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Program Monitoring and Evaluation

The Integrity Management Program (IMP) aims to systematize and implement integrity building across the entire bureaucracy. Its success hinges on three major activities, namely: (1) integrity assessment; (2) implementation; and (3) monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The first focuses on the determination of corruption-vulnerable areas in an institution’s operational processes and the formulation of integrity measures which could mitigate or eradicate the identified corruption risks. On the other hand, the third focuses on tracking the actual performance or situation against what was planned or expected and on systematically and objectively assessing the relevance, performance and success of the program itself.

The M&E system will be implemented in both the program and institutional (or internal) levels. This entails tracking the progress of implementation and the achievement of the program results at the institutional level, and eventually determining the efficiency and effectiveness of the program in preventing corruption in general.

The manner of conducting an internal M&E is comprehensively discussed in the IMP Handbook; therefore, this document is only meant as a guide for the Program Management Committee (PMC), the Secretariat, and internal and external assessors for the conduct of program M&E.

Objectives

Program M&E is intended to enable the institution to systematically gather information that can aid it in planning for IMP implementation. It also enables the PMC to monitor the progress of implementation and to assess the achievement of performance targets for programmatic decisions. Moreover, it ensures internal and external accountability. Lastly, it allows the PMC to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, impact or outcome, and success of the IMP.

---

1 Office of the President-Office of the Ombudsman (OP-OMB), Integrity Management Program Handbook, p.3
2 Ibid., p.39
3 Ibid., pp.39-42
4 Ibid., p.43
Monitoring is a continuing function that aims primarily to provide managers and process-owners with regular feedback and early indications of progress or lack thereof in the achievement of intended results. Monitoring tracks the actual performance or situation against what was planned or expected according to pre-determined standards. It generally involves collecting and analyzing data on implementation processes, strategies and results, and recommending corrective measures.\(^5\) It focuses on the outputs, which are the specific products and services that emerge from processing inputs.\(^6\)

---


\(^6\) Ibid., p.7
Mechanisms

The monitoring system will be managed by the PMC through the Secretariat. It will be implemented on 2 levels: (1) implementation of activities to reach the integrity targets, including the timeliness of implementation and the level of accomplishment (progress monitoring); and (2) achievement of performance targets (performance monitoring).7

For this purpose, the PMC adopts the following mechanisms to track the actual performance or situation against what was planned or expected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Validation</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Semi-Annual M&amp;E Progress Report8</td>
<td>• Desk review</td>
<td>• Stakeholders meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual Performance Monitoring Report9</td>
<td>• Field visits</td>
<td>• Focus group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual Financial Reports (or other relevant document)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Substantive program documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ REPORTING

M&E Progress Report (Template 8)

Timing : One hundred eighty days (or 6 months) after the submission of the Integrity Management (IM) Plan, and every 180 days thereafter throughout the five-year IMP cycle10

Purpose : To track the institution’s efficiency in accomplishing the targets set forth in the Implementation Plan (Template 6),11 its accomplishments, as well as the reasons for any deviations, if any12

Preparation : To be accomplished and submitted by the Integrity Management Committee (IMC) to the PMC based on the quarterly progress reports submitted by the implementing units13

Content : The report should contain an enumeration of the integrity measures and the activities related to each, the starting date of implementation, the target and actual completion dates, the accomplishments and the

---

7 OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.43
8 Ibid., p.41
9 Ibid., p.44
10 Ibid., p.46
11 Ibid., p.37
12 Ibid., p.41
13 Ibid.
reasons for deviations from targets, if any, The report should be signed by the head of the institution.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{Format}\textsuperscript{15}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IM</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>Remarks (Deviations, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See IMP Handbook for instructions on how to accomplish

\textbf{Performance Monitoring Report (Template 9)}

\textbf{Timing} : One year after the submission of the IM Plan, and every year thereafter throughout the five-year IMP cycle\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{Purpose} : To track the institution’s desired outputs and changes in relation to the IM that has been implemented as set forth in the M&E Plan (Template 7)

