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1. Moral Reporting Programme 2017-2022

For the 2017-2022 programme period the justification towards DGD will be significantly different from the previous programme period. In this manual we focus on the annual justification through performance scores. First we will consider the performance scores as part of the more encompassing framework of moral reporting. In the second part we will show how the new justification logic is present in the performance scores. In the third part we will provide tips on how to go about filling in the performance scores in practice. The last part lists two further points of attention. In the appendix you will find the performance scoring template.

Legal framework

According to the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 art. 45 § 1 and § 2, the moral justification of the 2017-2022 programme comprises three aspects. The term 'moral justification' refers to all non-financial justification about the programme towards DGD, i.e. everything related to the monitoring of the programme implementation. These three aspects are (§ 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Final submission date</th>
<th>Public or internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) A standardised form per outcome(^1) according to the IATI standard</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2a) Performance scores on the basis of the format set by the administration</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>To be shared with DGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2b) + lessons learned(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be shared with JSF colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Evaluation reports of the intervention together with the management response</td>
<td>-Mid-term(^3) -End of programme period</td>
<td>30 days after the approval of the management response Or 3 months after receiving the final version of the evaluation report</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three aspects (reporting through IATI, performance scores per outcome and lessons learned) replace the former annual narrative reports.

Upon conclusion of the programme an extensive moral final report is still expected to be submitted (§ 2).

\(^1\) In the context of the Royal Decree 2016, the term outcome refers to what we used to call a specific objective.

\(^2\) This is not specified as such in the Royal Decree, but it is mentioned in the individual Ministerial Decrees of the organisations.

\(^3\) An intermediate evaluation is required when the intervention takes longer than three years.
A short summary of the four aspects of moral justification

Each of these components will be discussed in more detail below. If necessary we refer to other relevant documents or indicate which aspects need to be explained further.

IATI

IATI is the abbreviation of International Aid Transparency Initiative and is primarily an international transparency instrument. However, the Royal Decree also defines IATI as a tool for moral justification. Every actor is required to publish two types of data files on IATI every year: one file about the organisation and one file about the interventions. The intervention file contains several form:

- a form for the programme
- a form for every outcome
- a form for the structural costs
- and – only for the IAs – a form for management costs

For each form a number of standard fields have to be filled in. (Think about the title, the date, place of implementation, sector, ‘policy markers’, budget, financial transactions, indicators at outcome level, etc. The publication of data on IATI is publicly accessible. The justification through IATI entailed a large workload for all organisations during the first year (2018), since many forms and corresponding fields had to be entered. For the subsequent years, except in the case of a change to the planned programme, only the fields "financial transactions" (every year) and "indicators at outcome level" (in years 3 and 5) will have to be updated in order to follow up the progress of interventions. In addition organisations will have to work on the quality of publications and make the necessary improvements.

For a full and technical explanation of the IATI publication, please refer to the IATI guidelines "Hoe gebruik te maken van de IATI-norm – handleiding over de publicatie van gegevens voor CMO’s en IA’s gefinancierd door DGD" (How to use the IATI standard – data publication guidelines for CSOs and IAs funded by DGD), the corresponding addendum and the notes, written by the federations either or not in collaboration with DGD.

Performance scores and lessons learned

The idea of the performance measurement system is for each non-governmental actor to indicate by means of self-assessment how the different interventions (understood as specific objective) which are co-financed by DGD performed in the past year. The performance measurement system contains 7 criteria each with one or several sub-questions (12 in all). These criteria are based on the OECD-DAC criteria (efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, (potential) sustainability), complemented with the criteria of gender, environment and contribution to the JSF. Scoring takes place according to a four-point scale (A-B-C-D) with a colour code. You are only required to give narrative explanations in case of ‘problems’ (score C or D).
Besides the performance scores you also have to explain the ‘lessons learned’ for each outcome once a year (at the latest 30 April of the year X+1). The requirement for the lessons learned is specified in the Ministerial Decrees of the different organisations. The information included in the lessons learned section may overlap with narrative notes on performance scores or may contain additional information. The nature of the lessons learned depends on what lessons were learned for the outcome in question in the year in question. No specific format is defined for this 'lessons learned' section, the topic is free. Interesting topics for information sharing may be suggested: e.g. partner participation, the link with the thematic JSF on Decent Work, policy priorities, evaluation, etc. The length of the document is limited to 2 pages per outcome.

The performance scores are only shared with your program officer at DGD. The 'lessons learned' must be shared at JSF level.

