RESEARCH REPORT

Survey of the European Union's arrangements for monitoring and evaluating support to security sector reform

By Sebastien Babaud

January 2009

1. Introduction

This survey provides an overview of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) arrangements of the Council of the European Union (EU) and European Commission (EC), looking specifically at how they apply to security sector reform (SSR) programmes. In addition to existing arrangements, needs, challenges as well as the trends and opportunities to improve M&E in this area are explored.

The survey is one of five donor surveys carried out as part of the Saferworld project 'Evaluating for Security: Developing specific guidelines on monitoring and evaluating Security Sector Reform interventions'.[1] While the donor surveys unpack the institutional arrangements for M&E within the major SSR donors, they do not provide a detailed analysis of how this is carried out at the country level in particular cases. Instead, five separate country case studies have been carried out to investigate how individual SSR programmes have been monitored and evaluated. Together with a wider desk review, the case studies and donor surveys provide the evidence base from which specific guidance on monitoring and evaluating SSR can be developed.

Interviews for this research were conducted with EC and EU Council staff responsible for policy development and implementation of SSR-related programmes, as well as for M&E, from 10-17 October 2008. Although the list of interviewees included some staff from missions, emphasis was placed on policy and headquarters level staff. A list of interviewees is provided in annex one.

The European Union (EU) has increased its involvement in the field of SSR in the recent years in order to address the different challenges of both the security and development needs of partner countries. An overarching policy document now covers the work of the Council of the EU and European Commission (EC).[2] However, this document does not provide any detailed guidance on the practical arrangements for SSR work and the two institutions continue to take different approaches to SSR as reflected in their respective SSR strategies.[3] Similarly, each institution applies its own M&E systems when dealing with SSR, albeit with some variations.

---

[1] Other donor surveys include the institutional arrangements for M&E of SSR programmes in the US, UK and Dutch Governments and the UN.

[2] *Council Conclusions on a Policy Framework for Security Sector Reform*; 2736th General Affairs Council meeting, 12 June 2006, Luxembourg.

[3] *EU Concept for ESDP Support to Security Sector Reform*; Council of the European Union,13 October 2005, Brussels; a *Concept for European Community Support for Security Sector Reform*; Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, 24 May 2006, Brussels.

2. The Council of the EU

2.1 Profile

The Council of the EU undertakes SSR missions under the European Security & Defence Policy (ESDP). ESDP missions, both military and civilian, have been carried out since 2003 in various sectors: rule of law, police reform, border management, civilian protection, civilian administration, defence sector reform, etc. Missions can last from a few months to several years. Each mission also varies in terms of scope, objectives and importance, which affects how M&E is handled. Formal procedures for M&E do exist and responsibilities in that respect are shared among Brussels-based and in-country staff. However, due to the relatively recent implementation of ESDP external operations, M&E has been developed and practiced pragmatically. References to the need for M&E can be found in EU policy documents:

- The *EU Concept for ESDP support to Security Sector Reform (SSR),* adopted in October 2005, states that 'Standards operating Procedures/Guiding principles' should be developed, including reporting procedures.

- The *Civilian Headline Goal 2010,*[4] approved in November 2007, identifies key objectives to improve quality of ESDP missions, such as a 'robust and systematic lessons-learned process' and information exchanges mechanisms.

It is important to note however that the M&E mechanisms of ESDP missions mostly serve internal EU information and accountability purposes. Missions report to member states (Political and Security Committee – PSC) and the operational Brussels based units (Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability – CPCC, for civilian or integrated missions) on the activities and achievements of a mission. They are also held accountable to the European Parliament (Security & Defence Committee in particular for oversight of EU external operations) and the EC (since ESDP missions are financed through the Community budget).

2.2 Existing M&E arrangements

2.2.1 Typical ESDP mission arrangements

Unlike in the EC (see Section II below), there is no working definition of 'monitoring' for the ESDP Missions, and therefore for the EU as a whole.[5] Monitoring arrangements are split between field and Brussels-based staff along the following lines: mission staff report to a Brussels-based 'Watch-keeping Capability' (WC) which passes on information to the CPCC. This unit then delivers reports to the Council's Committees where EU member states are represented (Political and Security Committee – PSC, Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management – CIVCOM, Politico-Military Group – PMG) and which exercises political control and strategic direction over ESDP missions.

