of National and International Development Cooperation Policy, Program, Project Initiative and Policy, Program, Project Initiative Training as One, it will be an uphill task for relevant Neighborhood to Global Stakeholders to Deploy the Art and Science of 3PCM in their day to day work.

Evaluation within 3PCM

It is pertinent to note that everything in 3PCM serves the purpose of the creation of sustainable benefits of the target group, revolving around the first Principle. The evaluation function is no exception to this rule. 3PCM considers, indeed, that evaluation has a right to exist only in the measure that it contributes to the creation of such benefits. It is never a stand-alone activity and is entirely integrated within the project/program/policy cycle.

Evaluation shares with the project preparation and implementation phases the application of the Basic Format, the techniques of the elaboration of the Terms of Reference and the review of the decision making discipline. Under 3PCM, it would not make much sense, therefore, to refine the degree of sophistication concerning evaluation methodologies in a situation marked by superficial pre-feasibility and feasibility studies, for example, or by insufficient monitoring or "political" decision making. Only if

equal care is devoted to project preparation, implementation and evaluation will careful evaluation pay dividends in terms of the creation of sustainable benefits for target groups. But then it will be of decisive importance for project/program/policy success, too. So, good planning and serious evaluation are twin brothers in 3PCM (although it should also be recognized that the first is the "big" brother and that the "little" one should support him…).

How far has PCM known an operational application until today, and can such application be further improved?

PCM was officially introduced within DG VIII of the EU Commission, by circular letter of its Director General, in January 1991, and in 1993 the method was "codified", by means of an official PCM Manual that was distributed in all of the major EEC languages in thousands of copies to as many recipients all over the world. In 1996, an independent consultancy firm proceeded to an evaluation of the application of PCM in the African, Caribbean and Pacific ("ACP") countries, the EEC's partner countries under the "Lomé" (and follow-up) Conventions.

This evaluation concluded that PCM was exceedingly well received by the EU Commission services as well as (and above all!) in the ACP countries, where the emphasis on the interests of the target groups was particularly appreciated. The evaluation concluded as well, however, that so far there were only a couple of "bridgeheads", in Brussels and in the ACP, that were trying to apply PCM to their daily work, and that it would take time for the approach to really start dominating practical ACP/EEC development cooperation.

This PCM position appear contradictory – How can an approach that is EXCEEDINGLY WELL RECEIVED be at the same time an approach where only a couple of bridgeheads in Brussels and in the ACP were trying to apply PCM to their daily work? Clearly if the former is right, then the latter is wrong and vice versa. Realities on the ground indicate that it is the latter that is right and this explains the warning that "it would take time" for the approach to really start dominating practical ACP / EEC work on both Brussels and ACP sides, we are still very far from getting to that time, as long as Decision Makers on both Brussels and ACP sides continue to seek to move forward along the same Direction and Priorities. It is very sad that 24 years after (2011), the reality is that "it would still take some time" for the approach to really start dominating practical work of not only the EC but indeed DFID, USAID, UN Agencies, other State and Non State Actors on both Developed and Developing Countries sides and other International Institutions e.g. World Bank Group; African Development Bank; Foreign Foundations e.g. Howard Graham Buffett Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation etc.

It was necessary, the evaluators said, with that aim in mind, to apply PCM to its own introduction. (Has Brussels tried to do this in the past? Is Brussels willing to do this now? Can Brussels achieve its International Development Cooperation Ambitions without doing this? Can other International / National Development Cooperation Agencies achieve their Ambitions without doing this?)

It is pertinent to note that this observation was made almost in passing. But for Eggers' understanding - and this conviction has asserted itself ever more strongly in his mind during countless discussions over recent years - this is the crucial point that will determine the ultimate fate of this methodological approach.

Given our above considerations, we cannot agree more with Eggers. However the Big Issue is What Can and Should he be doing towards ensuring that PCM and its improvement 3PCM; in its correct implementation is actually increasing convergence between Original PCM intention and reality and is effectively institutionalized and enthroned in Brussels, ACP, other Donors and Recipients across our World today in 2014, as is and not as any Stakeholder wish it to be?)

This was the "conditio sine qua non" Eggers tried to underline when talking of the first of the four "Main 3PCM Practices" as mentioned earlier. As long as official circles in development cooperation think that it is enough to teach PCM and that it is not necessary to insist, for example, on the need for a thorough involvement of senior administrators and of politicians, on the need to eliminate spending pressures as budget deadlines draw near, on the need to review the entire documentation accompanying the project/program/policy cycle concentrating on the creation of sustainable benefits for target groups, as long, Eggers thinks and we agree, that the potential of 3PCM will not be realized in full or at all.