\textbf{Preparation} : To be accomplished and submitted by the IMC to the PMC

\textbf{Content} : The report should contain an enumeration of accomplishments; challenges encountered; the steps taken to addresses these challenges; a summary of indicators; and a report on the actual performance or situation vis-à-vis what was planned or expected

\textbf{Format}\textsuperscript{17}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Public Sector Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Overview of Integrity Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Challenges Encountered and Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Summary of Indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Program Logic / Narrative & Indicators & Baseline & Targets & Actual \\
\hline
| Goal | Purpose |
| Activities |
| IMC Members |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
| Program Logic / Narrative & Indicators & Baseline & Targets & Actual \\
| \textsuperscript{Y}1 & \textsuperscript{Y}2 & \textsuperscript{Y}3 & \textsuperscript{Y}4 & \textsuperscript{Y}5 & \textsuperscript{Y}1 & \textsuperscript{Y}2 & \textsuperscript{Y}3 & \textsuperscript{Y}4 & \textsuperscript{Y}5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{14} OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.41
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p.46
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p.44
Note: See IMP Handbook for instructions on how to accomplish

### Annual Financial Report/s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>One year after the submission of the IM Plan, and every year thereafter throughout the five-year IMP cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To determine the amount of financial resource mobilized for the implementation of the IM Plan as one of the criteria in rating the agency’s performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>To be submitted by the IMC to the PMC as an attachment to the annual Performance Monitoring Report (Template 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The report should show the amount of financial resource set aside for the implementation of the IM Plan, how much was ultimately spent during the year, how it was spent, and other relevant details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Substantive Program Documentation

The IMC should submit, along with all the afore-mentioned reports, a copy of relevant documents that could help the PMC in its validation as well as in the rating of the institution’s annual performance.

➢ VALIDATION

### Desk Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Within two weeks after the submission of each M&amp;E Progress Report (Template 8) and within three weeks after the submission of each Performance Monitoring Report (Template 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To validate the contents of the report submitted by the IMC through intensive literature search, analysis of submitted documents, or informal telephone or email conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>To be conducted by the PMC Secretariat, particularly by the team assigned to the institution, or any other team or person at the discretion of the PMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>For progress monitoring –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i) Activities</th>
<th>(ii) Findings</th>
<th>(iii) Timeliness</th>
<th>(iv) Accomplishments</th>
<th>(v) Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Best practices:

#### Lessons learned:

(i) To be culled from Template 8  
(ii) To be culled from Template 8  
(iii) Comment on variation between target dates (start/end) and actual dates (start/end), if any  
(iv) Determine whether measure of accomplishment or means of verification is sufficient (S), insufficient (I), or if the activity was not carried out (N); If insufficient, cite reason and make recommendation  
(v) Comment on deviations

#### For performance monitoring –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i) Target</th>
<th>(ii) Baseline</th>
<th>S/I/N</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>(iii) Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Best practices:

#### Lessons learned:

(i) Outputs, activities, indicators and baseline are culled from Template 9  
(ii) Pertains to accomplishment of desired outputs or change; Determine whether measure of accomplishment or means of verification is sufficient (S), insufficient (I), or if the activity was not carried out (N); If insufficient, cite reason, make recommendation and indicate partial accomplishment, if any  
(iii) Percentage = (S/Total no. of indicators) * 100

In both instances, the Secretariat must prepare a narrative report based on the findings. The report along with the accomplished templates must be submitted to the PMC and transmitted to the concerned institution after approval.

---

### Field Visit/s

#### Timing

Within two weeks after the conduct of desk review, if necessary

#### Purpose

To validate the contents of the report submitted by the IMC through direct observation
**Preparation**: To be conducted by the PMC Secretariat, particularly by the team assigned to the institution, or any other team or person at the discretion of the PMC

**Format**: The Secretariat may improve upon the accomplished desk review report (for performance monitoring). Similarly, a narrative report must be prepared and submitted to the PMC. The approved report must then be transmitted to the concerned institution.