Each ESDP mission being different in capacity and objectives, monitoring mechanisms vary considerably, though several interviewees suggested a gradual trend towards more routine and detailed monitoring across missions. The general approach is to collect information through media monitoring and routine meetings with project stakeholders and in-country counterparts, but not to carry out any specific additional research work. Missions are required to report to Brussels weekly,

---

[4] *Civilian Headline Goal 2010,* Doc. 14823/07, 19 November 2007.
[5] In the absence of a working definition of monitoring in the ESDP Missions, the author has used the OECD-DAC definition of monitoring, 'regular process of examining a project's actual outputs and impact. Carried out during the implementation phase, monitoring seeks to provide a project team with current information that will allow them to assess progress in meeting project activities, and to adjust implementation activities if necessary. Monitoring generates data that can be used for evaluation purposes'. Taken from OECD-DAC Glossary of Terms http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf, (accessed on 12 August 2008).

monthly and six-monthly, so as to inform the EU member states of each ESDP mission's activities, expenditure, achievements, difficulties and shortcomings as well as to provide an analysis of the situation in-country and future options with respect to the mission's mandate. This requirement encourages monitoring up to a point, though it provides no guarantee as to the quality of information provided. Reporting formats vary by mission but are predefined in what is known as the Operation Plan (OPLAN) which details a mission's organisational aspects. All mission reports are confidential.

The most elaborate monitoring/reporting system of any mission so far is said to be that of EULEX Kosovo. The mission claims to have endorsed a 'programmatic approach' and uses tailored software to record collected information and report weekly on its progress. As the biggest ESDP mission ever launched, with around 3000 staff and a budget of €205 m for its first six months, EULEX is exceptional however. An additional type of monitoring has been introduced in the past two years in the form of short visits by CPCC staff to missions (so-called Internal Support Reviews – ISRs). These visits are meant to allow CPCC staff to review activities, progresses and identify challenges to be further addressed. A common road-map or check-list of activities and objectives will then be shared among field and Brussels staff against which to monitor progress until the next ISR.

Evaluation of an ESDP mission only occurs when it ends. The Head of Mission (HoM) is then invited to present a report highlighting results and lessons learned. There is no agreed definition for ESDP Missions, and therefore for the EU as a whole.[6]

2.2.2   Specific arrangements for SSR missions?

Most SSR-related ESDP missions have a specific sector focus (e.g. police reform, rule of law, defence reform) rather than a comprehensive approach (SSR Guinea Bissau is the only ESDP with holistic scope). Most of the SSR-related missions are managed by civilian bodies of the Council and only one is supervised by a military unit (EUSEC DR Congo) because of the mission's focus on defence sector reform.

The content of an SSR M&E exercise does not differ from other types of ESDP mission (e.g. monitoring, civilian administration). However, the process needs to be adapted to the integrated (civilian and military) nature of SSR. Consequently, more stakeholders are involved in the planning, operational, monitoring and political control of a mission: not only the civilian operational unit (CPCC) and the CIVCOM, but also the EU Military Staff and the PMG, as is the case for two ESDP missions in Guinea Bissau and DRC.

2.3   Needs, challenges and perspectives

The needs, challenges and opportunities outlined in this section reflect the views of the author and draw upon the opinions expressed during the interviews.

With ESDP missions being a relatively recent innovation but growing in regularity, the need for better M&E and supporting guidance and standards is keenly felt. This is now being addressed within the Council's general secretariat in several ways:

---

[6] In the absence of a working definition of evaluation in the ESDP Missions, the author has used the OECD-DAC definition; 'the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Taken from OECD-DAC Glossary of Terms http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf, (accessed on 12/08/2008).

- *Feeding M&E back into mission strategy:* One of the main challenges identified by interviewees is that of take-up of M&E findings. Problems in this area occur at different levels, so that it may be overall strategy or day-to-day work-plans, which are not modified in the light of emerging information. Inflexible mission mandates are however a central problem. ESDP mission mandates define and constrain strategy and operational design but are difficult to adapt since this requires changing the EU 'Joint Actions', the legal documents on which they are based. In view of this the Council of the EU has begun to issue shorter, renewable mandates (usually lasting one year) and is looking at how to give HoMs more autonomy in interpreting them.