The "latest cry" in an effort, by the EU Commission, to keep PCM up to date, is contained in a Commission document called: "Project Cycle Management Guidelines, Supporting effective implementation of EC External Assistance, March 2004". It reflects the essential substance of PCM as treated by Eggers in a PCM Interview used in preparing this paper, but it does not mention the "Four Main Practices" described above and thus lacks what Hellmut consider the decisive link between theory and practice. This seems to Eggers to be the reason for the lack of real progress in the operational application of PCM that appears to be observable until today – reasons that 3PCM seek to help jointly with concerned stakeholders find successful and sustainable professional solutions to.(Please imagine what Progress could have been made in the Past 10 years had EC latest cry yielded desired Results or if World Bank World Development Report 2004 was implemented in ways that Strengthened this EC Cry or if the 10 years review of WDR 2004 in March 2014 identified these flaws and took pro active steps to correct same).

Is there room for PCM improvement? Could it be that the PCM limitations Eggers mentioned are due, at least in part, to shortcomings of the PCM approach itself? What are its weaknesses and what are the circumstances to which it is well suited, and those to which it is less well suited?

Eggers, is grateful for this question as he interprets it as a firm invitation never to confuse dream and reality, although he also thinks that one should never stop dreaming…

First of all, he repeats that the application of the four "Main 3PCM Practices" is very important with a view to ensuring the practical relevance of 3PCM. As he underlined before, especially the third Main 3PCM Practice, the application of 3PCM to its own introduction, is indispensable, otherwise all genuinely interested in effectively deploying 3PCM towards achieving International / National Development Cooperation ambitions on a successful and sustainable basis, will never get much beyond the stage of good intentions.

This gap in the range of measures to be employed in the practical application of PCM, according to the above mentioned "PCM Guidelines" of 2004, is responsible, he believes, for the as yet limited impact of PCM on project planning, implementation and evaluation in EU development cooperation

and other International / National Development Cooperation Agencies. This is regrettable but is not due to a shortcoming of the method itself.

It seems to Eggers, however, that the method might still be further improved by:-
(a) a systematic attention to questions of responsibility ("who should do what?") and
(b) the establishment of a systematic documentation on how to deal with given development sectors, instruments and themes in different parts of the world.
Eggers comments briefly on each of these two points:-

Stakeholders' Responsibilities

Nothing gets done without well motivated and competent people on the donor as well as on the recipient side, a fact that is so obvious that it does not require extra emphasis. A rule, however, that does seem worthy of special attention is linked to a concern that might be called the "principle of subsidiarity" in the allocation of responsibilities: All that can be done at lower hierarchical levels of organizations involved should be left there and should not be moved up to higher levels. This rule of decentralization will do more for the promotion of "ownership" and professional drive and motivation than many a sophisticated "incitement" scheme.

Eggers has incorporated this aspect in the Third 3PCM Instrument, the Basic Format, where it was lacking up to recently.

We agree with this point. However, effective and efficient deployment of 3PCM towards achieving One UN Initiative Ambition, One MDG Ambition, One International Development Cooperation Ambition, One Global M & E Initiative Ambition and End Poverty, Hunger, Disease and Terrorism Ambitions greatly depends on Rethinking, Redesigning and Rebuilding – Development, Defense, Diplomacy, Democracy and M & E Systems from Village to Global Levels and this requires Rear Breed of Individuals from both Developed and Developing Countries sides who have the required levels of Hard Competencies; Learning and Skills and Soft Competencies: Character, Courage and Mindset - to be Change Makers and Change Champions, Driving Change in the Sub National, National and International Development.

The PCM Database

The question of how to ensure effective organizational learning, making sure lessons learned are heeded, absorbed and not "lost" (especially those learned from evaluations), has always exercised the professional minds of those involved in development co-operation but has not yet found a really satisfactory answer. One could fill whole libraries with evaluation reports gathering dust in forgotten filing cabinets without having been put to operational use. Is there a solution to this intractable problem of the lack of systematic, long-lasting feedback?

Eggers thinks there is, in the following way:-

Review the "Basic Format" for its application to each of the major *development sectors* of Infrastructure, Industry, Agriculture, Public Health, Education etc… and then adapt each of the resulting "Formats" to the specific conditions of given regions and/or countries. Write extensive "comments" to each of these sector formats. Proceed similarly with the major *development instruments*, like stabilization mechanisms for counterbalancing price oscillations on world markets for primary products exported by developing

countries; like "structural adjustment" and direct budgetary support, like trade promotion operations; like co-financings with non-governmental organizations; etc… Proceed, again, similarly with important "cross-cutting" _development themes_, like: "Environment", "Gender Issues", Good Governance etc… per sector and region/country, with assorted extensive "comments".

It is clear that this process will lead to the creation of an extensive "development cooperation library" that today, of course, will assume the form of a worldwide "e-Forum" or Database, to be established, reviewed, kept up to date and shared among organizations interested. This Forum would have to be managed by specialists of the different sectors, instruments and themes in question who would have to make sure that it is kept up to date, systematically incorporating evaluation results as they become available and also making sure they receive due attention in the planning, the implementation/monitoring and evaluation of new development cooperation interventions. That would be an effective guarantee against systematic "forgetting" of "lessons learned" that today is the rule, not the exception.

