1. The incorporation of monitoring and evaluation needs (of all development partners) and modalities should be an integral part of the design, formulation and management of a national programme and its contributing components.

2. In the context of the programme approach, monitoring and evaluation are means for contributing effectively, at all stages of programme development and management, to (a) clarifying the purpose and strategy of a proposed approach, including the results to be achieved; (b) highlighting the significance of various programme components, including their linkages as well as their causal relationship to the success of the programme, and the relevance of supporting policy actions; (c) validating the continued relevance of a programme, its components and approach; (d) responding to management needs in monitoring the performance of a given programme and its components; (e) supporting an effective decision-making process; (f) ensuring substantive accountability; and (g) promoting a learning process. For these purposes, monitoring and evaluation should be seen as advocacy means for better management practices and not only as technical ends.

3. Monitoring and evaluation of external contributions to a national programme should be conducted, wherever possible, within the framework of the national programme, and should be harmonized and/or at least coordinated.

4. After determining the monitoring and evaluation needs for a given programme, an assessment should be made of existing monitoring and evaluation capacity at corresponding national and sectoral levels, including both public and private institutions, and its effective functioning. The purpose of this assessment is to verify whether the monitoring and evaluation needs could be fulfilled by the current monitoring and evaluation capacity or whether some strengthening is required.

5. Assistance, as required, to the national (executing and implementing) authorities in developing/strengthening appropriate monitoring and evaluation capacity should be foreseen as part of the contributory programme. Such assistance can comprise both training and provision of hardware/software equipment. National authorities should furthermore be assisted in the identification and/or establishment of baseline data at relevant levels of monitoring and evaluation needs.

6. Monitoring and evaluation of a given programme should make optimal use of existing data at country level, through improved collection and analysis, for the assessment of progress based on performance indicators and success criteria.

7. The possibility of pooling resources from individual contributory programmes for strengthening national monitoring and evaluation capacities/data collection should be explored.

8. In the context of the programme approach, monitoring and evaluation should provide a more focused tool for achievements assessment, through the evaluation of progress towards the attainment of national development objectives. In this respect, monitoring and evaluation at the programme level may build on the monitoring and evaluation of individual components (project level) and promote their complementarity.

9. Mechanisms should be developed for sharing experience through the establishment of informal networks for posting and transferring ideas, experience and knowledge in monitoring and evaluation. These could include electronic networks, such as the Internet, linking United Nations system practitioners at all levels and facilitating selective, user-driven, practical application.

10. The monitoring and evaluation modality should facilitate accountability to governing bodies and funding sources, as well as answerability to beneficiaries. They should focus on the substantive performance of the programme (relevance, impact and sustainability) as well as its efficient implementation (cost effectiveness, programme adjustments, observance of timetable etc.). Financial accountability will normally be covered through the audit-related provisions foreseen for project/programme components.
11. Sustainability of results should be seen not only in a static manner as the capacity for a specific institution to reproduce the results attained with external assistance but also in a dynamic dimension, i.e., the capacity for the institution to use the results of that assistance to further develop its own capacity for managing change.

Note: