

2. CORE INDICATORS: Project data relevant for monitoring the progress, effects and impact of CoST

v 1.1

Explanatory Notes:

1. This table provides a summary of the indicators to be used in every CoST pilot country. An indicator describes specific data that indicate change that may be attributed to CoST.
2. The reference number used also appears on the DFID logframe, and on the national sub-framework sheets
3. The "causal chain" is a sequence of logical steps ("boxes") that describe the detailed logical flow of the design of the CoST initiative. Further information available from M&E Consultant.
4. If each pilot collects, stores and analyses, the data as shown, then it will be possible to measure the progress, short term effects, and longer term impacts of the CoST initiative.
5. All but one of the indicators listed here is a "Core" indicator. This means that they need to be used in every CoST country, so that, in time, cross country comparisons will be possible.
6. NMSGs may wish to include additional "Specific" indicators that they consider to be particularly helpful or relevant in the national context. The inclusion of such indicators is encouraged.
7. For the purposes of resource allocation, priority should be given to the careful collection, storage and analysis of data related to the core indicators listed here.

Log-frame reference	Causal chain reference		Scope			When			CORE INDICATOR	NON-CORE INDICATOR	INDICATORS (suitable for facilitating cross country comparisons unless otherwise specified)	Reference	
			CoST	non-CoST	Sample of Sector	Baseline survey	Routine reporting	End of Pilot survey					
Activities (process)	CoST institutional arrangements are in place	CoST management and coordination is effective	✓				✓		✓		Dates, by country, of achievement of preparatory CoST milestones: - completion of design of CoST concept and modification for detailed application at national level - NMSG establishment - workplan approval - appointment of CoST staff - baseline survey	1	
	Criteria for project selection are agreed and participating projects selected		✓	✓			✓		✓		Dates, by pilot country, of achievement of initial CoST milestones - Finalisation of project selection criteria - Identification of CoST projects - Identification (for comparison group) of non-CoST projects	2	
	Effective and representative MSGs are established	MSGs are established that are representative and effective	✓				✓		✓		Dates of MSG meetings, number of participants, and percentage of participation of each category of stakeholder	3	
			✓				✓		✓		Agreement on, quality of, and adherence to a written constitution to define the governance of the MSG	4	
	Interest in and commitment to the CoST process is demonstrated	Stakeholders are committed to the CoST process and principles	✓				✓		✓		For Clients approached for participation in CoST - number selected, and agreeing/ declining with time lapse between request and agreement	5	
			✓	✓		B	✓	E	✓		For Consultants/Contractors on ongoing projects approached for participation in CoST - number selected, and agreeing/declining with time lapse between request and agreement		
	Progress with extending CoST disclosure	CoST projects are being launched in the sector	✓				✓		✓		Contract value of CoST projects	7	
Progress in commissioning effective central support functions	Lessons from pilot projects learned and disseminated	✓	✓			✓		✓		Proportion (by value and number) of CoST to (all) non-CoST projects in selected client group(s)	8		
Context	TRANSPARENCY (information is available)	Box 1	Management information is stored and retrievable	✓	✓	✓	B	✓	E	✓		What MPI is required to be made publicly available? Of this, on sample of projects, what MPI is being made publicly available?	10
		Box 2	Material project information is disclosed from participating projects.	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		On CoST projects, what MPI is being made publicly available, and through what media?	11
		Box 3	Information is analysed and reported on by assurance teams.	✓				✓		✓		Number of CoST projects, and proportion subjected to: a) Summary Assurance process (presenting MPI and reporting on its completeness); and b) In depth Assurance process (presenting MPI and commenting on its accuracy and possible implications)	12
Purpose	TRANSPARENCY (information is available)	Box 4	Information accessed by NSAs	✓				✓		✓		Frequency and nature of accessing CoST-related MPI and reports by NSAs, Government bodies, and others. (Use of and downloads from web site to be monitored)	13
		Box 7	Questions and challenges by non-state actors	✓				✓		✓		Challenges raised, by stakeholders including MSG members, through media, parliament or other fora as a result of - release of CoST MPI - CoST assurance process	14
		Box 8	Investigations and audits by government bodies	✓				✓		✓		Response to challenges raised by stakeholders as a result of CoST, as demonstrated through: - Clarification provided - Further investigation promised	15
				✓				✓		✓		Number of public enquiries, police or judicial investigations launched as a result of CoST-related challenges wholly or partly upheld	16
Goal	ACCOUNTABILITY (questions are asked)	Box 12 (general)	Better Governance and reduced corruption (general)	✓				✓		✓		Percentage of projects considered by assurance team to have a high risk of governance failure.	17
		Box 12a	Better Governance and reduced corruption (time issues)	✓	✓	✓	B	✓	E	✓		The time from contract commencement date to completion date as a percentage of original contract programme at commencement date	18
		Box 12c	Better Governance and reduced corruption (cost issues)	✓	✓		B	✓	E	✓		(For countries looking at site supervision contracts) Average % changes from a) initial estimated price to Contract price on commencement date and b) contract price on commencement date to Final cost at completion date (contract for works supervision)	19
				✓	✓		B	✓	E	✓		Average % changes from a) Engineers estimated cost to Contract price on commencement date and b) contract price on commencement date to Final cost at completion date (construction works contract)	20
		Box 12d	Better Governance and reduced corruption (quality issues)	✓	✓	✓	B	✓	E	✓		Instances of re-award of main contract, with reasons	20
Lesson learning and replication of CoST	Lessons from pilot projects learned and disseminated	✓	✓	✓	B	✓	E	✓			Number of instructions to the contractor to remedy defective work: a) Issued b) Implemented	21	
		Additional countries express interest in CoST	✓				✓		✓		Number of "lesson sharing" case studies, in standard format, by country, a) formally prepared and submitted b) shared across other pilot countries and c) leading to adoption in at least one other pilot country	9	
		Additional countries express interest in CoST				✓		✓		Number of countries a) expressing interest in CoST b) formally seeking to join CoST	22		