A more detailed explanation of how the performance scores work and their practical aspects are described in the introduction to the Excel format finalized by DGD. This format can be found in the annex at the end of this manual.

**Mid and end evaluations**

See note “Nota DGD over evaluatie” (Note of DGD about evaluation) (ratified May 2017) and “Aanvullende nota evaluaties DGD” (Additonal note on DGD evaluations) (ratified May 2018).

Please note that the end evaluations must be external and that interim evaluations must also be external if they relate to interventions of more than three years. From now on the evaluations must also be published on the organisation's website.

**Moral final report**

Art. 45 § 2 of the Royal Decree indicates that the moral final report contains the following elements:

- a synthesis of the achievement of development results over the total duration of the programme and the main lessons learned from its implementation;
- an analysis of the programme's contribution to achieving the strategic objectives of the JSF or the JSFs it is focused on;
- a final evaluation report, or the final evaluation reports, together with the corresponding management response.

According to the logic of administrative simplification, the NGSOC decided to fill in the provisions about the moral final report as follows. At the end of the programme (2022), the performance scores and the lessons learned will serve as a basis for part of the moral final report. No separate performance scores and lessons learned need to be submitted for year 5 of the programme. In 2022, the performance scores and

---

⁴ Art. 5 §2. 1° of the MD talks about lessons learned. This article has been reinterpreted. Contrary to what is stated in the article, the lessons learned should not be added in IATI. The lessons learned must be submitted annually for each outcome together with the performance scores on 30 April.
lessons learned need to be submitted only once, for the entire five-year programme period. The performance scores and lessons learned form an important part of the moral final report.

The introduction of the performance scores/lessons learned format and the interpretation of the questions and scores were adapted providing the necessary explanation on how to report for the moral final report.

**Performance scores in the final moral report**

There are some different requirements for the performance scores of the final report compared to the format for the annual report of the first four years of the programme period:

1. Because it is no longer about the expectations with regard to achieving results/outcome (future-oriented) but about the effective achievement of results/outcome, the formulations of the criteria and scores in the performance scores were adjusted for the final report.

2. In order to comply with the requirements of the Royal Decree, the final report is expected to contain a compulsory narrative explanation of certain criteria, regardless of the score given. It concerns the following criteria:

   - **Effectiveness**: “a synthesis of the achievement of the development results over the total duration of the programme.” You provide an overview of the results obtained during the entire programme period. For this purpose, you compare the baseline situation, the proposed results and the results achieved for the defined indicators. If the achieved results deviate from the expected results, you will explain the reasons for this difference. This can be done for both criteria 2.1 and 2.2. You will be asked to be as accurate as possible. Where available and appropriate, you are expected to refer to quantitative data. By way of example, you could assign the following percentages to the achieved degree of implementation. A specific objective or result is achieved (score A), if 90% of the outputs are delivered as planned and are of good quality. A specific objective is largely achieved (score B), if 60 to 90 per cent of the outputs are delivered as planned and are of good quality. The specific objective is only partially achieved (Score C), if 30% to 60% of the outputs have been delivered and are of good quality. The specific objective was not achieved (Score D), if less than 30% of the outputs were delivered and of good quality.

   - **JSF contribution**: “an analysis of the programme’s contribution to achieving the strategic objectives of the JSF or JSFs it is focused on”. If the outcome is not part of a JSF, this criterion should focus primarily on an analysis of the country’s synergies and complementarity. For outcomes that are part of a JSF, this mandatory narrative explanation is given under 5.1. For outcomes that are not part of a JSF, a mandatory narrative explanation is given under 5.2. In this case also both quantitative and qualitative objective data should be referred to.

   - **Sustainability**: In order to gain insight about the sustainability of an outcome, it is advisable to elaborate on this criterion in the final report as well. This can comprise the financial (4.1), social (partnerships/support) (4.2), as well as technical (4.3) sustainability.

For the other criteria, narrative explanation is optional in the case of scores A and B. However, an additional explanation (also for scores A and B) is appreciated by the DGD and so it may be useful to add it occasionally.

**Lessons learned**
The final Lessons Learned is not about a description, but about an analysis of what worked and what didn’t in terms of organisation, management, strategy (e.g. theory of change) and implementation of an outcome. If considered useful by actors active within a country/JSF, it can be decided together to include certain themes in the lessons learned.

Other aspects of the moral final report
The moral final report consists, in addition to the performance scores and lessons learned, of the final evaluation report and entering the data in IATI.