---

**PARTICIPATION**

In all instances, the PMC and the Secretariat should ensure the inclusivity of the entire monitoring process by holding focus group discussions and process-owner meetings when necessary to track the accomplishments of the institution and the challenges it encountered.

Further, they may provide relevant advice through the process of IMP planning and implementation, as well as technical support, to address the concerns raised in the monitoring process.\(^\text{18}\)

---

**Rating**

In the annual review of the institution’s progress, the Secretariat will use the below Performance Rating Sheet (Template 10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Were the targeted outputs reached? (see indicators for outputs)  
  *Score*:  
  a. At least 60-75% of the output targets were reached = 1  
  b. At least 76-90% of the output targets were reached = 2  
  c. At least 91-100% of the output targets were reached = 3 | |
| 2. Were the activities set out in the Integrity Management Plan implemented?  
  *Score*:  
  a. At least 60-75% of activities were implemented = 1  
  b. At least 76-90% of activities were implemented = 2  
  c. At least 91-100% of activities were implemented = 3 | |
| 3. Was there sufficient amount of resources mobilized for implementation of the Plan?  
  *Score*:  
  a. The IMP included in the institution’s budget = 1  
  b. At least 50% of IMP budget expended = 2  
  c. The IMP budget was fully expended = 3 | |
| 4. Were the activities implemented in a timely manner?  
  *Score*:  
  a. At least 60-75% of the activities were implemented within planned period of implementation = 1 | |

\(^{18}\) OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.45
b. At least 76-90% of the activities were implemented within planned period of implementation = 2

c. At least 91-100% of the activities were implemented within planned period of implementation = 3

5. Was the annual target set for the goal reached? (see indicator for goal)
   Score:
   a. No compliance =0
   b. Partial =1-2
   c. Yes = 3

   TOTAL

Note: Rate the institutions using the scores provided under each number. The highest score that can be earned by the institution is 15 points. If the institution does not fall under any criteria provided under each number, a zero (0) rating is given.

The PMC will endorse its findings and recommendations to the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman for approval and action. The PMC implements the decision or action of the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman on matters involving IMP. They may independently decide or act on matters or concerns particularly those involving their respective mandates.19

Steps

1. The IMC submits an M&E Progress Report (Template 8) to the PMC 180 days after the submission of the IM Plan (and every 180 days thereafter);

2. The Secretariat conducts a desk review within two weeks after the submission of each M&E Progress Report to examine and assess the contents of the report;

3. The Secretariat accomplishes a desk review report and submits it to the PMC;

4. The PMC transmits the desk review report to the IMC for appropriate action;

5. The IMC submits a Performance Monitoring Report (Template 9) to the PMC one year after the submission of the IM Plan (and every year thereafter);

6. The Secretariat conducts a desk review within three weeks after the submission of each Performance Monitoring Report to validate the contents of the report;

7. The Secretariat accomplishes a review report and submits it to the PMC;

8. The PMC transmits the review report to the IMC for appropriate action;

9. The Secretariat conducts a field visit, if necessary, within two weeks after the conduct of desk review to validate the contents of the report;

10. The Secretariat integrates its findings into the review report and submits it to the PMC;

11. The PMC transmits the review report to the IMC for appropriate action;

19 OP-OMB, supra note 1, pp.44-45
12. The Secretariat rates the performance of the institution using a Performance Rating Sheet (Template 10);

13. The PMC endorses its findings and recommendations to the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman for approval and action; and

14. The PMC implements the decision or action of the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman.

15. The PMC submits an annual IMP Performance Report to the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman not later than January 31 of the immediately following year.

In all instances, the Secretariat must keep a copy of all the reports submitted by the institutions. Further, it will be the responsibility of the PMC to consolidate all the Performance Rating Sheets accomplished and approved during the calendar year and submit the same to the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman along with an annual IMP Performance Report consisting of a summary of findings, recommendations and best practices not later than January 31 of the immediately following year.

