
SOCIAL PROTECTION PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS

 **ASSESSMENT MATRIX**



PROGRAM



Assessment Matrix

| Key Area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Description | Latent: Significant attention needs to be paid to this dimension | Emerging: This dimension requires vigilance. Elements for effective performance are in place but gaps and constraints persist. | Moderate: Satisfactory performance, with most of the elements showing effective and efficient parameters. | Advanced: Highly satisfactory practice, with broad-based success in the examined elements. |
| A. Eligibility & Targeting | Target population may need clarification; program eligibility criteria may be loosely specified or applied; and procedures may not be conducted in line with program manuals. Mechanisms to target poor and vulnerable may not be functional. Evidence of large inclusion and exclusion errors may exist. Direct or indirect measures to promote female participation may not be present. | Target population and eligibility criteria are generally clear. However, targeting mechanisms may present a number of gaps, e.g., possible issues in wage setting protocols, use of geographic targeting, or in eligibility criteria. There may be evidence of significant inclusion and exclusion errors, accompanied by actual low women participation compared to planned rates. | Green signals clear target population, eligibility criteria, and functioning targeting mechanisms. Yet there may be evidence of inclusion or exclusion errors or there may be gaps in program design limiting the participation of women. | The program exhibits clear target population and eligibility criteria. Evidence of effective targeting mechanisms is present, including as documented by robust impact evaluations. The program has promoted participation in line with program manuals, as well as encouraged the inclusion of vulnerable groups such as disabled people. |
| B. Nature of Benefits, Timing & Duration | The level of benefits may be inadequate or inappropriate, e.g., benefits too low, program duration too short, or generating labor market distortions. High incidence of payment delays may be reported. | The level of benefits may not be set adequately given local needs, e.g., wage levels too high/low, with consequent impacts on local markets. This, however, may be accompanied by low incidence of payment delays. | The program may have set benefits that are adequate, appropriate and have no adverse impact on local economy. | The program includes benefits that are adequate, appropriate, and compatible with local context. Additional benefits are provided through combined interventions. |



Assessment Matrix

| Key Area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| C. Asset Creation & Services | <p>The rationale for projects and/or services may be unclear and/or inadequate given the local context or timing of the program. Process and criteria for project selection may be unclear or not applied correctly. Implementation arrangements may not meet operational requirements. Needs of community may not be addressed. There may not be measures to ensure completion and quality control of assets. Environmental impact of projects may be of concerns. Participants may not receive adequate training before working on their tasks. Technical supervision on projects may be absent or inefficient.</p> | <p>The rationale for projects tends to be relatively clear, although the participation of people in different activities may not be well documented. Quality of projects and service may be of concern. Pre-project and follow up training and supervision may be insufficient.</p> | <p>Projects and/or services are well defined and respond to community needs. Implementation arrangements are well defined, but projects may lack adequate technical training and/or supervision.</p> | <p>Projects and services are well defined. Quality of projects and services has been well documented, while environmental safeguards have been taken into account. Participants have received adequate training before project commencement. Local contractors are used for material provision. Adequate technical supervision of projects is in place.</p> |
| D. Institutions, Coordination & Financing | <p>The program may have unclear roles and responsibilities amongst stakeholders. Oversight and coordination mechanisms may be limited. The program may not be flexible in face of crisis, in case that is the objective. Funding may be not sufficient, or may be inefficiently managed, to cover all designed activities.</p> | <p>Roles and responsibilities may be defined for some stakeholders. There may be limited coordination and oversight capacity. Manuals and contracts to support coordination could be more developed. Program may lack preparedness for crisis response, if this objective is envisaged within the program. The allocation of funding to the program may not be adequate.</p> | <p>The program assigns clear roles and responsibilities to diverse stakeholders. Program features oversight and coordination mechanisms, but flexibility to respond to crisis in case of need may be limited, and/or financing, too.</p> | <p>The program assigns clear roles and responsibilities amongst diverse stakeholders to ensure effective implementation, coordination, and oversight. Stakeholders have developed capacity to implement program efficiently. Institutional arrangements are adequately devised to ensure responsiveness to crises, if needed. Funding is adequately allocated and efficiently managed.</p> |