Periodic up-dating would also have to include revisions of the very structure of the Material included in the "e-Forum of Identification Information System; Management Information System; Geodesign Information System and Manpower Information System": If, for instance (as has happened in recent years), price and other stabilization mechanisms go "out of fashion", to be replaced by, say, "Partnership Global Budget Support", the e-Forum structure would have to reflect such important change. That way, the Forum would resemble more a living and evolving organism rather than a cold and rigid machine.

The establishment and periodic review of this Forum or Database would also allow submitting 3PCM itself to constant challenging by professional debate and by evaluations and thus lead to its systematic improvement. It would be a treasure of knowledge to be created, to be kept up to date and to be exploited by all. Together with the "Four 3PCM Principles", the "Four 3PCM Tools or Instruments" and the "Four 3PCM Practices", it would become the method's tenth cardinal point, and a "point" of impressive dimensions it would be…: the "3_PCM Database"_.

Please note that the consultation of this Database, in spite of its impressive volume, can easily be arranged in such a way that it becomes a concise, easy-to-handle instruments at the service of planners and evaluators alike who will be just a mouse-click away from accessing the guidance they are looking for: in an order of diminishing importance and increasing volume, so that they can stop such consultation whenever they feel that they are well informed enough to act responsibly and professionally.

**Eggers is convinced that, again, "IDEAS" might be well suited to undertake the establishment and the running of such Database, and that, if this could be arranged, a dramatic improvement of development cooperation quality, its efficiency and effectiveness, would ensue. It is clear IDEAS has no interest in running such Database. An alternative may be MPCOP-PE&ES, if empowered and or Developed Countries, Developing Countries and International Institutions themselves individually or collectively.**

**Our study findings and real experience over the past 21 years (1993 – 2014) of continuing constructive engagement of concerned stakeholders on International Institutions, Developed and Developing Countries sides, including our experience of low response from many that have sent Expressions of Interest (EOI) to join MPCOP-PE&ES and to join the M & E Standards Discussion on the MandENews Yahoo Group; all these provides supporting evidence for our position. The way forward is to strengthen the 3PCM Approach in its work towards creating Development and Evaluation Conceptual Frameworks that are Too Tempting or Too Threatening for World Leaders to Continue to Ignore.**

Once the Conceptual Framework is accepted and publicly supported by Influential World Leaders, necessary Orders for provision of relevant information and data required to build the database will be issued. Civil Servants at Sub National, National and International Levels are fully aware of the consequences of failure to comply with such Orders. With full Political Support and Funding Support, there are enough Professionals with Basic Hard Competencies and Soft Competencies that could be Continuously Trained and Retrained to Build and Maintain the Database on a successful and sustainable basis.

Other weaknesses?

Eggers now turns to those weaknesses that even the best methodological approaches cannot ward off:-

First of all, 3PCM cannot replace good workmanship: if data collection and treatment are unprofessional, if the wrong choice of indicators lead to "proof" of phenomena that don't exist or that are irrelevant, if complex interventions for the development of human resources are treated as though they could be squeezed into blue-prints, then the mere use of the 3PCM "label" will be unable to lead to any improvement. Bad projects cannot be turned into good projects that way.

Neither can 3PCM replace lack of motivation and shaky morals: Those who really don't care about the outcome of their work for anybody but themselves and those who confuse public interest with private gain will not be swayed by 3PCM to do an honest job in favor of poor people.

Eggers thinks, however, that both, the bad technician as well as the corrupt official or politician, will prefer working outside the framework of 3PCM as the approach makes it less easy to "cheat": If 3PCM is "officially" applicable, then they will have to "explain" (invent!) all the time why their way of acting will lead to the creation of sustainable benefits for the target group rather than to meeting their own ends according to their hidden agendas. That will be extremely awkward for them. So, 3PCM might seriously damage if not the health, at least the peace of mind of such people. But all of this is not a weakness specific to 3PCM but is shared by any other methodological approach as well.

Moreover, Eggers does not think that there is any possible case or that there are any special circumstances in project/program/policy work where the application of 3PCM would not lead to an improvement. He might be totally wrong in this, he says, and he would be more than willing to listen to any serious argument designed to convince him of any errors, but until such time he'll hold this opinion.

We agree with this thinking.

3PCM is compatible with any of the evaluation methodologies that have proven their worth so far: Quantitative as well as qualitative methods, any of the well known methods and tools of economic and financial analysis, positivist up to constructivist stances, the whole range from blue-print to process approaches, from "random experiments" to "case studies", they are all compatible with 3PCM.

3PCM is, moreover, applicable to areas other than development cooperation. It is applicable to any project, to any program, to any policy, always and anywhere. I have been involved for instance, says Eggers, in helping to apply 3PCM to a systematic effort, in Italy, to improve the performance of schools in Campania, and "I am surprised not by the specificity of that case and by the difficulties to adapt 3PCM to that unique situation but rather the contrary: I am surprised by how evident and relatively easy it appears (but it would, of course, require a longer article in its own right to explain why…) So, summing up, I would say: limitations to what 3PCM can do: of course; but none of them specific to that approach. There is always "added value" to be gained by its application to projects, programs and policies..."