- *Enhancing lesson learning:* The *Civilian Headline Goal 2010* sets some objectives related to improving the quality of ESDP missions. One of these objectives is the launch of a 'robust and systematic lessons-learned' process intended to capture past and on-going missions' experiences and best practices. This also relates to the previously identified challenge of feeding back information into a strategic planning process. 'Best practices officers' have also been appointed in more recent missions (such as EULEX Kosovo) whose role is to collect and mainstream these best practices. The CPCC also organises annual meetings of Head of Missions (HoMs) and meetings of different sector experts (police officers, judges, press officers, etc.) to share experiences and enhance this institutional learning process. Lastly, sector annual reports are elaborated based on the various HoM reports highlighting best practices and lessons learned in different policy areas (police, justice, etc.).

- *Result-focussed M&E:* Although ESDP missions are now required to report, monitor and evaluate according to set procedures, M&E is still not results or impact focussed. The CPCC has begun in recent months to focus more on these questions but there appears to be a long way to go.

- *Coordinating with other stakeholders:* ESDP missions often operate alongside other international stakeholders (Kosovo: EULEX and UNMIK, Afghanistan: EUPOL and UNAMA, DRC: EUSEC and MONUC, etc.). The importance of donor co-ordination is now widely recognised, to some extent in relation to M&E also. But in practice, different operating frameworks, mandates, agendas and approaches continue to limit EU co-ordination in this area.

3.   The European Commission

3.1   Profile

The EC is supporting SSR projects and programmes in many different ways and under different thematic and geographic instruments and policies (neighbourhood policy, development co-operation, democracy & Human rights, stabilisation processes, etc.). However, unlike the Council of the EU, the EC is steeped in the culture and discourse of development co-operation. The institution's development co-operation strategies (country or regional Strategy Papers) sometimes cover SSR issues, though the terminology used may vary.

The EC's M&E arrangements are strongly influenced by its development co-operation culture and its endorsement of various strategic frameworks (Millennium Development Goals, Paris Declaration on Aid effectiveness, European Consensus on Development, etc) and of the OECD DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability).[7] Since 1999 when the EC substantially revised its external assistance framework, the institution has elaborated new M&E procedures, methodologies, tools and guidelines with the aim to improving the quality and delivery of its assistance. These existing M&E mechanisms apply

---

[7] As set out in: *The DAC Principles for the Evaluation.*
 of Development Assistance, OECD (1991), *Glossary of Terms Used in Evaluation, in 'Methods and Procedures in Aid Evaluation',* OECD (1986), *and the Glossary of Evaluation and Results Based Management (RBM) Terms,* OECD (2000).

for all types of activities, all modes of development co-operation (e.g. project, sector approaches and budget support) and all geographical areas.

Finally, the EC carried out a structural reform process from 2000 onwards, variously labelled 'deconcentration' or 'devolution'. The objective was to improve the effectiveness and the quality of operations and to increase their impact and visibility along the principle that everything that can be better managed and decided in-country should not be dealt with in Brussels. EC delegations have consequently been assigned greater responsibilities in recent years for programme management and M&E. Responsibility for M&E is still however split between delegations and Brussels.

3.2   Existing arrangements

3.2.1   Monitoring

Monitoring is defined by the EC as *'the systematic and continuous collecting, analysing and using of information for the purpose of management and decision making. The purpose of monitoring is to achieve efficient and effective performance of an operation. Monitoring systems should therefore provide information to the right people at the right time to help them make informed decisions. Monitoring must highlight the strengths and weaknesses in project implementation, enabling managers to deal with problems, finding solutions and adapt to changing circumstances in order to improve project performance.'*[8] According to internal EC guidance, different types of monitoring are used by the EC staff in-country and in Brussels:[9]

- Project internal monitoring – refers specifically to monitoring that is undertaken by the project's implementing partners, using their own (local) systems and procedures, to meet their own ongoing management information needs.

- Monitoring by EC Task Managers – refers to the role of EC Task Managers with respect to collecting, analysing and using information about project progress and performance, whether it is sourced from 'internal' or 'external', formal or informal sources.

