

MfDR pillar components	Criteria for each progressive stage			
	AWARENESS (1)	EXPLORATION (2)	TRANSITION (3)	FULL IMPLEMENTATION (4)
I LEADERSHIP				
Commitment	Top management asserts importance of MfDR. But no concrete initiatives have been initiated.	A small number of managers investigate MfDR tools, and apply them sporadically. But initiative is not consistent, nor mandated.	Full commitment within government to MfDR. New MfDR practices are systematically adopted. Most, but not all staff, support initiative and most, but not all units practice MfDR.	All units practice comprehensive and systematic MfDR systems. Staff report benefits outweigh costs of MfDR. Organization is learning how to use and continuously adapt MfDR.
MfDR informs policy	Although leaders claim that evidence should be integrated into policy processes, reliable data are not collected or used.	At least a few decisions are taken based on hard data. However, these are the exceptions in an environment where data are seldom available or used.	A thorough array of results based data-grounded decision- and policy-making support systems are installed in some units. Leadership emphasizes the importance of such systems and indicates that they should be harmonized and used universally.	Results-based management systems are used in virtually all relevant areas. These systems are adequately funded, staff at all levels appreciate their utility, they use data to revise policy and procedures, and systems are in place to continuously improve them.
National Planning	National Development Plan exists. However, outcomes and targets – even for such areas as poverty reduction or health – are not clearly articulated.	National Development Plan articulates outcomes, and maybe even some specific targets. However, that discipline is not consistently applied throughout the Plan.	The National Development Plan clearly articulates outcomes, results and measurable targets against which programs can be measured. However, data are not systematically collected and used by decision makers. « Ownership » of the Plan and its data is not widespread.	Outcomes, results and target areas are consistently and appropriately applied throughout the National development Plan. Relevant data are collected and used to adapt implementation of the plan. Decision makers recognize the utility of the data and ensure it is integrated into the decision-making process.
Public consultation	Government tolerates civil society and private sector advocacy, as politically necessary.	Government actively pursues civil society and private sector input into the formulation of policies and plans. But, such participation is normally the result of relatively powerful interests, donor pressure, or individual government managers.	Government has specific policies, structures, and practices for soliciting civil society and government input. These policies are often, though not always pursued. A significant number in government view these practices as burdensome and unproductive. Public increasingly feels entitled to participate.	Public consultation in policy and planning is the norm. Officials recognize that public consultation is a necessary and productive ingredient in policy setting and planning. Public feels entitled to participate and responsible for planning and policy outcomes.
Donor coordination	Government extols the importance of coordination. However, real coordination is not common, even where, even where 'donor coordination forums' may exist.	Government has some success to promoting coordination in certain areas, such as in vertical health programs or poverty reduction strategies. However, these are	Government has developed clear donor coordination expectations, systems and procedures – based on results management. Some donors follow these regimes, but many	The vast majority of donor inputs are programmed consistently with an overall donor coordination program linked to results based management. Donors appreciate

	Government lacks the institutions, tools, data, passion, or leverage to ensure productive donor coordination.	isolated cases.	remain outside it.	the coordination function and are supportive of it.
Linking the field and the capital	Managers report frustration that their MfDR approaches can't bear fruit due to disconnects between direct service providers and the center.	Some organizations, or departments within organizations have developed MfDR systems that link central planning and budgeting with field operations (possibly on a pilot basis). But these efforts remain isolated.	Vertically-integrated MfDR systems are being applied in many sectors. Appropriate training and monitoring systems are being developed. Ownership of the systems is uneven.	Virtually throughout government MfDR systems reach from the capital to the local level. Planning and budgeting systems are linked and data – such as on access, quality, and customer satisfaction – flow from the field to the center and are used to adjust programming.