The real weaknesses are unwillingness of Political, Public Service and Civil Service Leaders in Developed Countries, Developing Countries, International Institutions and National Institutions to accept failure of their systems and the urgent need to overhaul these systems. This is reinforced by the fact that those benefiting from the decay do not want change and those likely to benefit from overhauled systems do nothing to help achieve change until success becomes clear even to the Blind, because for them to be safe is better than to be sorry.

The WIN – LOSE System in Operation over the years gives disproportional benefits to the Oppressor over the Oppressed, Rewards Vice / Bad Behavior and Punishes Virtue / Good Behavior. The Reality of the ongoing Global Recession is that Citizens in Developed Countries' Political Capitals – Washington, London etc, are finding with increasing ANGER that Washington has been unable or unwilling to Solve America's Complex National / International Development and other Complex Problems on the ground; London has been unable or unwilling to Solve Britain's Complex National / International Development and other Complex Problems on the ground; and respective Capitals have been unable or unwilling to solve their Countries Complex National / International Development and other Complex Problems on the ground. There is Similar Anger on Developing Countries sides. These current national and international developments at a time of elections in the US, UK and other Countries present bright prospects of success persuading and/or pressuring Political Leaders in both Developed and Developing Countries to try and test alternative solutions within 3PCM. This is an Opportunity that should Not be Squandered.

MandENews Yahoo Standards Discussion

A 2011 MandENews Yahoo Group M & E Standards Discussion raised fundamental issues of:-
1. *Corruption and related practices that reward bad M & E Professionals and punish good M & E Professionals, so there is no incentive to encourage adoption of 3PCM Approaches hence the low acceptance of MPCOP-PE&ES Membership we are recording in reality.*
2. *Poor Hard Competencies and Soft Competencies being continuously demonstrated by the bad M & E Professionals whom the existing Competencies Framework select as preferred bidders.*
3. *Lack of an M & E Standards Framework, so there is no basis for providing assurance to M & E Services Users and Protection to M & E Services Providers, particularly to those among good M & E Professionals who manage to get Patronage.*
4. *More Poor Environment – Political Space, Economic Space, Social Space, Cultural Space, Religious Space that Promote and Protect Bad Thinking; Bad Politics and Bad M & E and Less Good Environment – . And less Political Space, Economic Space, Social Space, Cultural Space, Religious Space that Promote and Protect Good Thinking; Good Politics and Good M & E.*
5. *No Mechanism for Creating Demand for M & E as Basis for creating Supply for M & E.*

The above fundamental issues highlight the fact that M & E Systems from Village to Global Levels on Developed Countries, Developing Countries and International Institutions sides are decayed and infested with Decision Makers who lack courage and integrity and who are arrogant and ignorant and who practice corruption and injustice with impunity.

It is clear to us that 3PCM can contribute significantly towards a relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable overhaul / reform of decayed current Village to Global Development Systems and of M & E Systems, designed to evolve New Village to Global M & E Systems Fit for the 21ˢᵗ Century. Indeed, our study findings are that:-

1. *Over 99.9% of Decision Makers / Leaders in M & E Services Users, M & E Services Providers and M & E Global, Regional and National M & E Organizations sides have Hard Competencies – Learning and Skills using Regular University Grading System – First Class, Second Class Upper, Second Class Lower, Third Class or Pass Degrees*

2. *Less than 0.1% of Decision Makers / Leaders in M & E Services Users, M & E Services Providers and M & E Global, Regional and National M & E Organizations have Soft Competencies – Character, Courage and Mindset using University Medical School Grading System – Distinction or Pass Degree.*

3. *(1) and (2) largely explain why current Village to Global M & E Systems on both Developed Countries, Developing Countries and International Institutions are so decayed and so infested with Decision Makers / Leaders who lack courage and integrity and who are arrogant, ignorant and who practice corruption and injustice with impunity.*

If 3PCM is to meaningfully help concerned stakeholders achieve One UN Initiative Ambition, One MDG Ambition, One International Development Cooperation Ambition, One Global M & E Initiative Ambition and help End Poverty, Hunger, Disease and Terrorism then:-

1. *Over 80% of Decision Makers / Leaders in M & E Services Users, M & E Services Providers and M & E Global, Regional and National M & E Organizations should have both Hard Competencies – Learning and Skills and Soft Competencies – Character, Courage and Mindset using University Medical School Grading System – Distinction or Pass Degree.*

2. *World Leaders need to accept that M & E, Procurement, Human Rights in all its Ramifications – Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Service Delivery have each emerged as Interlinked, Interconnected and Interdependent Professions and that these new Professions should be Governed by Self regulatory Professional Bodies. That is in each Developed and Developing Country there is urgent need to:-*

   a) *Establish or Reestablish Departments / Divisions / Units in all Government Ministries / Departments / Agencies for each of the 6 Re-established / Established Professions*

   b) *Establish or Reestablish Professional Cadre in the Public Service and Civil Service at all tiers of Government for each of the 6 Re-established / Established Professions*

   c) *Establish National, Regional and Global Self regulatory Professional Bodies for each of the 6 Re-established / Established Professions*