- External monitoring (including Results-Oriented Monitoring – ROM) – is distinguished from 'internal monitoring' because it involves external agents (e.g. contracted consultants), and the use of donor designed/approved monitoring methods and reporting formats, which are designed primarily to meet the donor's own upward reporting and accountability requirements. The ROM system is a key example of an 'external monitoring' and reporting requirement.

These different types of monitoring nevertheless share a common approach towards project design and management, i.e. the Logical Framework Approach (LFA – adopted by the EC in 1993) which sets out a hierarchy of objectives (means, activities, results, project purpose and overall activities), a set of defined assumptions and a framework for monitoring and evaluating projects' achievements (indicators and sources of verifications). The quality of EC operations is also assessed in certain cases against the five key OECD DAC criteria for evaluation of development interventions (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability).

Procedures, methodologies and responsibilities depend on the type of monitoring:[10]

---

[8] *Handbook for Results-Oriented Monitoring of EC External Assistance*, EuropeAid, April 2008.
[9] *Strengthening Project Internal Monitoring*, Aid Delivery Methods Support Team, EuropeAid, June 2007.
[10] EuropeAid has issued several handbooks on methodology as well as on concrete practical guidance for the different activities that are necessary to conduct monitoring of EC operations. All methodological tools are elaborated by a dedicated unit, placed within EuropeAid, the Quality monitoring systems and methodologies Unit. Most of these publications are available here: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/multimedia/publications/index_en.htm.

- Internal monitoring comes under the responsibility the project implementing partner / contractor (recipient country institution, non-state actor, International Organisation, etc.). It is meant to support effective and timely decision making by the project managers to promote accountability for resource use and achievement of results. The monitoring method consists of normal EC project management activity (e.g. documenting information collected during routine meetings with project stakeholders, monitoring the media etc.) and results in a progress report to a format and schedule that is agreed between the EC and the partner.

- Monitoring by an EC Task Manager occurs in the case of a centrally managed project (from Brussels) or when a project is conducted by an implementing partner. This kind of monitoring is intended to inform the Task Manager on the project's development and to support his/her decision-making, capacity-building and reporting tasks. Information collection methods include consultations with implementing partners, field visits and analysis of reports. The Manager then reports half yearly and the report is uploaded on a dedicated database (CRIS – Common Relex Information System).

- External monitoring involves external and independent experts who are commissioned by EuropeAid. The objective is to provide an independent assessment of project performance with a focus on results. External experts undertake short visits to project sites to analyse project records and interview different stakeholders according to a standardised assessment format which includes quality criteria and a rating scale. The final product of these monitoring exercises is known as a Results-Oriented Monitoring Report (ROM).

The ROM system is now generally presented as the main EC monitoring methodology. Elaborated in 2000, the ROM system applies to all regions and sectors of Community Aid. Its initial purpose was to improve quality by setting up a performance-based monitoring mechanism that would provide the EC in Brussels with a global overview of its operations and progress towards results. The use of ROM has since expanded to Delegations and geographic coordinators in Brussels allowing them to supervise EC operations under their responsibility.

ROM Reports are accessible to all RELEX family and Delegation staff via the CRIS database. Whilst National Authorities and PMUs do not have direct access to this database, the Delegation is strongly invited to share results with all stakeholders. The aim is to monitor ongoing projects of an at least €1 m EC contribution and to assess a sample of 10 percent of projects below €1 m (no more than 300 small projects each year).[11]

The ROM system applies for all kinds of operation regardless of their nature and specificity, such as SSR related programmes.

3.2.2   Evaluation[12]

The EC defines evaluation as *'…rendering accounts to the public on the results and impacts of activities financed by EC funds and drawing lessons on what has worked and what has not'.* As was the case with monitoring, the EC has enhanced its evaluation mechanisms through its 'deconcentration' process. A dedicated Evaluation Unit tasked with developing methodologies and tools now sits within EuropeAid managing Brussels-based evaluations of EC operations.

The stated purposes of evaluations are: to contribute to the design of interventions, including providing input for setting political priorities, to assist in an efficient allocation of resources, to improve the quality of the intervention, to report on the achievements of the intervention (i.e. accountability).[13]

---

[11] Brief information on Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) system, EuropeAid/E5, November 2007.
[12] See: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/introduction/introduction_en.htm.
[13] *Methodological bases for evaluation*, Evaluation methods for the European Union's external assistance vol.1, EuropeAid, 2006.