Timing
The moral final report (and its various components) must be submitted 6 months after the end of the programme, i.e. by 30 June 2022.

The final report of interventions/outcomes in the shorter term is expected in the year following the completion of the outcome and its final expenditure, also no later than six months after the end date of the intervention/outcome.

2. NEW JUSTIFICATION LOGIC THROUGH PERFORMANCE SCORES

Whereas the previous programme period referred to narrative reporting, the Royal Decree now speaks of moral reporting. This implies a shift in function: from an extensive report on what has been achieved to a self-evaluation, i.e. an overview which provides a reflection on the progress of the interventions. However, this lighter justification format should be based on good information within the organisation and partners and may be supplemented by oral explanations during the institutional dialogue.

The new method of annual reporting is based on the principle of simplification and a focus on higher levels in the results chain.

1. Less focus on activities and more on intermediate indicators

This format, in line with a number of recommendations from evaluations of SES (the special evaluation service) (meta-evaluation, evaluability study, impact assessment at 4 NGOs) focuses on higher levels in the results chain. As an organisation, you need to focus more on the question whether you expect the activities you implement will lead to the intended results and objectives (see link monitoring and evaluation below). This means, in relation to your account manager at DGD, that the monitoring will be less on a micro level.

2. Simplification of justification based on an adequate monitoring system

The new form of narrative justification means, in the first place, a simplification in terms of providing information. It is still expected that organisations will follow up on the indicators included in the submitted programme and that the necessary monitoring will be carried out. This monitoring provides the necessary information to complete the performance scores. In addition, in year 3 and 5 information must be provided in IATI about the indicators at outcome level. In year 5, after the end of the programme, this information should also be included in the moral final report. So nothing much changes in terms of monitoring.
Organisations are expected to have a monitoring system in place that provides them with the necessary reliable information to fill in performance scores consistently.

One of the changes is, however, that the detailed explanation at the lower levels in the results chain (levels of activities and outputs) no longer have to be written down annually. Only in the event of problems (score C or D) should additional explanations be given.

3. **Relationship with the account manager**

Through this system the account manager primarily monitors whether the interventions are on track. The focus is shifted from extensive written explanations to more verbal explanations. For example, less time has to be devoted to drawing up detailed annual reports and programme follow-up by DGD is no longer conducted at micro level. The oral explanation is given during the annual institutional dialogue. The link with the JSF is also of particular interest. Through field visits in the context of JSF and the strategic dialogues there are also further dialogues with DGD. The new approach also aims to create a relationship of trust and constructive dialogue between the account manager and the organisation.

In addition to the annual reporting and institutional dialogue, the new reporting method also requires continuous contact with the account manager of DGD. In particular, just like before, any problems and any corresponding changes at the level of programme implementation should be discussed with the desk officer. It is recommended that the exchange with the desk officer (especially regarding changes) is also published on the extranet.

Account managers will obviously compare the performance scores of the successive years, as well as the performance scores and the evaluations. As an organisation you should be able to explain any inconsistencies well, in case an account manager asks questions about this.

4. **Relationship with partners**

Because the justification is limited to scoring and ‘exception reporting’ (in case of score C or D), there is room for a stronger focus on monitoring the indicators. It offers the opportunity to discuss, together with the partners, the degree of implementation of the intervention, through monitoring of the indicators. The performance scores can also be filled in together with the partners. This will contribute to developing a common vision on the implementation of the intervention/programme.

5. **Link between monitoring and evaluation**

The performance scoring is based mainly on the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. The use of evaluation questions for monitoring the programme ensures that an explicit link is made between the monitoring of the programme and the evaluation of the programme.

The performance scores should be used by an organisation to indicate, based on its monitoring data, the extent to which the intervention is expected to achieve the intended development results. The link with the final evaluations is that these evaluations should in principle confirm the expected performance scores. The importance of performing a good self-assessment should therefore not be underestimated.
3. PERFORMANCE SCORES IN PRACTICE

How to fill in the performance scores? Every actor has a lot of freedom in this respect. To get you going we will give a few general guidelines and then we will present a (completely non-committal) methodology proposal.

General guidelines

The contribution of different results to one outcome

DGD does not impose any guidelines on how to compile the information about different partners and/or results within one outcome when filling in the performance scores. In order to join the information about different partners and/or different results and underlying activities, you need to check to what extent a non-implemented part or unspent budget compromises the intervention. For example, the implementation of one or two results may be significantly delayed and therefore compromise the overall intended objective. A score C would seem appropriate in that case. It may well be that the delay in the implementation of the result does not substantially compromise the achievement of the outcome, because the rest of the intervention or the other results are progressing well and compensate the problems. A score B would seem appropriate in that case.