3. *World Leaders need to help Create Demand for M & E as BASIS for creating Supply for M & E*

4. *World Leaders need to help Create Capacity Building for M & E Services Providers and M & E Services Users through:-*

   a) *Creating the necessary Political Space, Economic Space, Social Space, Cultural Space and religious Space for M & E Services Users and M & E Services Providers.*

   b) *Overhauling and Strengthening M & E Services Providers Institutions and M & E Services Users Institutions.*

c) Creating Career Development Opportunities for individuals in M & E Services Users and Individuals in M & E Services Providers.

New Communication Strategy

The Operation in Practice of the Value Orientation Dimension of 3PCM Approach towards achieving One UN Initiative Ambition, One MDG Ambition, One International Development Ambition, One Global M & E Initiative Ambition and Helping to End Poverty, Hunger, Disease and Terrorism, is essentially a "Country Partnership Strategy" or "Living Strategy" taking shape as it is put into practice. This Living Strategy comprises a "Communication Strategy" that is aimed at Building an accurate and up-to-date understanding of the "Business of Business": as the Primary Focus of the Private Sector and the "Business of Governance" as the Primary Focus of Government at all tiers in each Country – Developed or Developing. It is important to meaningfully involve all Citizens and Foreign Stakeholders in building National and International Consensus. Without such consensus, the Principles of Business of Business and Business of Governance cannot be implemented

The 3PCM Approach recognizes that turning Researches into Policy, Program, Project Entrepreneurs or M & E Entrepreneurs and turning Researchers' Institutions into Policy, Program, Project focused or M & E Focused Think Tanks is not easy because it involves:-

1. **Fundamental re-orientation, organization and discipline towards Policy, Program, Project Continuing Constructive Engagement or M & E Continuing Constructive Engagement rather than academic achievement;**

2. **Engaging much more vigorously with Policy, Program, Project Community or M & E Community; Developing a Consultative Research Agenda focusing on Policy, Program, Project or M & E real Sectors / Services / issues, Problems on the ground from Village to Global levels on both Developed and Developing Countries sides;**

3. **Building and Strengthening multidisciplinary teams of Experts in one or more Sectors / Services / Issues with sound knowledge of M & E and Experts in M & E with sound knowledge of one or more Sectors / Services / Issues. These teams should be genuinely committed to acquiring simultaneously New Hard Competencies – Learning and Skills and Soft Competencies – Character, Courage, Mindset; and deploying their New Hard and Soft Competencies in their daily work.**

4. **Establishing New Internal Systems and New Incentives, Re-establishing Old Internal Systems and Old Incentives and Spending much more Talent, Treasure and Time on Communicating much more effectively and efficiently with all concerned Stakeholders.**

Effective ACTIONS in (1) – (4) should include Dialogue before, during and after the Consultative Research itself; producing appropriate Communication Products for each audience, at the Right Time and working more in Effective Partnerships and networks. It also involves looking at a Radically Different Funding Model. To successfully influence Policy, Program, Project Decision Makers and M & E Decision Makers in all concerned Stakeholder Communities, Researchers for Good Thinking, Good Politics, Good Economic Development and Good M & E, there is a need for additional Hard and Soft Competencies. They need to be Politically Influential, able to understand the Politics, the Economics, the Sociology, the Culture, the Environment and the Religious persuasions they deal with and to correctly identify the Key Players. They need to be Good Story Tellers, to Synergize and Leverage Simple Compelling Stories from Real Results of the Consultative Research (Not Spin Doctors who publicize falsehood). They need to be Good Net Workers, to work effectively with all other Concerned Stakeholders and they need to be Good Engineers to Build Shared Political and Economic Vision Initiatives that Effectively Pulls these Together, and they have

also to be able to work on multidisciplinary teams with others who have the necessary Hard and Soft Competencies to Effectively Compliment their own Hard and Soft Competencies.

Further details on Frameworks and Processes within 3PCM Benefits Focused Approach would be made available to Service Providers, Managers, Commissioners and Policy / Decision Makers, who demonstrate genuine interest towards deploying the art and science of 3PCM in their daily work and in ways that continuously improve Learning, Performance and Results in the work towards achieving Global / National Visions Ambitions of International Institutions, Developed Countries and Developing Countries. These details are set out in Generic MAF and Testing MAF Documents.

Contact:

Secretariat to MPCOP-PE&ES & 3PCM Project
International Society for Poverty Elimination
Economic Alliance Group
Abuja Nigeria; Kent UK
Email: nehap.initiative@yahoo.co.uk

July 2014
"Master Assessment Framework"

Foreword

MAF is for Researchers, Planners, Statisticians, Implementers, Monitors, Evaluators and Assessors. Work on the Evaluation side – Monitors, Evaluators and Assessors has been done. Work on Implementation side – Implementers and Planning side – Researchers, Planners and Statisticians would be done as part of MAF testing.