The PMC must devise a plan to communicate the performance of IMP-participating agencies to the public and to the institutions on a yearly basis or oftener.

CHAPTER 2: PROGRAM EVALUATION

Program evaluation is a time-bound exercise that will be conducted by the PMC, through the Secretariat, to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, impact or outcome, and success of the IMP. It is undertaken selectively to answer specific questions to guide the PMC, and to provide information on whether underlying theories and assumptions used in program development were valid, what worked and what did not work and why. Moreover, the evaluation process focuses on the outcomes of efforts, which are the changes in conditions that the government aims to achieve through the program, which include, among others, a reduction of incidences of corruption and the enhancement of public trust in the institution.

---

20 UNDP-EO, supra note 5, p.100
21 Ibid., p.7
22 OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.46
Scope

The PMC, through the Secretariat, will conduct mid- and end-of-program evaluations. The former will be done during the third year of implementation; the latter will be done at the end of the 5-year IMP cycle.

The subject of evaluation is the program itself. The issues to be covered are its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Changes in the level of corruption in the IMP-participating institutions, and in the government as a whole, will also be taken into account.

The evaluation process will involve a wide range of stakeholders including, but not limited to, the PMC, the institution itself, its internal and external clients and the general public.

Expected results

During the mid-program evaluation, the PMC is expected to generate 3 products, namely: best practices, lessons learned, and sustainability.

Best practices refer to planning and/or operational practices that have proven successful in particular circumstances. Best practices are used to demonstrate what works and what does not, and to accumulate and apply knowledge about how and why they work in different situations and contexts. They can be used as a benchmark, when appropriate, during the implementation of the IMP in other institutions.

Lessons learned refer to those gained from experience that are applicable to a generic situation rather than to a specific circumstance. While lessons learned could refer to both good and worst practices, the evaluative product under this M&E system pertains only to the latter. The inclusion of worst practices as one of the products will enable the PMC to continually improve IMP implementation by recognizing mistakes and sharing them.

Sustainability refers to dynamic sustainability, or the continuous use or adaptation of program to a different context or changing environment by the original target groups and/or other groups.

In addition to these 3 products, the PMC is expected to generate 2 more products during the end-of-program evaluation, namely: impact and effectiveness.

Impact refers to the overall and long-term effect of the IMP. Impact is the longer term or ultimate result attributable to an intervention—in contrast to output and outcome

23 OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.46
24 Ibid.
25 UNDP-EO, supra note 5, p.99
26 Ibid., p.102
27 Ibid., p.106
which reflect more immediate results from the intervention.\textsuperscript{28} Impact pertains to the effect of the program as seen or experienced by external clients, e.g. public.

**Effectiveness** refers to the extent to which the IMP objectives are achieved through interventions, or the extent to which the IMP achieves its planned results (goals, purposes and outputs) and contributes to outcomes.\textsuperscript{29} Effectiveness pertains to the effect of the program as seen or experienced by internal clients.

**Methodology**

The data on the indicators will be gathered using various collection methods. Data may be gathered through surveys and interviews. It could also come from the reports of institutions and other organizations. These will then be analyzed to find out whether the program was delivered according to its objectives. Basic comparisons, such as targets-to-accomplishments comparison, will be made. The trends in implementation will also be determined to identify the necessary adjustments to program implementation.\textsuperscript{30}

**Best Practices / Lessons Learned**

**Methodology** : Document Analysis

The sources of data for these two outputs are the Desk Review Reports, Field Visit Reports and annual IMP Performance Reports. The Secretariat will collate the best practices and lessons learned from these sources and select the ones which have proven successful in particular circumstances (in the case of best practices) and those that are applicable to generic situations (in the case of lessons learned).

Great care should be taken to describe the circumstances in which the best practices have proven successful and the situations in which the lessons learned are applicable in order that the PMC and the IMP-participating agencies will be guided accordingly.