It may be advisable to develop a kind of reading guide within your organisation that ensures consistency in how performance scores for the different outcomes and over the different years are awarded. Even though there is a subjective dimension to awarding the performance scores, the scores must always be based on objective quantitative or qualitative monitoring data.

A narrative explanation is only required in the case of a C or D score. Some actors may wish to use the option to give narrative explanations that provide insight into minor adjustments, shifts or interesting achievements even in case of an A or B score. Another option could be to provide this explanation or information via the document ‘lessons learned’.

Proposal of methodology

Below you will find a proposal of methodology and tools that can be used to award the performance scores. Every organisation is free to use it or not or to draw inspiration from it. This proposal was developed on the basis of BTC's experience, where the system has been used for several years as part of the annual reporting.

Approach

The way to fill in performance scores is conceived in the context of the logic of a participatory self-evaluation by the programme actors. A possible method could consist of organising a workshop bringing together the main actors and partners of the programme. The actors thus gathered should reflect on the implementation of the programme over the past year, either collectively or in working groups. In this context, participants should review the different results contributing to the outcome and thereby give an estimate of the extent to which the result has been implemented. In order to encourage the reflection, working groups may be set up in advance to address the following aspects: reviewing the context of the intervention, verifying the progress of the various activities both from the perspective of annual progress,
and overall progress, analysing the risks associated with the programme, discussing the monitoring indicators, etc. These preliminary exchanges will facilitate the decision on the final performance scores. It is recommended to involve partners at this level. On the one hand, because it will allow them to provide input. On the other hand, because it allows us to develop a common vision about the level of intervention that was achieved, as well as about the strengths and weaknesses.

**Instruments**
The availability of certain documents/tools may be useful in the context of awarding the performance scores and organising the reflection about the scores. These can be used either to feed the reflection in case of score C and D, or to facilitate and substantiate the discussion. The follow-up of the budget, activities, indicators and revision of context is discussed below. The Theory of Change is also an important tool to monitor the progress of your intervention.

**Budget monitoring**
Monitoring the implementation of the outcome budget provides useful information for the fulfilment of two specific criteria: efficiency and effectiveness. The level of implementation of the budget for the past year compared to the budget foreseen at the beginning of the year is a good indicator of the level of annual implementation of the outcome. In addition, the degree of overall budgetary implementation of the outcome at a certain point in time provides a good overview of any problems and necessary adjustments. If, for example, only 20% of the total budget for the outcome was spent at the end of the third programme year, it can reasonably be assumed that there is a problem with the implementation of the outcome. This should, of course, be linked to the financial planning of the programme.

**Activity monitoring**
In addition to monitoring the implementation of the budget, it is also advisable to analyse the progress of the various activities within the outcome in relation to all the anticipated activities of the outcome. If it is found that the number of activities achieved within the outcome is at any given moment lower than anticipated, this should be reviewed. The progress status of the activities will be easier if the activities to be performed for each year of the programme are planned from the start.

In order to fill in the efficiency criterion, these activities must be linked to the budget provided for each of the activities in order to check whether any budget overruns have occurred. The evaluation of organised activities should also allow to check whether their costs are justified. When doing this exercise it can be very useful to have different activity reports.

**Indicators monitoring**
Indicators must be updated in year 3 and year 5. However, it is absolutely recommended to update these indicators every year, even though the information does not need to be given in the relevant formats. It is useful information to award performance scores. At the same time, in the internal monitoring system of the organisation other indicators can be included. A more extensive matrix of indicators other than those proposed in the programme file may certainly be an interesting option.

**Context review**
Reviewing the context of the programme is important for the information for the relevance criterion. In fact, the context affects the Theory of Change and the intervention logics and that is why it is necessary to
evaluate the context at regular intervals. The context analysis can be both external (country, region, partners, etc.) and internal (operation, HR, etc.). At the level of the external context the evolution of the general situation can be analysed, as well as the political, institutional and social context, etc. All elements that may possibly affect the programme can be taken into account. If these context factors have an impact that may compromise or thoroughly change the intervention logics, this may also be mentioned. Besides, this can also help to update the management of the risks related to the programme.