MAF is a Master Toolbox – Single Agenda Implementation Framework (SAIF). MAF consists of a set of Interlinked, Interconnected and Interdependent Frameworks within 3PCM (Policy, Program, Project Cycle Management) Approach. MAF is the 4th Instrument / Tool in 3PCM. The Instruments in SAIF are:-

1. Standard Budget Framework, SBF

2. Standard Changing Attitude and Behavior at Scale Framework, SCABS

3. Standard Commissioning Framework, SCmF

4. Standard Competencies Framework, SCpF

5. Standard Knowledge and Communications Framework, SKCF

6. Standard Lessons Learning Framework, SLLF

7. Standard Marketing Communications Framework, SMCF

8. Standard Measures of Success Framework, SMSF

Work on SBF, SCABS, SCmF, SCpF, SKCF, SLLF, SMCF and SMSF would also be done as part of MAF Testing.

This MAF is built upon 3PCM Benefits Focused Approach to Trade / Development; Monitoring, Evaluation and Assessment; Service Delivery / Performance Management; Elections and Democracy; Diplomacy; Defense / Security; Procurement; Human Rights in all its Ramifications – Political, economic, Social and Cultural Rights, HR-PESCR; Environment / Climate Change; Management; Governance; Capacity Building; Competencies Assessment / Testing and Poverty

This MAF assumes a Community of Practice (COP) whose members are Professionals genuinely committed to deploying the Art and Science of Practice of a known Approach, such as 3PCM in their daily work. The COP will have responsibility for Professional Regulation and Control, Professional Ethics and Sanctions Enforcement, Continuing Professional Education and related matters. For Professionals on both Service Users and Service Providers sides adopting MAF built upon 3PCM Approach, the COP is MPCOP-PE&ES (Multidisciplinary Professionals Community of Practice on Poverty Elimination and Environmental Sustainability) with 10 Professional Societies: Trade / Development; Monitoring, Evaluation and Assessment; Service Delivery / Performance Management; HR-PESCR, Management etc. When fully operational MPCOP-PE&ES would be present in 8 Regions Worldwide – US, Canada and Western Europe; West and central Africa, Eastern and Southern Africa, North Africa and Middle East; Latin America and Caribbean; South Asia, East Asia and Pacific; Central and Eastern Europe and CIS and speak 6 Official Languages – Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

MAF is generic. It could be adapted to suit the unique and specific needs of any Developed Country; Developing Country or International Institution.

Preamble (extract from Paris Declaration, 2005):

"We reaffirm the commitments made at Rome to harmonize and align aid delivery. We are encouraged that many donors and partner countries are making aid effectiveness a high priority, and we reaffirm our commitment to accelerate progress in implementation, especially in the following areas:
i. Strengthening partner countries' national development strategies and associated operational frameworks (e.g. planning, budget and performance assessment frameworks);
ii. Increasing alignment of aid with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures and helping to strengthen their capacities;
iii. Enhancing donors' and partner countries' respective accountability to their citizens and parliaments for their development policies, strategies and performance;
iv. Eliminating duplication of efforts and rationalizing donor activities to make them as cost-effective as possible.
v. Reforming and simplifying donor policies and procedures to encourage collaborative behavior and progressive alignment with partner countries' priorities, systems and procedures…

Indicator 11: Results-oriented frameworks – Number of countries with transparent and monitorable performance assessment frameworks to assess progress against (a) the national development strategies and (b) sector programs."

PART A: Introduction

1. The "Paris Declaration" (PD) underlines the need for the establishment, by developing countries, of "Assessment Frameworks" (AFs) designed to guide and structure their involvement in International Development Cooperation. However, the PD does not define the nature of such AFs, a fact that must be considered a serious gap. The present proposal is designed to contribute to fill in this gap.

2. Traditionally, an "Assessment", in International Development Cooperation, is the analysis of a Development Intervention (Policy, Program or Project) Proposal. It is designed to judge the quality of that proposal in terms of its completeness and its justification. In judging the proposal,

donor priorities and procedures have sometimes weighed too heavily in negotiations between partners, negotiations which should lead to a version of the proposal mutually acceptable. The present draft of a "Master Assessment Framework" (MAF) is designed to be acceptable to ALL actors concerned and to facilitate such negotiations in an atmosphere of mutual respect among equal partners.

3. The MAF agreed among all partners and used to guide and structure the establishment of any proposal for any development intervention within any developing country, could go a long way to render the above mentioned negotiations superfluous or, at least, to seriously limit their length and importance. The probability of rapidly arriving at an agreement between the partners will, indeed, be greatly enhanced if the partners have arrived, prior to the establishment of a country specific "Assessment Framework" or "National Assessment Framework" (NAF), as advocated by the Paris Declaration, at a common understanding of the nature of any Assessment Framework (AF). Such understanding can thus be greatly facilitated by the establishment, in common agreement among ALL partners involved in International Development Cooperation, of such "Master Assessment Framework" (MAF) incorporating the essential features of any AF. What can be said about those "essential features"?