**Impact**

**Methodology** : Rapid Assessment (Mini-survey); Citizen Report Card

Impact evaluation is the systematic identification of the effects – positive or negative, intended or not – on individual households, institutions, and the environment caused by a given development activity such as a program or project. Impact evaluations can range from large scale sample surveys to small-scale rapid assessment and

\textsuperscript{28} UNDP-EO, supra note 5, p.101  
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p.100  
\textsuperscript{30} OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.46
participatory appraisals.31 With regard to the IMP, the PMC will use a rapid appraisal method, particularly a mini-survey.

A mini-survey is a structured questionnaire with a limited number of close-ended questions that is administered to 50-75 people. Selection of respondents may be random or purposive.32 The survey tool will be the subject of a separate document.

In the same survey tool, the PMC may opt to include a Citizen Report Card which is a tool used commonly by non-government organizations and think-tanks to investigate, among others, the extent of corruption encountered by ordinary citizens.33 This will determine if there is a lower incidence of corruption in the processes that were subjected to integrity assessment or an improvement in public perception, and if the changes are attributable to the IMP.

In both instances, a baseline survey must be conducted on the first year of implementation.

**Timing:** For the initial evaluation, the PMC will assess the IMP-participating agencies that were able to complete the IMP cycle by on or before December 2019.

---

**Sustainability**

**Methodology:** Rapid Assessment (Key Informant Interview)

Rapid appraisal methods are quick low-cost ways to gather the views and feedback of beneficiaries and other stakeholders, in order to respond to decision-makers’ needs for information.34 As regards the IMP, the PMC will conduct key informant interview, which is a method that utilizes a series of open-ended questions posed to individuals selected for their knowledge and experience in a topic of interest.35

To determine the dynamic sustainability of the program or its adaptability to a different context or changing environment, i.e., processes or systems other than those which were initially subjected to integrity assessment, the PMC, through the Secretariat will do any or all of the following: (1) interview the IMC to determine if other processes/systems can be assessed; (2) interview process owners of offices, divisions or bureaus which were not involved in the IMP’s initial run; and/or (3) conduct executive briefing in other agencies and accomplish Template 1 – Critical Systems of Assessment.36

---

32 Ibid., p.15  
33 Ibid., p.13  
34 Ibid., p.14  
35 Ibid., p.15  
36 OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.26
Effectiveness

Methodology: Document Analysis

The sources of data for this output are the Performance Monitoring Reports (Template 9) and the annual IMP Performance Reports of all the IMP-participating agencies that were able to complete the IMP implementation cycle, which should not exceed five years.

To determine whether the IMP achieved its planned results (goals, purposes and outputs) and contributed to outcomes at the end of the IMP cycle, the PMC, through the Secretariat, must check whether the following were achieved:

1. At least 60% of the IMP-participating agencies that were able to complete the IMP cycle (which should not exceed five years) received an aggregate performance rating of 10 or higher; and

2. At least 60% of the IMP-participating agencies that were able to complete the IMP cycle (which should not exceed five years) achieved the goals indicated in the Logical Framework (Template 5) of the IMP-participating agencies, which were copied onto their respective Performance Monitoring Reports (Template 9), were achieved.

Timing: For the initial evaluation, the PMC will assess the IMP-participating agencies that were able to complete the IMP cycle by on or before December 2019.

Report Format

The evaluation report should contain the following data:

1. Background
2. Best practices
3. Lessons learned
4. Sustainability assessment results and analysis
5. Impact evaluation results and analysis
6. Effectiveness rating and analysis
7. Conclusion
8. Recommendations
The report will be prepared by the Secretariat and submitted to the PMC for approval, after which it should be submitted to the Ombudsman and the Executive Secretary for information and other appropriate action.

**Steps**

1. After the **first year** of implementation, the Secretariat will conduct the following activities:

   a. Conduct a survey to establish a baseline for the prospective impact evaluation and citizen report card survey; and

   b. Prepare an evaluation report and submit it to the PMC not later than the 90th day after the end of the first year of implementation.