There are two main types of evaluation: project evaluations conducted by delegations on each of their operations and complex evaluations that are conducted by the Evaluation Unit in Brussels. The latter are planned annually and multi-annually and can be thematic or geographically focussed, eg conflict prevention or health; EC assistance to Vietnam or Eastern Africa. An evaluation of the EC support for justice, rule of law and SSR is programmed for 2009, to be centrally managed by the Evaluation Unit in Brussels.[14] The process for either type of evaluation is essentially the same:

> **Preparatory phase (phase 0)**
> A manager is appointed to conduct an evaluation. She/he sets up the reference group, writes the terms of reference and recruits the external evaluation team.
>
> **Desk phase (phase 1)**
> The external evaluation team analyses the logic of the intervention on the basis of official documents and proposes the evaluation questions and 'reasoned assessment criteria', drawing on the five OECD DAC development evaluation criteria. The evaluation questions are validated by the reference group. The team then specifies the indicators and provides partial answers to the questions on the basis of existing information. It identifies the assumptions to be tested in the field and develops its work plan for data collection and analysis.
>
> **Field phase (phase 2)**
> The evaluation team implements its work plan for data collection in the partner country or countries. It applies the specified techniques and begins to test the assumptions.
>
> **Synthesis phase (phase 3)**
> The evaluation team draws up its final report, which includes statements, and conclusions which respond to the questions asked, as well as an overall assessment. The report also includes recommendations that are clustered and prioritised. The final report is subject to a quality assessment.
>
> **Dissemination and follow-up phase (phase 4)**
> The evaluation (report, executive summary, article and/or presentation) is disseminated to policy-makers, to the concerned services and partners, and is posted on the Commission's website. The uptake of the recommendations is monitored.
>
> Source: *Guidelines for geographic and thematic evaluations*, Evaluation methods for the European Union's external assistance vol.3, EuropeAid, 2006.

The evaluation process falls under the responsibility of the EC Delegation or the Brussels-based Evaluation Unit and more specifically the evaluation manager. It involves different stakeholders such as:

• A reference group: membership depends on the nature of the EC operation but involves relevant EC staff and external stakeholders such as representatives of the recipient country, issue specialists and in some cases, non-state actors. The group assists the evaluation manager in defining the objectives and Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation and accompanies the evaluation through the whole process.

---

[14] *Indicative multi-annual evaluation programme 2007-2013*, EuropeAid.
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/work_programme/documents/strategy_2007_2013_en.pdf.

- The external evaluation team consisting of independent experts contracted to undertake the evaluation along the ToR defined by the reference group.

The ToRs set out the overall methodology and work-plan for the evaluation.[15] They particularly address the guiding questions for the evaluation which typically relate to the OECD DAC development evaluation criteria but may also specify measurement indicators which can be qualitative or quantitative.[16]

The final evaluation report will typically include a context analysis, a presentation of the EC intervention's characteristics, answers to the evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations for further related strategies and programming.

The specificity of each operation being evaluated, and thus of SSR related programmes, is addressed in the setting of the reference group and through the use of specific questions and indicators which are supposed to be tailored to the given topic.

3.3 Needs, challenges and opportunities

The needs, challenges and opportunities outlined in this section reflect the views of the author and draw upon the opinions expressed during the interviews.

3.3.1 Monitoring

- *Timing and clarity issues:* As mentioned above, the ROM system has expanded to all sectors and geographical areas of EC assistance. However its systematic use and added value is sometimes hampered by the daily constraints facing EC staff as well as by a lack of clear understanding of its rationale. Whether in Delegations or in Brussels, EC staff usually face important time pressures. Apparently some monitoring reports are also delivered towards the end of a project, meaning that they are too late to influence strategy. Finally, there is sometimes a lack of understanding among staff of the distinction between what the EC terms 'external monitoring', and evaluation (which is carried out by external consultants as standard).[17]

  One of the roles of EuropeAid's Quality Monitoring Systems and Methodologies Unit is to address these concerns by, among other things, raising awareness among EC staff and providing training on the ROM system. EC staff also admit that one obvious way to improve M&E and increase the chances of findings being actioned would be to make room in activity plans for considering the findings of external monitoring.