4. First of all, there is one common aspect ALL development interventions worthy of that name have to present, without any exception: they should **improve the living conditions** of the people at whom they are directed. In other words and employing a somewhat more technical language: In a democratic setting, all public development interventions: Policies, Programs and Projects, are designed to **realize sustainable benefits** for their target groups. The design of all Public Development Interventions, ODA co-financed or not, must be conceived on the basis of this principle. All of the MAF design elements considered below, have to serve this objective.

5. The MAF will serve as the basis for the establishment of all National Assessment Frameworks (NAFs). The NAFs, in turn, can be adapted (i. e. subdivided or "categorized") to suit more closely any regional/sector/theme specifics. Ultimately, thus, the MAF/NAFs will guide the establishment of the Terms of Reference (ToR) that structure all of the standard documents established along the 3P Cycle, for Planning as well as for Evaluation, of any specific Development Intervention: Policy, Program or Project ("3P") anywhere. Each of these Interventions will thus (a) conserve its unique individuality while (b) incorporating the common wisdom as enshrined in the MAF/NAFs. The above mentioned standard documents will comprise: "3P Idea" documents, pre-feasibility studies, feasibility studies, implementation and monitoring reports, evaluation reports and assessment reports. If thus applied in operational practice, the MAF will help development partners to assess the extent to which development interventions have contributed to poverty alleviation, wealth creation, reduction of inequalities, capacity building, governance, all of which will culminate in sustainable benefits for target groups.

6. If applied according to points 4. And 5 above, the MAF will also be extremely useful in coping with some of the great challenges facing the International Development Community today: It will facilitate the review of progress made by development partners in:

(a) achieving the "Millennium Development Goals" (MDGs);

(b) respecting commitments undertaken according to the "Paris Declaration" (PD) and the "Accra Agenda for Action" (AAA), as well as other international / national development cooperation commitments.

7. The fact that, thus, planning, implementation, evaluation and assessment should be conceived along the same lines of reasoning will not be obvious without justification. Evaluators often give the impression that they want to stay aloof from action, thus keeping their independence, and conceiving "ad hoc" and for each 3P anew, their own terms of reference for their evaluations. This stance ignores a vital fact: Evaluators, like planners, should agree to promote, together and above anything else, the creation of conditions leading to the realization of sustainable benefits for the target groups of development interventions. What else could be the purpose of evaluations? Other than that there's none: "Benefit focused Planning" should thus be echoed by "Benefits focused Implementation" and "Benefit focused Evaluation".

8. The ToR for each 3P, as traced by the MAF/NAFs and then their progressive adaptations to sectors/themes/regions/countries down to the last specific concrete, unique project, should thus be identical for planners and for implementers and evaluators. There is just ONE fundamental difference between the application of these identical ToR by planning on the one hand and implementation / evaluation on the other: Planning is affirmative and looks forward, while Evaluation is inquisitive and looks backwards, and Implementation is constructive and looks at the moment. Planning is intention driven and considers future possibilities/probabilities, while evaluation looks exclusively at existing facts and Implementation is action driven and looks at getting results. But the questions asked in the three cases are on the same subject, point by point, as contained in the common ToR. Please notice that Planners, when trying to avoid the errors they committed "last time", are engaged in "evaluation", while evaluators, when making recommendations for future development interventions, are engaged in "planning", and implementers in seeking to get tasks done are engaged in both "planning" and "evaluation" and so they should be: Planners', Implementers' and Evaluators' minds and imaginations are ever free to travel between the realms of past and future. It is only these two realms that are never allowed to touch, forever divided, as they are, by the fleeting NOW.

9. Some evaluators may be scandalized by and violently opposed to such parallel structuring of the ToR, fearing for what they cherish most of all: their independence. Don't despair, dear colleagues! Note that the MAF and ALL its "derivatives", down to the last specific ToR for the smallest "Project" in country C, province P, will obligatorily contain one point that can never be "adapted away", and that is the point: "Other Aspects". That will give you the possibility to argue your case: you can say that the idea of identical ToR for planning and evaluation is all nonsense, and WHY. You can invent, under that point, your own ToR and restart the entire evaluation exercise accordingly. There's ONLY ONE thing that is NOT permitted by the MAF: ignoring the ToR planners have used: You MUST use them, "inter alia", as well! If you do and if planners have made a serious effort to apply MAF inspired ToR, then chances are that you will find them sufficient. If not, there's always (remember!) the point: "Other Aspects"...

10. Evaluators may find that the ToR used by planners are insufficient, erroneous or, worst of all, virtually absent. Then they will have to reconstruct what they think might have been planners' ToR and judge them in the light of the MAF/NAF.

11. Evaluators may also find that the Objective of the development intervention, even if it is expressed in terms of the realization of sustainable benefits for the intervention's target group (that's a condition sine qua non, remember!), are not convincing. Then they will propose a different objective (still expressed in terms of sustainable benefits for the target group). This case will be rare, though. In general one can expect that the objective of a development intervention, if conceived by planners within a democratic setting (that's an important point contained in the MAF), will also be acceptable to evaluators.

12. Summing up, the advantages of the parallel structuring of ToR for (forward-looking) "Benefit focused Planning", (current action) "Benefits focused Implementation" and (backward-looking) "Benefit focused Evaluation", in the light of the MAF, appear convincing: This "amalgamated system" will:

(a) make planners, implementers and evaluators of all partners agree and concentrate on the ONE topic that matters in the end: the realization of sustainable benefits for the target groups of development interventions; this being the way, impact should be expressed;

(b) make evaluation "Learning" and "Operational Feed-back" (that remain two important but unresolved problems today) part of an integrated system and therefore, as the term implies, "systematic", that's to say automatic;

(c) accumulate lessons from experience while simultaneously encouraging the necessary attention to the specifics of each individual development policy, program and project;

(d) keep lessons learned "up to date", as new insights contributed by evaluations will be routinely incorporated into the MAF/NAF system which will thus acquire and maintain its "dynamic nature";

(e) allow the development of a detailed "Data Base", containing ample comments on each important aspect presented in the MAF/NAFs, at the disposal of planners and evaluators, of implementers and monitors, of target groups and other stakeholders and the interested public (with its parliamentary representatives) in general: the volume of such data bank may turn out to be considerable, as the MAF is adapted to country/regional/sector/thematic NAFs and as these are used as the basis for specific policies, programs and projects;

(f) be easy to use (in spite of the considerable volume of the "Data Base") as the most important elements will always appear "up-front" in a highly concentrated form on a minimum of pages, thus allowing all actors to descend just to the level of information detail they need to make sure they don't miss any element, as taught by experience, that they consider important for the specific "P" of the 3P they are involved with;

(g) in that way, quite naturally, simplify the exchange of information, experience and lessons learned among all actors concerned and spread a "common development language" among stakeholders everywhere. Such common language might evolve, eventually, into a true "Communication Strategy" pursued by actors/stakeholders concerned as they learn together and act accordingly.

PART B: Master Assessment Framework (Evaluation side)

1. Summary

2. Background

2.1. Government/sectoral and Donor policies, coherence and complementarity, Democracy and Human Rights, Good Governance

2.2. Features of the sector(s) in the given country (or international) context

2.3. Problems and opportunities to be addressed (Relevance)

2.4. Beneficiaries and the other stakeholders (interests, role in the intervention)

2.5. Other related interventions, cooperation/harmonization with other donors/actors, past best practice

2.6. Documents and data available

2.7. Project/program/policy history, including (a) the process of its advocacy and preparation, (b) application of 3PCM and (c) evaluation lessons learned/applied

3. Intervention (intended and unintended results): Logic Model and Theory of Change (including indicators)

3.1. Objectives/Goals: Realization of sustainable benefits for target groups; contributions to these benefits on the (a) Project, (b) Program and (c) Policy levels (Impact)

3.2. Intervention Outcome/Purpose: Introduction of necessary conditions contributing to the realization of sustainable benefits for target groups (e.g. improved governance, better access to basic services, new knowledge and skills applied, changed attitudes and behavior) (Effectiveness)

3.3. Outputs - tangible and intangible results needed for achieving the purpose of the intervention: capital goods, products, knowledge (e.g. infrastructure, equipment installed, new capacities and skills acquired) (Efficiency)

3.4. Inputs and activities (Economy)

3.5. Flexibility mechanisms allowing the Intervention's periodic adaption

3.6. Alternative solutions

4. Assumptions

4.1. Assumptions at different intervention levels

4.2. Risks and risk management

5. Implementation

5.1. Physical and non physical means

5.2. Organization: roles and responsibilities, systems, procedures/alignment, transparency, ethics

5.3. Timetable

5.4. Cost estimate and cost-effectiveness (including non-monetary costs), financing plan

5.5. Special conditions: accompanying measures taken by Government and/or other development actors, reliability and predictability of funding, mutual accountability

6. Quality and Feasibility Factors ensuring Viability/Sustainability

6.1. Economic and financial viability

6.2. Policy support

6.3. Appropriate technology and "soft" implementation techniques

6.4. Environmental aspects

6.5 Socio-cultural aspects (including intercultural dialogue): gender issues, inclusion/participation, empowerment, ownership

6.6. Institutional and management capacity, strengthening and use of local structures (public, voluntary and private), cross-sector cooperation among actors involved, decentralization of responsibilities: subsidiarity

6.7. Innovations

7. Monitoring and Evaluation

8.1. Monitoring and reporting system, milestones

8.2. Reviews/evaluations (lessons learned and recommendations)

9. Other Aspects

10. Conclusions and proposals

Please read complementary Generic MAF Testing Document.

Contact:
ISPE / EAG
Email: nehap.initiative@yahoo.co.uk

July, 2014