

Resources, Environment and Economics Center for Studies, Inc. (REECS) and Meganomics Specialist International, Inc. Impact Assessment Study of the Agrarian Reform Communities Development Project (ARCDP), Vol. IIC Other Studies: Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES) Assessment. November 2003.

The Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES) Assessment is part of the Impact Assessment Study of the Agrarian Reform Communities Development Project (ARCDP) which aimed to examine the monitoring and evaluation system (MES) under the project to determine appropriate measures that should be undertaken for its improvement. The study was conducted through interviews with ARCDP staff who are involved in the monitoring and evaluation and those individuals involved in the review of the Project's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Manual. The effectiveness and efficiency of the MES was analyzed using five (5) criteria, namely: comprehensiveness of the system; quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) reports generated; utilization of reports; timeliness of reports; and accessibility and ease of data retrieval and processing. The results of the assessment show that there are deviations from the manual in the operationalization of the MES. Among the five (5) criteria listed, the current MES was found to have satisfactorily met timeliness and utilization criteria but was found deficient in terms of comprehensiveness, quality of data/reports, and accessibility and ease of data retrieval. Among the assumptions set forth at the start of project implementation, the study found out that only two (2) assumptions, i.e., no major tenurial issues and government continues to support agrarian reform programs through appropriate policies remain valid. The assumption on credit availability was found to be valid but the effectiveness of this to ensure investment in viable economic enterprises is constrained by farmers' negative attitude towards credit. Based on the findings of the study, the specific issues related to monitoring and evaluation were raised such as: variability in gathering monitoring data; variability in the interpretation of indicators; inadequacy of database/information; unavailability of list of individual project beneficiaries; accuracy of entries in M&E forms; undocumented results of ongoing evaluation; gaps in the evaluation functions; and difficulty in accessing stored data.