---

[15] The Evaluation Unit has elaborated comprehensive and detailed methodological tools and guidelines for the directly involved practitioners (evaluation manager in delegation or in Brussels and the evaluation team). All related materials can be found on the EuropeAid web site: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/index_en.htm.

[16] For example: to measure the impact and effectiveness of the EC assistance to Mozambique, one of 10 evaluation questions used is the following: 'To what extent has EC support contributed to promoting good governance at all levels of society?' In order to answer this question, evaluators had to explore the following three issues through a range of specific indicators: i) Decision-making process accepted as being representative of a constituency leading to public sector decisions that are more transparent, responsive and equitable (indicators: Evidence of improved legal and institutional framework for participation, Level of participation of representatives of different relevant groups in decision making process); ii) Inviolable human rights are respected (indicators: Evidence of strengthened initiatives to promote and protect human rights of vulnerable Groups, Effective functioning of bodies concerning human rights); iii) Improved justice sector services with increased accessibility to courts (indicators: Strengthened coordination of legal system structures, Reduction of number of outstanding cases (processing periods and waiting times of civil and criminal suits) in the courts, Increased access of vulnerable groups to judicial services). Source: *Evaluation of the European Commission's Support to the Republic of Mozambique*, Annex E, Final report, 14 December 2007, EuropeAid.

[17] These other types of M&E are not all detailed in this survey as they are not systematic and sometimes appeared as 'secondary' during interviews with various EC staff (from Delegations and Brussels based Units).

- *Compliance with the different types of EC assistance:* The ROM system only applies to the project-type of assistance (defined as a series of activities aimed at bringing about clearly specified objectives within a defined time period and budget). Support to Sector programmes (transfer of funds to a partner government national treasury to be used in pursuit of an agreed set of sector outputs and outcomes) and Direct Budget support (transfer of funds to partner government national treasury for one particular sector or its general budget) use other types of monitoring mechanisms that are less sophisticated. In these cases, a key requirement for the recipient country is to set up an M&E mechanism that will allow donors to measure performance.

  The increasing prevalence of these types of assistance has led EuropeAid's Quality Monitoring Systems and Methodologies Unit to develop ROM system guidelines for assessing EC sector support.[18] These are being tested at the moment.

- *Joint donor monitoring:* Especially in the field of SSR where multiple donors operate in various SSR sub-sectors, it is important that donors can assess progress in a coordinated way. This issue obviously needs to be addressed early during needs assessments and strategic planning phases. The EC, World Bank and United Nations Development Group[19] all recognise this issue and have announced their intention to agree on common assessment and planning frameworks for post-crisis situations. Whatever emerges from these discussions is likely to have a bearing on the EC's handling of SSR work.

3.3.2   Evaluation

- *A shortage of SSR experts:* EC delegation staff are sometimes concerned by the limited availability of qualified SSR specialists. External experts are commissioned using framework contracts awarded to private consortia. For the most part, these companies do not retain in-house expertise on technical issues like SSR and may either go on to sub-contract or try to make do with non-specialists. This applies to different sorts of contract, whether for evaluations or project design or evaluation and as such is a general problem facing the EC. Among those in the EC concerned specifically with SSR, establishing a pool of experts for M&E but also for other SSR-related tasks has often been put forward as one possible solution to the shortage. Whether this effectively contributes to the pool of staff available for M&E of SSR and in turn drives up M&E standards in the future remains to be seen.

- *Dissemination of recommendations and lessons learned:* Since the purpose of evaluations is to inform strategies and programming, dissemination of recommendations and lessons is cited as a priority in various EC documents.[20] But this information needs to reach higher decision-makers within the EC as well as the Council of the EU and the parliament if it is to influence police and practice more broadly.

