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The NAPs in the framework of the Decade

- Efficient and timely implementation of NAPs (including necessary **funding**)
- Romani **participation** in implementation and monitoring
- **Coordination** among line ministries and other relevant institutions
- Provision of **disaggregated data** in accordance with international standards on data collection and data protection
- Establishment of an effective monitoring mechanism for measuring progress
Five+ years down the road – some general questions

- Are M&E activities going as planned?

- How are findings from M&E activities being used and disseminated? What changes are needed to make M&E more relevant for decision-making?

- What are there methodological issues that need to be addressed or changes that need to be made to M&E design? Which institutions are responsible for making necessary changes?

- Are sufficient human and material resources available for M&E activities as planned/after any necessary changes? If not, what must be done to secure necessary resources?
A glance at the NAPs: prevailing weaknesses

- **Institutional arrangements** for M&E not sufficiently developed
- Absence of clear arrangements for:
  - **Reporting** (i.e., who reports to whom and when)
  - **Data collection** (including lack of clear timelines)
- **Baseline data** generally not available
- Lack of **funding provisions** for
  - Baseline studies
  - Ongoing data collection and review
- **Insufficient distinction** among categories:
  - targets
  - objectives
  - indicators
  - activities
- **Qualitative methods** (e.g. surveys) used in unsystematic manner
- **Follow-up mechanisms** not adequately developed
- Regular updates but within the existing frameworks of the initial plans
### Key elements of M&E (2007 status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>MCD</th>
<th>MNT</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>SRB</th>
<th>SK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional arrangements for monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear reporting requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive M&amp;E plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of funds for monitoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback mechanisms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Revising NAPs - design quality

- Adequate coverage of Decade priority areas, incorporation of cross-cutting issues
- Realism, plausibility, and relevance of goals
- Identification of segments of Romani population with distinct needs
- Specification of outputs at national, regional, local levels with appropriate budget allocations
- Fit between measures in different priority areas
- Extent to which probable effects of NAP implementation on relations between Roma and non-Roma have been taken into account
- Clear link to crisis response policies
Revising the naps – M&E arrangements

- Clear M&E responsibilities with budget allocations for M&E activities
- Appropriate performance indicators for each activity using qualitative and quantitative methods and indicators
- Identification of data sources and availability of data; specification of data collection methods, frequency, responsibilities
- Baseline studies for target-setting
- Description and quantification of needs as outputs
- Quantified milestones and thresholds
- Clear procedures for analyzing, reviewing, and using performance data and reporting (what reports produced, for whom, and how often)
- Provisions for regular review of NAPs; regular stakeholder meetings
- Mechanisms to ensure action on M&E findings
National capacity for effective M&E

- Building monitoring capacity
  - *Distinct administrative body for M&E?*
  - *Specialized units within general NAP coordinating body?*

- Making M&E participatory
  - *M&E networks (government, implementers, target group)*
  - *Standing mechanism for consultation with Romani NGOs*

- Providing necessary training
  - *Government and non-government actors*
  - *Adapted to recipients’ needs*
  - *Common minimum level of M&E knowledge*

- Periodic (external) evaluation complements ongoing (internal) monitoring!

- Dissemination to widest possible audience