MfDR pillar components	Criteria for each progressive stage			
	AWARENESS (1)	EXPLORATION (2)	TRANSITION (3)	FULL IMPLEMENTATION (4)
II Evaluation and Monitoring				
Monitoring and evaluation capacity	A minimum capacity for monitoring and for evaluation exists in key units; some key units have M&E officers on staff	A limited number of units have developed competency in monitoring or evaluation	Government has a program to develop monitoring and evaluation capacities in all units. Some units are implementing the systems more readily than others	All units have the appropriate level of monitoring and evaluation capacity to support MfDR. Efforts are adequately funded and produce data that are used
National Development Plan evaluation systems	A National Development Plan – with indicators and targets to track progress – exists. However, data are generally not collected on progress.	Performance data are collected for some components of the Development Plan – such as health or poverty reduction – but data are seldom used for decision making.	Government is committed to measuring progress against virtually all aspects of the Development Plan. Progress may be somewhat uneven, but information is flowing through the system and used by many managers to improve implementation.	Performance data is systematically used to gauge progress of the Development Plan. Resultant analysis is increasingly used to inform current implementation and drafting of future Development Plans.
Client satisfaction systems	Officials give voice to the need to serve customers, but have no systems to learn whether they are succeeding.	Some unites have developed formal customer satisfaction measurement systems.	Virtually all units have used customer satisfaction measurement systems. Applications may be uneven and inconsistent.	Customer satisfaction systems are applied throughout units – as appropriate. The approaches are consistent across units and data are used to improve services.
Data management capability	Managers feel constrained by lack of data – such as on output and outcomes, service quality, and overall program measures – available to them to make programmatic decisions or judge progress against results.	Some organizations or departments are able to collect, manage and report on relevant management data, but most are driving beyond their headlights.	The government has promoted specific MIS standards – included data acquisition, storage, analysis and reporting. Skills and understanding of their utility may not yet be adequate to implement them across the government.	Managers are able to obtain data – such as on outputs and outcomes, service quality, and overall program measures – in a timely and useful format. Cross-organizational MIS Coordination facilities results management.
Donor required reporting systems	Government is frustrated by need to respond to ‘x’ different donor required reporting systems.	Government must respond to ‘x/2’ different donor reporting systems.	Government must respond to ‘x/3’ different donor reporting systems.	Government must respond to ‘x/4’ different donor reporting systems.
Reporting harmonization	Government responds to diverse donor reporting requirements – though doing so is time consuming and Government would prefer a more unified approach.	Government has begun dialogue with donors on ways to harmonize reporting requirements.	Government has established a policy of requiring a harmonized approach to reporting to diverse donors. Some units, and donors, remain resistant to the change.	All units apply harmonized donor reporting procedures. All major donors comply with this policy.

MfDR pillar components	Criteria for each progressive stage			
	AWARENESS (1)	EXPLORATION (2)	TRANSITION (3)	FULL IMPLEMENTATION (4)
III Accountability and Partners				
Judicial independence	Government acknowledges the importance of judicial independence. However, structural or political realities prevent this.	Government is in the process of instituting structural and/or policy reform to increase judicial independence.	Formal structural and policy constraints to an independent judiciary are largely removed. However, in practice, some judicial functions and transactions appear to be influenced by government and/or special interest.	The judiciary appears to operate without significant influence from government or special interests. Officials and the public take pride in this reality.
Legislative oversight	Legislators consider one of their key functions to be monitoring government activities. As a practical matter, they may not be as effective at this as they would like.	The Legislature has formed a structure to oversee at least some government activities. It has adequate resources to be effective in at least a portion of this mandate.	The Legislature has a comprehensive structure to provide meaningful oversight over a significant range of government activities. These mechanisms are reasonably well funded. This oversight sometimes lacks “reach” but as Legislature can report some instances of having influenced Government actions as a result of its oversight.	The Legislature has the structure, resources, and acknowledged mandate to effectively oversee government activities on a comprehensive scale. The legislature has had success in influencing government actions as a result of its oversight.
Media independence	Portions of government recognize that an independent media watchdog function is necessary for effective governance. However, it is not a reality.	Government has taken specific actions – such as reducing government media outlets, passing press freedom laws – to reduce government control over the media.	Media are increasingly independent of government and able to investigate and report on the results of government activity. However, there are still some subjects, geographic, or topic areas that are considered off limits to media. Government can report on instances where policy and/or procedures have been revised as a result of media reporting.	Media are largely independent of government influence and actively report on a broad range of government activity results. Government policy and/or procedures are often revised as a result of media reporting.
Customer feedback	X% of units have customer feedback mechanisms.	Y% of units have customer feedback mechanisms.	Z% of units have customer feedback mechanisms. Government policies and/or procedures are occasionally adjusted in response to feedback.	XX% of units have customer feedback mechanisms. Government policies and/or procedures are frequently adjusted in response to feedback.
Public access to results	Government recognizes the need for the public to learn about the degree of government effectiveness (results data, at the	Some units have established formal procedures to provide access to results data. Limited publication of results data also occurs. No	Government has a policy to provide citizens access to results data. Many have formal structures to share information. This is generally,	The public has access to results data in all relevant units. Government has a proactive approach to informing the public