  The Evaluation Unit is in charge of disseminating evaluation results and has developed a communication strategy to enhance this feedback process. It consists of more systematic publications (not only within the EC, and sometimes not only within the EU, but also to the OECD DAC for instance) that are shorter and more reader-friendly, with clear overall assessments and recommendations ranging from the most to the least urgent priorities. Evaluations are ultimately then presented during public seminars (especially in-country seminars) and during internal EC workshops. In addition to this, the dissemination of a 'Fiche

---

[18] *Guidelines for Monitors to assess Commission's Sector Policy Support Programmes under Results Oriented Monitoring System*, Draft final for testing; EuropeAid, E5 Unit, 8 May 2008.
[19] *Joint declaration on post-crisis assessments and recovery crisis*, European Commission, World Bank, United Nations Development Group, 25 September 2008, http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=806.
[20] *Commission Communication on Evaluation Standards and Good Practice* Brussels, 2002 (COM 2002/5267); Guidelines for disseminations and feedback of evaluation, EuropeAid, Brussels, November 2003; Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation**,** Brussels, 21 February 2007, SEC (2007) 213.

Contradictoire' setting out: a summary of the evaluation report conclusions; the EC's response to the recommendations; and a review one year after the report is now becoming more common as a way to raise awareness of lessons learned and promote acceptance and implementation of recommendations.

4.   Conclusion

The EU shows a strong discrepancy in its M&E systems between that of the Council of the EU and that of the EC. These differences can largely be explained by the different operating practices and overall mandate of the two institutions. The former operates through limited mandate missions with specific scope; the latter through a more open-ended development cooperation framework. The EC is also further down the road of results-based management and M&E than the Council in view of broader trends in the development world. More firmly embedded in mainstream development thinking, the EC also has an older culture of evaluation, albeit an imperfect one. The Council can perhaps be characterised as having a more pragmatic or *ad hoc* approach towards M&E of its ESDP missions, though it is striving now to become more systematic and results-focussed.

The underlying purposes of the two institutions' M&E are similar though, with accountability looming large and lesson learning playing an important secondary role. Common concerns in relation to M&E include ownership and capacity of partner countries and coordination with others. In the case of ESDP missions, it is a constant challenge to get the partner country closely involved in reviewing progress and assessing results. In the case of EC assistance, this is achieved through regular dialogue under the strategic partnership framework and more practically through the participation of national representatives in evaluation and follow-up processes.

The specificities of SSR are partly addressed in the EU's M&E systems. For example, the cross-departmental nature of SSR entails a broader participation in steering or reference groups. The interconnected nature of reform processes (e.g. police-justice, penitentiary-justice) may also be addressed by tailoring evaluation questions and criteria. The basic methods used in the M&E do not however differ from those used in other sectors (nor is it clear that they should).

Another common challenge facing both institutions is that of effective dissemination, feedback and follow-up of the recommendations and lessons derived from M&E. This challenge applies both at project/mission level and also at higher levels decision-making across the EU.

Finally, coordination among donors on M&E is clearly an important area.[21] Both the Council and the EC are aware of this necessity yet varied donor approaches towards SSR has hampered coordination. For its part the EC is looking to address this problem by focussing upstream in the project management cycle and carrying out joint needs assessment and planning with others.

---

[21] Such as *the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*, OECD, Paris, 2005. The importance of joint donor coordination on M&E is also highlighted in the *OECD-DAC Handbook on SSR: Supporting security and justice, OECD,* Paris, 2007.

Annex 1: Interviewees

Alexander Beetz: European Parliament, assistant to Karl Von Wogau MEP, Chair of Security & Defence Committee

Olivier Bribosia, Myriam Pinot-Bernard, Daniela Chiriac, Eric Tourrès: Transtec

Sabato Della Monica, Fernando Cerutti Gil: European Commission, EuropeAid, Quality Monitoring Systems & Methodologies

Mercedes Garcia Perez: Council of the EU, General Secretariat, Civilian Planning & Conduct Capability

Marie-Noëlle Grell: Delegation of the European Commission to Burkina Faso

Antoine Gouzée de Harven: European Commission, EuropeAid, Governance, Security, Human Rights & Gender

Julia Jacoby: Delegation of the European Commission to Georgia

Joaquin Tasso Villalonga: European Commission, DG Relex, Crisis Response and Peace building Unit

Patrick Vanhees: Council of the EU, General Secretariat, DG 8 – Defence aspects

Birgit Susanne Wille: European Commission, EuropeAid, Evaluation Unit