

Annex B

M&E framework guidance notes

As part of IFRC research into national and local capacity building for DRM, an M&E framework has been created specifically for use in the monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects that aim to strengthen capacity for DRM/DRR. Donors, bilateral organizations, national and international NGOs, and project and programme managers can use the guidance sheets to help them design their M&E systems for DRM capacity-building initiatives.

The framework is a generic, outcome-based tool intended to address the current gap in M&E resources that are available specifically for DRM capacity-building activities. It aims to serve as a management tool to track and improve the effectiveness of capacity building for DRM projects, to enable lessons to be learned and provide a mechanism of accountability to donors and beneficiaries. It also aims to facilitate an understanding, at a global scale, of what works and why when it comes to building capacity for DRM. The table below outlines three overarching outcomes for DRM capacity-building programmes. Any capacity-building intervention should show potential for contributing to at least one of these outcomes.

| Outcome | Sub-outcome |
|---|---|
| 1. The ability of actors to use knowledge, innovation, education, communication and technology for DRM has been enhanced. | 1.1 Individuals and communities at risk of disaster are able to use enhanced DRM skills and knowledge as a result of the capacity-building programme. |
| | 1.2 Actors engaged in policy-making, planning and/or implementation of DRM at national, regional, district and/or community level are using enhanced skills built by the capacity-building programme. |
| 2. The institutional framework for DRM has been strengthened. | 2.1 The capacity-building programme has led to the improvement of DRM policies, strategies and procedures. |
| | 2.2 The capacity-building programme has led to the inclusion of a wider range of stakeholders in developing new DRM planning and operational processes. |
| 3. Motivation to achieve effective DRM has been improved. | 3.1 Political support for DRM has been strengthened at national, regional, district and/or community level by the capacity-building programme. |
| | 3.2 The capacity-building programme has strengthened the motivation of communities and individuals to reduce their vulnerability to disasters. |

The guidance sheets below should enable the user to apply the framework comprehensively to meet the circumstances and context of a specific DRM capacity-building initiative. Each sheet provides explanatory text and examples of indicators, including suggestions of how they should be measured, where the data can be accessed and who should be responsible for data collection.

It is a flexible framework as it allows the user to choose from the various outcomes and sub-outcomes and apply them as it suits them, according to the scope of the programme or project. It is deliberate that the outcomes and indicators are defined very broadly to cover the wide variety of potential capacity-building interventions. This will include projects working on all aspects of the DRM cycle (capacity building for prevention, mitigation, preparedness, emergency response and/or recovery) and projects addressing the reduction of current or future risks. The framework is suitable for use with projects seeking to build either functional or technical capacity, or both. It is appropriate for differing scales of intervention, whether national, subnational or community.

Outcome 1. The ability of actors to use knowledge, innovation, education, communication and technology for DRM has been enhanced