	least). But public can not access important data.	consistent policy exists.	though not universally, followed. Some units are more proactive than others in publicizing results data. Instances exist of the public using the data to work for change.	on government results on a regular basis through established structures. The public acknowledges improved access to data. Many examples can be provided by Government where the public has used the data to work for change.
People-led MfDR	Limited training on MfDR. Performance appraisal systems, including rewards and recognition, linked to the spending of resources (inputs) as well as activities and outputs.	MfDR training needs identified: training packages developed and some training provided (basic training and technical skills). Performance appraisal systems linked primarily to outputs and a few outcomes. There is a general awareness of the goals/objectives of the organization.	MfDR training provided to key managers and functional experts. Performance appraisal systems linked to outcomes in some key areas. All staff have a commonly shared vision of the results that the organization is trying to achieve.	MfDR training available to all managers and staff. Performance appraisal systems linked to outcomes in all areas. Virtually all staff have a commonly shared vision of the results of the organization and understand their role in achieving these results.
Aid information availability	Government desires – but does not proactively solicit – timely and comprehensive information from donors on aid flows.	Government is able to obtain comprehensive information on aid flows from a small number of donors.	Government proactively requests comprehensive aid flow information from all donors. Most, but not all, comply.	Government is able to receive comprehensive information on aid flows from all donors.

MfDR pillar components	Criteria for each progressive stage			
	AWARENESS (1)	EXPLORATION (2)	TRANSITION (3)	FULL IMPLEMENTATION (4)
IV PLANNING AND BUDGETING				
Budget reflects national political priorities	Government acknowledges that budget should reflect national political priorities, but it does not	Government initiates process of outlining national priorities and providing a structure in the budget to address some of them	Increasingly, the budget is organized around national priorities (such as in the National Development Plan) and funds are allocated according to those priorities	A transparent process is followed where national priorities are established transparently and budgets are allocated and spent according to those priorities
Performance based budgeting	Although staff can discuss the importance of MfDR, in fact budgets are more the result of past expenditure patterns and political performance	A small number of units make budgetary decisions based on progress against targets and resources need to achieve results	Most units have budgetary decisions on progress against targets (performance data) and resources needed to achieve results. Application may not be consistent across units	Performance-based budgeting is the norm throughout the government. Data are regularly gathered to support budgetary decisions. Management occasionally reviews performance-based budgeting systems for continuous improvement
Participation in planning and budgeting	Legal system provides for participation in planning and budgeting by legislature. No legal constraints exist to citizen participation in planning and budgeting processes. However, no real participation occurs and no formal structures support participation	A limited number of structures have been established for legislative participation (such as a committee to review budget and certain planning functions) and citizen input (such as outreach for a poverty reduction strategy)	Legislative review committees are more common, and some actively engage in the process in a mostly objective process that yields improved results. In certain sectors citizen input is intense and government has responded to concerns in and planning through formal structures	Virtually all significant planning and budgeting is subject to substantive legislature review. Virtually all planning activities of significant scale are subject to citizen input through established structures
Internal coordination	While managers realize they must work together most organizational planning and budgeting is done in isolation. This is true within organizations (among departments) and across organizations (among different organizations)	Some organizations work to align departmental objectives and budgets with overall results expectations. Some sectoral approaches are developed, with structures to support joint planning, budgeting and measurement approaches that span organizational boundaries	Most significant sectoral efforts are pursued through integrated results processes and coordination structures to support them. Many ministry results frameworks are based on cascading results management approaches among departments	Virtually all significant sectoral efforts are pursued through integrated results processes and structures to support them. Departmental planning and budgeting must demonstrate effective contribution to overall organizational frameworks
Results management framework	Managers understand the value of MfDR, but do not manage their portfolios accordingly	A small number of managers apply MfDR practices, such as logical frameworks, results frameworks and other tools	A real movement is underway throughout the government to practice MfDR. Some units resist the change, but substantial movement is underway. Most managers can articulate intended results	The government is managed based on results. Managers can articulate intended results and adapt implementation – based on results data – to achieve those results