2. After the **third year** of implementation, the Secretariat will simultaneously conduct the following activities:

   a. Conduct a document analysis to determine best practices and lessons learned;

   b. Conduct a key informant interview to determine the dynamic sustainability of the IMP; and

   c. Prepare an evaluation report and submit it to the PMC not later than the 150th day after the end of the third year of implementation.

3. After the **fifth year** of implementation, the Secretariat will simultaneously conduct the following activities:

   a. Conduct a document analysis to determine best practices and lessons learned;

   b. Conduct a mini-survey to evaluate the impact of the program;
c. Conduct a key informant interview to determine the dynamic sustainability of the IMP;

d. Conduct a document analysis to assess the effectiveness of the program; and

e. Prepare an evaluation report and submit it to the PMC not later than the 180th day after the end of the fifth year of implementation.

In the case of mid-program and end-of-program evaluations, the PMC must endorse its findings and recommendations to the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman for approval and action. If the PMC deems it necessary to do so, it may share its findings with IMP-participating agencies.

The Secretariat should ensure that all documents are properly and securely kept.

**CHAPTER 3: CERTIFICATION**

At the end of the 5-year IMP cycle, public sector institutions will be assessed on their level of achievement in building a culture of integrity within their respective organizations. Institutions which performed exemplarily will be recognized and awarded.  

The recognition for exemplary performance will be by means of certification. The institution will be rated according to 3 certification levels based on the performance rating, the extent of implementation, and the public trust rating. To determine the public trust rating, the PMC may consider entering into a Memorandum of Agreement with entities that engage in research such as EON, Pulse Asia Research, Inc. or Social Weather Stations. 

The following are the criteria for each certification level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Certification Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold: A Culture of Organizational Stewardship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver: A Culture of Accountability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bronze: A Culture of Commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject of rewards and incentives will be tackled in a separate document.

---

37 OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.46
38 EON official website - [http://www.eon.com.ph/content/philippinetrustindex](http://www.eon.com.ph/content/philippinetrustindex) (accessed April 14, 2016)
41 OP-OMB, supra note 1, pp.46-47
The PMC may maintain a pool of external assessors consisting of volunteers from the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, Association of Government Internal Auditors, Inc., compliance officers and experts from various government organizations and institutions. The responsibility of determining the certification level of a public sector institution falls under the external assessors.\(^{42}\)

To ensure impartiality, each institution will be assessed by 3 external assessors who will decide by majority vote on all issues. The 3 external assessors will be chosen from the pool of assessors by means of raffling, which will be conducted by the PMC.

The below scorecard will be used in determining the certification level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold: A Culture of Organizational Stewardship</strong></td>
<td>The institution received a Performance Rating of 14-15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution is implementing integrity measures within its organization based on its Integrity Management Plan (including central, regional, and other field offices).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The IMP is part of the annual agency planning (executive committee meetings, core planning, Performance Based Bonus/ Results-Based Performance System, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution is adopting relevant values, governance principles and standards in the formulation and development of their integrity measures under any five (5) of the six dimensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution received a trust rating of 75% or at least an increment from base rating to current rating of 25%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver: A Culture of Accountability</strong></td>
<td>The institution received a Performance Rating of 11-13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution is implementing integrity measures throughout the central office and in at least three regional/field offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel are awarded for work related to IMP (e.g. full integration in Performance-Based Bonus).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution is adopting relevant values, governance principles and standards in the formulation and development of their integrity measures under any three (3) of the six dimensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution received a trust rating of 65% or at least an increment from base rating to current rating of 15%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{42}\) OP-OMB, supra note 1, p.47
The Secretariat must keep a copy of all the scorecards accomplished by the external assessors. Further, the PMC must include in its annual IMP Performance Report a compilation of the scorecards of all the IMP-participating institutions which were assessed during the immediately preceding calendar year, along with a summary.