| | |
|--|---|
| Sub-outcome 1.1 | Individuals and communities at risk of disaster are able to use enhanced DRM skills and knowledge as a result of the capacity-building programme. |
| What does this mean? | <p>The point of measuring this sub-outcome is to check whether or not participants in the capacity-building activity have had their skills and knowledge built so that, now, they can respond better to prevent, mitigate, recover from or be resilient to disasters. This is not a case just of measuring the number of people trained (that would be a valid output indicator) but of measuring the outcome: how much have they been able to use their training to improve DRM?</p> <p>This could be as a result of specific training, such as workshops or seminars, or as a result of improving access to (and the ability to interpret and use) information and technology.</p> <p>Ideally, a programme would measure whether or not behaviour has changed as a result of the capacity-building activity. The aim is to measure retained learning and, where possible, behaviour change.</p> |
| Examples of possible indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number or percentage of individuals who have participated in a capacity-building activity and are now using their enhanced skills and knowledge</i> • <i>Ability of beneficiaries to present concrete examples of improvements in their situations, due to increased capacity</i> |
| How should we measure this? | <p>The data to measure an indicator for this sub-outcome will have to be collected either through a survey or through a focus group discussion.</p> <p>For capacity-building activities focused on the individual, data should be collected through individual surveys conducted during short meetings with participants at least one year after the activity. For activities focused on the community, information should be collected through focus group discussions.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>How should we measure this? (cont.)</p> | <p>The questions could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you regard yourself as particularly at risk of disaster and why? • Have you used the information/equipment/technology to which you were introduced? Can you give an example? • Do you feel that participating in the programme has improved your ability to respond more effectively to/prevent/mitigate/recover from disasters? • Is what you learnt relevant to your current situation? • Have you shared the information/skills with any others, and in what circumstances? • What is stopping you from using the information/applying the skills in which you were trained? <p>The data that is collected should be disaggregated by gender and by vulnerable groups where possible (for example, disabled people, older people, etc.).</p> |
| <p>Where can we find the necessary data?</p> | <p>The starting point for measuring this sub-outcome area is the number (or percentage) of people trained or provided with improved access to information, technology, etc. This information should be collected as part of the ongoing M&E system or as part of regular programme administration.</p> <p>As explained above, evidence of retained knowledge would then be collected through a survey or focus group discussion. Depending on numbers of individuals and communities trained and funding available, the survey could be carried out on all or a sample of participants.</p> <p>It will be important to have baseline information, which should be collected at the beginning of each activity. This could be a Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) survey, which was then repeated at a later date.</p> |
| <p>Who should be responsible for collecting this data?</p> | <p>If the project has contracted independent evaluators from the beginning, it will be their responsibility to ensure that baseline data are collected. Otherwise, the project M&E staff should collect information about the capacity of participants at the beginning of each capacity-building activity.</p> <p>Because this information is unlikely to be collected on a regular basis as part of routine administration, it could be collected once or twice during the life of a project, as part of a mid-term review, or as part of a final evaluation. Ideally, it would be collected also a few years after the project has finished, to see whether or not the capacity produced has been sustainable.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Sub-outcome 1.2</p> | <p>Actors engaged in policy-making, planning and/or implementation of DRM at national, regional, district and/or community level are using enhanced skills built by the capacity-building programme.</p> |
| <p>What does this mean?</p> | <p>The point of measuring this sub-outcome is to check whether or not participants have enhanced skills and knowledge to develop policy, make decisions and plan for DRM, either at national, district or community level, as a result of the capacity-building activity. This is not a case just of measuring the number of people trained (that would be a valid output indicator) but of measuring the outcome; how much have they been able to use their training to improve decision-making and policy-making for DRM?</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>What does this mean? (cont.)</p> | <p>This could be as a result of specific training, such as workshops or seminars, or as a result of improving access to (and the ability to interpret and use) information and technology.</p> <p>Ideally, a programme would measure whether or not behaviour has changed as a result of the capacity-building activity. The overall aim is to measure retained learning and, where possible, behavioural change.</p> |
| <p>Examples of possible indicators</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number or percentage of individuals in key positions for policy-making and/or decision-making who have participated in a capacity-building activity and are now using their enhanced skills and knowledge</i> |
| <p>How should we measure this?</p> | <p>The data for this indicator will have to be collected through a survey. This could be either through an individual survey conducted over a short meeting with participants at least one year after the activity. Alternatively, the survey could be conducted electronically.</p> <p>The questions could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you in a position where you have some responsibility for planning, policy making or decision-making? • Have you used the information/equipment/technology to which you were introduced? Can you give an example? • Do you feel that the information/equipment/technology has increased your ability to plan or make policy more effectively? • How and in what ways is the information/equipment/technology relevant to your current situation? • Do you regard yourself as playing an important role in DRM planning and policy-making? • Have you shared the information/skills with any others and, if so, in what circumstances? • What is stopping you from using the information/applying the skills in which you were trained? <p>Data should be disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>Data should be obtained only from those who have been trained and who remain in positions of responsibility for DRM planning and policy-making.</p> |
| <p>Where can we find the necessary data?</p> | <p>The starting point for measuring this sub-outcome is the number of people trained or provided with improved access to information, technology, etc. This information should be collected as part of the ongoing M&E system or as part of regular programme administration.</p> <p>Evidence of retained knowledge would be collected then through a survey or interviews. Depending on numbers of individuals trained and funding available, the survey should be carried out on all or a sample of participants.</p> <p>It will be important to have baseline information, which should be collected at the beginning of each activity.</p> |
| <p>Who should be responsible for measuring it?</p> | <p>If the project has contracted independent evaluators from the beginning, it will be their responsibility to ensure that baseline data are collected. Otherwise, the project M&E staff should collect information about the capacity of participants at the beginning of each capacity-building activity.</p> <p>Because this information is unlikely to be collected on a regular basis as part of routine administration, it could be collected once or twice during the life of a project, as part of a mid-term review or part of a final evaluation. Ideally, it would be collected a few years after the project has finished, also, to see whether or not the capacity produced has been sustainable.</p> |