MfDR pillar components	Criteria for each progressive stage			
	AWARENESS (1)	EXPLORATION (2)	TRANSITION (3)	FULL IMPLEMENTATION (4)
V Statistics				
Statistics strategy	No national strategy for the development of statistics exists.	A national strategy for the development of statistics exists, but is implemented to a very limited extent.	A national strategy for development statistics is implemented in many areas, with useful data emerging. Data may not be fully utilized and strategy is static.	The national strategy for development statistics is implemented fully, revised as needed, and forms the foundation of data collection in the country.
Data disaggregation	Policy makers and statisticians understand the importance of disaggregating gender by sex, geographic area, etc. However, few data sets are disaggregated usefully.	Some surveys and data sets are meaningfully disaggregated, but they tend to do so at the wish of donors or particular researchers.	The national strategy for development statistics provides useful guidance on disaggregation. Most surveys and data sets are disaggregated.	Policy makers appreciate the utility of data disaggregation and can report instances where disaggregation has supported improved decision-making. Information users expect all data to be disaggregated, where appropriate.
Data quality assessment	Data consumers are wary of government-produced data, recognizing these are not data quality assessment (DQA) procedures.	Some units and researchers have appropriate data quality assessment protocols. These, however, are exceptions to the rule and vary in size and approach.	The government has developed standard DQA protocols. These are generally followed, though some units either skip DQAs or use their own approach.	A standard DQA approach is adopted throughout government and applied uniformly throughout. Policy makers express confidence in the DQA process and the data.
Survey capability	Managers responsible for national-level results seek data on national trends – in areas such as poverty, demographics, HIV/Aids or environment – but government is not yet producing quality national survey data.	Some national-level studies have been completed, but at the initiative of a single organization or in respect to one-time donor funding. Ownership of data is uneven and local capacity to analyze data is not yet developed.	National level studies are conducted with some cross-sectoral coordination. But, out-year follow-up is uncertain. While some managers are able to analyze the data, some of the data are not adequately processed nor are results appropriately disseminated to other parts of government and the public.	Household income/expenditure or other national surveys are conducted regularly (at least every five years). Relevant cross-sectoral units contribute to the content of the studies. Data are used to inform national planning and budgeting efforts through effective data analysis and dissemination of findings.
Performance measurement	Managers appreciate the utility of performance data, but little is available to them.	Some units systematically collect performance data to inform decision making. But most units do not.	Performance measurement systems are operational throughout the government and data is systematically collected and reported. Some units, however, do this only as a requirement, they don't use the data.	Most managers report the usefulness of the data they get and that decisions are made based on that data.