The PMC must devise a plan to communicate the performance of IMP-participating institutions to the public and to the institutions after the end of the 5-year cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Content/Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. M&amp;E Progress Report</td>
<td>After 6 months from submission of IM Plan</td>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>Template 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance Monitoring Report</td>
<td>After 1 year from submission of IM Plan</td>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>Template 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Desk Review Report</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks from submission of M&amp;E Progress Report or 3 weeks from submission of Performance Monitoring Report</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Summary of Findings, Recommendations and Best Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Field Visit Report</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks from conduct of desk review</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Summary of Findings, Recommendations and Best Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance Rating Sheet</td>
<td>Within 5 weeks from submission of Performance Monitoring Report</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Template 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Annual IMP Performance Report</td>
<td>Not later than January 31 of the immediately following year</td>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>Consolidated Performance Rating Sheets, Summary of Findings, Recommendations and Best Practices, and Certification Scorecards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mid-program Evaluation Report</td>
<td>After 3 years from submission of IM Plan</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Best Practices, Lessons Learned and Effectiveness Reports (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Duties and Responsibilities

It shall be the duty and responsibility of the IMC, under this M&E mechanism, to:

1. Submit on the periods heretofore indicated the following:
   a. M&E Progress Reports (Template 8)
   b. Performance Monitoring Reports (Template 9)
   c. Annual Financial Reports
   d. Other relevant documents

2. Act on the Desk Review Reports and Field Visit Reports transmitted by the PMC;

3. Allow and cooperate with the Secretariat during field visits;

4. Participate in the rapid assessments conducted by the Secretariat; and

5. Cooperate with the PMC and Secretariat in other aspects to ensure the accomplishment of the objectives of this M&E system.

It shall be the duty and responsibility of the Secretariat, under this M&E mechanism, to:

1. Conduct on the periods heretofore indicated the following:
   a. Desk review of the M&E Progress Reports (Template 8), Performance Monitoring Reports (Template 9), Annual Financial Reports and other relevant documents submitted by the IMC;
   b. Field visit to offices when necessary to validate the contents of reports submitted by the IMC;
   c. Focus group discussions and stakeholders meetings when necessary to track the accomplishments of the institution and the challenges it encountered;
   d. Mid- and end-of-program evaluation, particularly: document analysis (best practices/lessons learned/effectiveness), mini-survey (impact), and key informant interview (sustainability);
2. Prepare on the periods heretofore indicated the following:
   a. Desk review reports;
   b. Field visit reports;
   c. Annual IMP performance reports
   d. Certification reports; and
   e. Mid- and end-of-program evaluation reports.

3. Rate the performance of the institution using the Performance Rating Sheet (Template 10);

4. File copies of reports submitted by the IMC and other pertinent documents; and

3. Provide technical and administrative support to the PMC and the IMC to ensure the accomplishment of the objectives of this M&E system.

   It shall be the duty and responsibility of the **PMC**, under this M&E mechanism, to:

   1. Review all reports submitted by the Secretariat;
   2. Endorse its findings and recommendations to the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman;
   3. Implement the decisions or actions of the Executive Secretary and the Ombudsman;
   4. Ensure the formulation of a communication plan and a survey tool to complement this M&E system;
   5. Form a pool of external assessors for the purpose of certification; and
   6. Perform such other actions to ensure the accomplishment of the objectives of this M&E system.
Glossary

**Baseline data** – Those which describe the situation to be addressed by a program and that serve as the starting point for measuring the performance of that program.\(^{43}\)

**Citizen Report Cards** – A type of survey usually conducted by non-government organizations (NGOs) and think-tanks to investigate the extent of corruption encountered by ordinary citizens.\(^{44}\) For example, the Report Card Survey utilized by the Civil Service Commission is a client feedback survey used to check government service offices’ compliance with the provisions of the Anti-Red Tape Act of 2007. It provides a quantitative measure of user perceptions on the quality, efficiency, and adequacy of public services.\(^{45}\)

