ROM Monitoring Questions

Type of ROM review	**Projects and Programmes**
Project title	**Supporting rural entrepreneurship and promoting womens socio-economic empowerment in Dara-i-Suf Bala and Dara-i-Suf Payan districts of Samangan Province.**
Project reference	**C-337962**
Delegation in charge	**Afghanistan**
Print date	**16/03/2016**

Key information				
Domain (instrument)				
DAC sector				
Zone benefitting from the action				
Type of Project/Programme				
Geographic Implementation				
Contracting party				
EU contribution				
Project Implementation Dates	**Start date**		**End Date**	
Reason for ROM review				
Countries visited				
ROM expert(s) name(s)				
Field phase	**Start date**		**End Date**	

Summary of grades	
Relevance	
Efficiency	
Effectiveness	
Sustainability	

Keys documents	Number
Essential Project/Programme documents	
Other documents available	

Persons interviewed	Number
EC services	
Partner country	
Implementing partner	
Final Beneficiaries	
Other	

1. Relevance	Select:	Good / Very good	Problems	Serious deficiencies

1.1. Does the project presently respond to the needs of the **target groups**?	

1.2. Is the action (including CD if relevant) adequate vis-à-vis the present **capacity of the local partner**?	

1.3. Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment (**ownership**)?	

1.4. Is there an effective government led system of sector coordination (including CD) involving the relevant local stakeholders and donors?	

1.5. Are there any **complementarity issues** with other ongoing/planned projects or programmes (including CD) managed by donors that need to be addressed?	
1.6. Have **changed circumstance**s (including critical constraints in the context) been taken into account by updating the **intervention logic**?	

1.7. Indicators	
a) Are the indicators well defined and relevant to measure the achievement of the objectives?	
b) Are all related data available?	

c) Are all indicators sex-disaggregated, if relevant?	
d) Are baselines set and updated for each indicator?	

e) Are targets values set and are they realistic or do they need to be updated?	
Conclusion	

2. Efficiency	Select:	Good / Very good	Problems	Serious deficiencies

2.1. Are the chosen **implementation mechanisms** (incl. choice of implementation modalities, entities and contractual arrangements) conducive for achieving the expected results?	

2.2. Do local partners effectively **lead in the planning** of the action (including CD if relevant) beyond formal endorsement?	

2.3. Inputs	
a) Do the resources correspond to the needs of the action?	
b) Do local partners provide the inputs (human or physical) that would be required to enable the action (including CD if relevant) to be effective?	

c) To what degree are resources (inputs) available on time from other stakeholders?	

2.4. Delays

a) If there are delays, how important are they?	

b) Have the reasons been identified?	

c) Are the revisions of planning been properly implemented? Effective?	

2.5. Have the outputs been produced/delivered in a cost-efficient manner?	

2.6. Is the action adequately monitored and/or assessed by the local partners?	

Conclusion	

3. Effectiveness	Select:	Good / Very good	Problems	Serious deficiencies

3.1. Has the **expected progress** in term of **outputs** being properly achieved?	

3.2. Is the **quality of outputs** (including those of CD support) satisfactory?	

3.3. Are the outputs (including CD) still likely to lead to the **expected outcomes**?	
3.4. Are there evidences that the action supports the implementation or the development (or its changes) of the **partners' policy/actions**?	

Conclusion	

4. Sustainability	Select:	Good / Very good	Problems	Serious deficiencies

4.1. Is an adequate level of **human and institutional capaci**ty (avoiding unnecessary parallel mechanisms) put in place in order to continue delivering the action's benefits?	

4.2. Is the role of the EUD/HQ in the management and the monitoring of the operation sufficiently respectful of the **leading role of the partners** in order to enhance their capacities?	

4.3. If there is a **financial contribution** needed for continued access to the benefits of the action, can **target groups** afford such a payment?	

4.4. Are the **relevant authorities** taken the **financial measure** to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the action?	

4.5. Has the **private sector** been involved to ensure the sustainability of the action?	

4.6. Have the necessary measures been taken to address the **environmental sustainability**?	

4.7. Have the necessary measures been taken into account to enhance the **role of women**?	
Conclusion	

5. Horizontal issues

5.1. To what extent have recommendations raised in QSG/previous ROM/ or previous evaluations been taken into account?

5.2. Have the **communication and visibility** actions been implemented in an appropriate manner?

5.3. Are there **good practises** inherent to the project which could be useful to share beyond the project context?

Sources of Information: List all documents analysed	
Essential Project/Programme documents	**Availability**
Country Programming documents	
Action Documents	
QSG checklists	
Financing/Contribution/Delegation/Administration Agreement or grant contract (or in some cases service contracts). In these documents, all annexes are to be included such as Technical and Administrative provisions, Implementation schedule, logframe (incl. updates)...	
Project contracts/programme estimates	
In case of projects selected through calls for proposals: Guidelines for calls for proposals	
Riders to all the documents listed above and their explanatory notes	
Annual and overall activity schedules/implementation plans	
Implementation progress reports	
Previous ROM Reports	
Mid-term evaluations	
Final evaluations of previous phases (if any)	
Thematic studies and consultancy reports related to Project	
Other documents	

Sources of Information: List of persons interviewed				
Categories	**Name**	**Email**	**Position**	**Institution**