4. LESSONS LEARNED

Objective ‘lessons learned’

| ✅ | There may be an overlap with the narrative explanation of the performance scores, but a literal repetition without further analysis has little added value. |
| 🌟 | A tool to enrich the strategic dialogue of the JSF. |
| 🌟 | Provide insight in things that do and do not work with regard to organisation management or programme to share with others |

Format and content of ‘lessons learned’

Format:
- There is no format imposed.
- The ‘lessons learned’ are part of the moral justification. Hence, the ‘lessons learned’ must also be described per outcome every year by 30 April at the latest.
- The length of the ‘lessons learned’ is limited to 2 pages per outcome.
- The ‘lessons learned’ are shared with DGD and with the other members of the JSF that the outcome concerned forms part of.

Content:
- The topic is free.
- Some possible topics proposed by DGD for inspiration: partner participation, links with the thematic JSF on Decent Work, policy priorities of the Belgian government (e.g. Digital4development, gender, sexual and reproductive health and rights, inclusive growth), evaluation methodologies for development cooperation.
- If actors who are active within a country/JSF consider it useful, they can decide together to include certain topics in the lessons learned for a given year.

Tips for writing and examples

Suggestions for editing
- Specify for whom which information in the document is useful (see examples 1 and 2).

5 This is not mentioned as such in the Royal Decree, but it is mentioned in the individual Ministerial Decrees of the organisations.
Make a **distinction between findings** or descriptions of the situation and **changes** and the conclusions you draw from them or the recommendations you derive from them. The conclusions or recommendations that you draw from certain findings and descriptions are in fact the lessons learned (see examples 1, 2, 3 and 4).

**Writing style:**
- Avoid continuous text
- Use bullets and subtitles

**Choose useful titles:** You can find inspiration for this in the formats presented. For example:
  - Facts, findings
  - Critical success factors: good practices or pitfalls to be avoided
  - Recommendations/suggestions: these are in fact the ‘lessons learned’
  - Target group of the information: this information is useful for next actors/countries/sectors

### Moral final report

As described under title 1, the final ‘lessons learned’ is not about a description but about an analysis of what worked and what didn’t in terms of organisation, management, strategy (e.g. in terms of theory of change) and execution of an outcome. If considered useful by actors active within a country/JSF, it can be decided together to include certain themes in the lessons learned.

So there are no separate lessons learned about year 5 of the interventions. The intention is that at the end of the programme, an overall analysis of the lessons learned per outcome will be made after the five-year programme period for the entire period.

### Examples

There is not one single format that works for all organisations or all outcomes. It is up to the organisation itself, either or not in consultation or coordination with the JSF group, to check what is the best way to draft the ‘lessons learned’ per outcome. For inspiration we present below a number of examples of formats, structures and guidelines that have been developed by several members. None of these examples should be considered as the standard. You can take a look at these examples and possible writing tips for inspiration and critically consider what could work in the context of your organisation, programme, outcome, ...

### Example # 1

This example:

- First of all makes a distinction between lessons learned about the programme on the one hand and lesson learned about the organisation on the other (logistics, administration, finance, HR).
- Uses the same relevant titles for each of those categories that are always dealt with according to a fixed pattern: findings and insights, success factors and good practices, pitfalls to be avoided, recommendations and suggestions.

- LL with regard to Logistics, Administration, Finance, Human Resources
- LL with regard to Programmes;
  - Determination of processes
    - Lessons learned
    - Key success factors and good practices
    - Pitfalls to be avoided
    - Recommendations and suggestions
  - Stakeholders
    - Lessons learned
    - Key success factors and good practices
    - Pitfalls to be avoided
    - Recommendations and suggestions
  - Target groups
    - Lessons learned
    - Key success factors and good practices
    - Pitfalls to be avoided
    - Recommendations and suggestions
  - ...

**Example # 2**
This example:
- Makes a distinction between findings/ observations and lessons to be drawn for each topic.
- States for each topic with whom this must be shared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/subject</th>
<th>Findings/observations</th>
<th>Lessons to be learned/capitalised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal health</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share with/for</td>
<td>Internal use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example # 3**
This example:
- Makes a distinction between ‘lessons learned’ and recommendations.
- Indicates for each of the lessons learned what are the positive, negative or neutral aspects.

<p>| Lessons learned | Recommendations |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) <strong>Consideration of the TOC approach TOC:</strong></th>
<th>1) Commitment to the TOC requires: ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+/-) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2) **Consideration of very vulnerable / marginalised groups:** | |
|-----------------------------------------------| |

This format was drafted by Guy van Vlaenderen and can be used freely.