**Client Satisfaction (or Service Delivery) Survey** – A type of survey usually conducted by a government ministry or agency to assess the performance of government services based on client experience. The survey sheds light on the constraints clients face in accessing public services, their views about the quality and adequacy of services, and the responsiveness of government officials.\(^{46}\)

**Evaluation** – A time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of an ongoing or completed program. It is undertaken selectively to answer specific questions to guide decision-makers and/or program managers, and to provide information on whether underlying theories and assumptions used in program development were valid, what worked and what did not work and why. Evaluation commonly aims to determine relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.\(^{47}\) Moreover, it focuses on the outcomes of efforts, which are the changes in conditions that the institution aims to achieve through its projects and programs.\(^{48}\)

**Impact** - The overall and long-term effect of an intervention. Impact is the longer term or ultimate result attributable to an intervention—in contrast to output and outcome which reflect more immediate results from the intervention.\(^{49}\)

**Impact evaluation** - The systematic identification of the effects — positive or negative, intended or not — on individual households, institutions, and the environment caused by a given development activity such as a program or project. Impact evaluations can range from large scale sample surveys in which project populations and control groups are compared before and after, and possibly at several points during program intervention; to small-scale rapid assessment and participatory appraisals where estimates of impact are obtained from combining group interviews, key informants, case studies and available secondary data.\(^{50}\)

**Logical Framework** – That which helps to clarify the objectives of any project, program, or policy. It aids in the identification of the expected causal links—the “program logic”—in the following results chain: inputs, processes, outputs (including coverage or “reach” across beneficiary groups), outcomes, and impact. It leads to the identification of performance indicators at each stage in this chain, as well as risks which might impede the attainment of the objectives.\(^{51}\) In the context of integrity management, it details the institution’s objectives, outputs and activities that address priority areas in pursuit of its anti-corruption agenda and integrity objectives.\(^{52}\)

---

\(^{43}\) UNDP-EO, supra note 5, p.98

\(^{44}\) World Bank, supra note 31, p.13


\(^{46}\) World Bank, supra note 31, p.13

\(^{47}\) UNDP-EO, supra note 5, p.100

\(^{48}\) Ibid., p.7

\(^{49}\) Ibid., p.101

\(^{50}\) World Bank, supra note 31, p.22

\(^{51}\) Ibid., p.8

\(^{52}\) OP-OMB, supra note 1, pp.33
**Monitoring** – A continuing function that aims primarily to provide managers and main stakeholders with regular feedback and early indications of progress or lack thereof in the achievement of intended results. Monitoring tracks the actual performance or situation against what was planned or expected according to pre-determined standards. It generally involves collecting and analyzing data on implementation processes, strategies and results, and recommending corrective measures.\(^5^3\) It focuses on the outputs, which are the specific products and services that emerge from processing inputs.\(^5^4\)

**Outcome** - Actual or intended change in conditions that interventions are seeking to support. It describes a change in conditions between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact.\(^5^5\)

**Outputs** - Tangible products (including services) of a program that are necessary to achieve the objectives of a program. Outputs relate to the completion (rather than the conduct) of activities and are the type of results over which managers have a high degree of influence.\(^5^6\)

**Performance** – refers to the progress towards and achievement of results.\(^5^7\)

**Performance Indicator** – refers to measures of inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impacts for projects, programs, or strategies.\(^5^8\) Quantitative indicators are reported in terms of curves (mean or median) or percentages. Qualitative indicators either measure perception (e.g. level of public trust) or describe a behavior (e.g. level of understanding of a policy).\(^5^9\)

**Reporting** - refers to the systematic and timely provision of essential information at periodic intervals.\(^6^0\)

---

\(^5^3\) UNDP-EO, supra note 5, p.102
\(^5^4\) Ibid., p.7
\(^5^5\) Ibid., p.103
\(^5^6\) Ibid.
\(^5^7\) Ibid., p.5
\(^5^8\) World Bank, supra note 31, p.6
\(^5^9\) OP-OMB, supra note 1, pp.34-35
\(^6^0\) UNDP-EO, supra note 5, p.7