Outcome 2. The institutional framework for DRM has been strengthened

| Sub-outcome 2.1 | The capacity-building programme has led to the improvement of DRM policies, strategies and procedures. |
|--|--|
| What does this mean? | <p>This section will explain some of the terminology used in outcome 2 and sub-outcome 2.1. An ‘institutional framework’ refers to the systems of formal laws, regulations and procedures, and informal conventions, customs and norms that shape socio-economic activity and behaviour. For this sub-outcome, the emphasis is on formal institutions that can be identified and documented. However, this does not exclude the possibility of incorporating informal or indigenous knowledge into policy. This is particularly important where communities have developed their own procedures at a local level.</p> <p>DRM ‘policies’ are guiding principles in place at a national, regional or local level, which are used to set government direction to achieve a certain purpose in relation to the prevention of, mitigation of, response to or recovery from disasters.</p> <p>A DRM ‘strategy’ is a plan of action designed to achieve a long-term aim (which may be set out in a policy). A strategy is a key part for implementing and communicating a policy.</p> <p>DRM ‘procedures’ are the specific instructions necessary to implement a strategy. Procedures are more detailed and specific to a particular topic, and address a particular task: e.g., a response to a particular early-warning signal.</p> |
| Examples of possible indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Submission of an Act to Parliament that establishes a DRM governance framework</i> • <i>Revision of local planning procedures to incorporate DRR measures</i> <p>A project which is assisting with the strengthening of DRM governance might have as an output the drafting of the appropriate section of the Act. Then the outcome indicator for 2.1 would be the submission of the Act to Parliament.</p> <p>A project which sets out to assist local government officials to revise their local planning procedures to incorporate effective DRM guidelines might have as an output the setting up of a local committee to review the current procedures and then have as an outcome indicator for 2.1 the local planning procedures having been revised and put out to consultation (or whatever the appropriate steps necessary for the changes in procedures to be accepted).</p> |
| How should we measure this? | <p>How this sub-outcome can be measured will depend very much on the types of activity and the stated objectives of the capacity-building programme. The programme could, for example, include sensitizing national policy-makers to the need for a DRM policy, strategy or procedure, or it could be exposing regional planners to how DRM has been incorporated into development plans in other countries, or it could be assisting local government officials or a community DRM committee with writing a DRM strategy. The programme is likely to have made direct contact with those responsible for developing policies, strategies and procedures, whether at national level (policies and strategies), district level or community level (procedures).</p> <p>Developing or improving a policy can take considerable time and should involve consultation at various stages. It is, therefore, important at the beginning of the programme to assess the length of a reasonable time-frame for measuring this outcome. If an unrealistic time line is chosen, then the programme may be evaluated prematurely as being unsuccessful. It may be useful to identify appropriate milestones: for example, ‘a draft policy is developed’, ‘consultation events are held’, etc.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Where can we find the necessary data?</p> | <p>As a first step, a baseline should be developed for this sub-outcome. In some cases, data will be available publicly: e.g., DRM policy published. In other cases, the process of development of improvements in policies, strategies and procedures will have to be tracked through engagement with those responsible for the development and improvement of policy and strategy. This tracking of changes may need to be undertaken at different levels.</p> <p>Quantitative data may be appropriate (e.g., the number of local DRM plans submitted). However, other data for this may need to be qualitative, in order to measure whether or not improvement has taken place.</p> |
| <p>Who should be responsible for measuring it?</p> | <p>Someone working on the programme should document and track the status of policies, strategies and procedures at the start of the project and monitor any changes. If the programme has an M&E officer, this could be part of their responsibilities. However, if this is one of the principal objectives of the programme, then it should be part of the manager/team leader's responsibilities to track this and understand the reasons for any deviation from the agreed time line.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Sub-outcome 2.2</p> | <p>The capacity-building programme has led to the inclusion of a wider range of stakeholders in developing new DRM policy, planning and operational processes.</p> |