Assessment Matrix

| Key Area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| E. Monitoring & Evaluation | <p>The program may not present a well defined M&E system. An MIS may not be established. Indicators for performance may not be well defined and systematically collected. At present, evaluations may have not been conducted or planned. Measures to address accountability concerns may not be in place.</p> | <p>An MIS may not be well developed. Input and output indicators may be collected but not outcome or impact indicators. Evaluations may have not been conducted but are planned. Accountability mechanisms may be underdeveloped.</p> | <p>The program exhibits clear M&E arrangements, as well as clear mechanisms to promote accountability. The program should enhance ways to capture and disseminate evidence. MIS is developed but it could be strengthened. Some evaluations have been conducted or are planned.</p> | <p>M&E protocols track results and impacts of the program across time and space. MIS is fully developed. Process and impact evaluations have been conducted. Mechanisms are in place to enhance transparency and reduce error, fraud, and corruption.</p> |
| F. Coherence & Integration Across Programs | <p>The program may not be harmonized or integrated with similar or complementary interventions. The program may not use common administrative tools. There may be limited potential for harmonization.</p> | <p>The program may have loose harmonization arrangements with other programs. Use of complementary administrative tools may be limited. There is some potential of harmonization among a few programs.</p> | <p>The program is well integrated and complemented with other interventions and may use complementary administrative tools to support implementation. Potential for harmonization exists.</p> | <p>The program is harmonized and complemented with other interventions to contribute to shared objectives of similar programs and to complement the efforts of other programs. Program uses complementary administrative tools. There is great potential to continue harmonizing programs at various levels.</p> |
| G. Skills & Employability | <p>Training strategies may not be clear. The nature of trainings may not meet participant needs. Delivery of the program may not be well designed. No clear market linkages exist between needs, demand, and training. Materials and staff may be inadequate, either in number/amount or capacity. Feedback on received training may be negative.</p> | <p>Training is in place but may not be adequate or up to date. Links to longer term employability through training or complementary services may not be in place or may be very limited. Of the three measures examined here (Nature of Curricula, Delivery and Incentives, and Logistics), at least one component is well measured and well executed.</p> | <p>Training is provided as a link to employability, as well as other services to improve longer term income generation possibilities for participants. Of the three measures examined here, at least two components are well measured and well executed.</p> | <p>The nature of curricula is aligned to participant needs. Best practices in program delivery and design are utilized. Strong market linkages exist and are documented between needs, demand, and training. Abundant materials are available and adequate and quality staff is implementing the project. Feedback on received training shows positive results.</p> |



Assessment Matrix

| Key Area | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| H. Conditions of Work & Labor Practices | <p>The program may not take into account the relevant national legislation or codes of conduct. Labor standards may not be applied, hence the program may not provide social insurance benefits and may not guarantee a safe and healthy working environment. The recruitment process may not be clear or transparent and the contract signed with participants may not be explained or shared with them. The participants' right to collective bargaining may not be recognized, while the minimum age of workers may not be respected.</p> | <p>Labor standards may be applied to a limited extent, hence appropriate working conditions may not be granted. The recruitment process may not be fully transparent. Worker rights (to maternity, to collective bargaining, etc.) may not be always respected in project implementation.</p> | <p>National labor legislations and codes of conduct are available and can be used as a reference. Some social insurance benefits may be in place, as well as safe and healthy working conditions. The right to collective bargaining is respected, and the minimum working age, too. Participants have usually been provided with a signed contract.</p> | <p>Relevant national laws and codes of conduct have been used as a reference for designing the program. The program offers appropriate social insurance measures and provisions for safety at work, together with means for facilitate the participation of working parents. Participants have been provided with a clear description of the recruitment process and their contract. The right to collective bargaining is respected and so is the minimum age of workers.</p> |