**Example # 4**
The features of this example are:
- A standard template with standard table of contents.
- The approach of this format is to focus on significant changes. In addition there is the request to outline the internal and external factors that led to that significant change.
1. {Provide a short title of the case}

Select one of the following cases, and describe it briefly by answering the questions below:

- A significant “positive” change for direct or indirect beneficiary groups, realised by the programme or to which the programme has made an essential contribution. Explain/describe: what changed/what was the change about; for whom/who benefitted from the change; scope of the change and beneficiaries involved.
- A significant change or challenge in the programme operation context (political context, institutional, social or economic context….) and how you have addressed this change/challenge successfully. This can be a challenge or change in the context that was anticipated as indicated in the Risk Analysis of the MYP Programme Document or this can be an unforeseen change or challenge in the programme context.
- The start-up of the programme and how you have managed to conceptualise/operationalise the programme approach, to take all partners on board, set-up programme structures etc.

2. Critical Success Factors

Describe the main causal factors that lead to or contributed to the fact that the case described was successful. Distinguish between external factors and internal factors that enabled to achieve this result. To the possible extent, present evidence for “how” and “why” this positive effect/result was realised.

3. Lessons Learned

What important lesson(s) do you take from this experience that can be useful in future, in the context of your own programme, for other programmes or for other actors, and in particular for partners of the Joint Strategic Framework if applicable? How can the positive effect/experience be replicated and expanded? What will you do more, less, the same or differently in future so that this positive effect may be repeated or replicated? What factors need to be taken into account and which conditions (institutional, economic, social…) are best fulfilled?

4. Resources

Here you can list any documentation (reports, papers, presentations, tools, audio or video material…) that give more background on the case or that illustrate the positive experience more in detail.

Example # 5

Format based on the question: “If a project/intervention/ activity should be repeated, which elements would you maintain and which elements would you improve and why?”
### Example # 6

1. **Overall summary of programme outcomes and lessons learnt**

2. **General points of attention / 'going forward':**
   a) Problem
   b) Strategic action
   c) Anticipated outcome

### Example # 7

In these examples there is no standard table of content within the organisation. The content is adapted for each outcome.

**Example 1**
- Partner participation
- Planning
- Sustainability
- Internal communication
- Management
- Value of the partnership and synergies

**Example 2**
- Items relevant for other NGAs
- Generic internal issues
- Component-specific topics

**Example 3**
- On the context and its relation to the program
- On the effectiveness of the strategy
- On coordinating campaigns
- On synergies with other actors
- On transversal themes in an RBA
- On efficiency
- On sustainability

Example 4
- State of play of the programme in 2017
- Gender villages, a methodology that brings the gender issue into the home
- “Rights” approach versus “needs” approach
- Meet local authorities when large-scale mobilizations are not possible
- The use of media allows to raise awareness among a broad audience

5. OTHER POINTS OF ATTENTION

Joint programmes
The exercise of awarding performance scores is obviously more complex for organisations in a joint programme. The number of actors which, together or separately, are active within a specific objective or within an outcome, makes the reflection more complex. It is therefore recommended that the organisations involved in a joint programme award the performance scores together. This is to avoid inconsistencies or differences in the assessment. On the other hand, it may also be a good opportunity to take stock of the operations of the joint programme.

Potential risks
Because the performance system requires little narrative explanation (especially if the scores are good (A or B)), people may be inclined to pay little attention to the assessment or systematically award higher scores. It is therefore important to be aware that this form of reporting is compared with evaluations, field visits and institutional dialogues. Inconsistencies or scores that are systematically contradictory to other documents or other forms of follow-up would raise serious questions at the end of the programme.

In addition, there may also be a tendency to neglect the internal monitoring system of programmes and organisations because a full narrative report is no longer needed. However, it is precisely the monitoring system that forms the basis for the performance scores and therefore it must certainly not be neglected.

Help Desk
The federations are available as a help desk when you have to fill in the performance scores by the end of April.

At ngo-federatie you can contact:

Femmy Thewissen
Femmy.thewissen@ngo-federatie.be
025/361928
At Fiabel you can contact:

Ruth Beeckmans
Ruth.beeckmans@fiabel.be
02/209.07.96

At Acodev you can contact:

Raphael Maldague
rm@acodev.be
02/209.29.66
6. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM (EXCEL)

Excel format performance measurement system: consult here