| <p>What does this mean?</p> | <p>This section will explain some of the terminology used in outcome 2 and sub-outcome 2.2. An 'institutional framework' refers to the systems of formal laws, regulations and procedures, and informal conventions, customs and norms that shape socio-economic activity and behaviour. For this sub-outcome, the emphasis is on formal institutions that can be identified and documented. However, this does not exclude the possibility of incorporating informal or indigenous knowledge into policy. This is particularly important where communities have developed their own local-level procedures.</p> <p>A 'stakeholder' is a person, group or organization that has an interest in or concern about an issue. Stakeholders could relate to different ministries, businesses, NGOs, corporations, communities and individuals affected by a policy, strategy, procedure or plans.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that women and vulnerable or at-risk groups are included in the development of DRM processes. Vulnerable groups are people who, by reason of their geographical, economic, social, physical or ethnic characteristics, face particular risk of disaster. These could include older people, disabled people and those living in extreme poverty.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Examples of possible indicators</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Consultations that have been held with relevant at-risk stakeholders and inputs that have been incorporated into plans/processes</i> • <i>Joint working that has taken place with other ministries/sectors/departments to incorporate a multi-sectoral perspective into the development of DRM plans</i> <p>A project which is assisting with the strengthening of DRM governance might have as an output the drafting of the appropriate section of an Act. The outcome indicator for 2.2 could be that consultations with relevant and at-risk stakeholders have been held, and have resulted in their concerns being addressed in the draft document.</p> <p>A project which set out to assist local government officials to revise their local planning procedures to incorporate effective DRM guidelines might have as an output the setting up of a local committee to review the current procedures and then have as an outcome indicator for 2.2 that consultations had been held with relevant and at-risk stakeholders.</p> |
| <p>How should we measure this?</p> | <p>In order to measure this sub-outcome, the programme may have to develop its own definition of appropriate stakeholders, ensuring that women and vulnerable groups are well represented. It should then set up a tracking system which covers the various forms of consultation (open meetings, e-consultations, round tables) and communication linked to the development of policies and strategies.</p> <p>Programme staff will have to identify those actively involved in developing policies, plans, procedures and strategy, and those who are ultimately responsible for finalizing the processes and the outcome.</p> <p>Once this has been done, appropriate milestones can be identified: e.g., preliminary district-level consultations held, validation meetings held and parliamentary consultations undertaken with members of parliament for constituencies who are particularly at risk. If possible, the monitoring system also should track to what extent the concerns of vulnerable groups have been addressed in the planning and operational processes.</p> <p>Indicators measuring this sub-area are likely to be qualitative process indicators and should be measured in conjunction with indicators for sub-outcome 2.1, and against predetermined milestones as appropriate to the individual project. A target should be set in terms of inclusion of particular groups of the population but a quantitative target may not be appropriate.</p> |
| <p>Where can we find the necessary data?</p> | <p>As with sub-outcome 2.1, the programme will have to track the process of developing and improving DRM policies, strategies and procedures.</p> <p>This will require an individual to engage with the DRM policy process and document consultative and validation processes at different levels – national, intra-governmental, parliamentary, district and community. For each of these processes, the numbers consulted should be documented, along with their gender and vulnerability status.</p> <p>There is no need for a baseline here unless the DRM intervention concerns an ongoing process, in which case, changes in the numbers of stakeholders included after the intervention should be documented.</p> |
| <p>Who should be responsible for measuring it?</p> | <p>As this is a process indicator which should be measured throughout the time period of the project, and possibly afterwards, it cannot be left to a final evaluation for measurement. It should be measured on a continuous basis, depending on the time-frame for change of the policy or strategy concerned, by the individual responsible for M&E in the project.</p> |

Outcome 3. Motivation to achieve effective DRM has been improved

| | |
|--|---|
| Sub-outcome 3.1 | Political support for DRM has been strengthened at national, regional, district and/or community level by the capacity-building programme. |
| What does this mean? | <p>Raising awareness and support among political leadership may not be the prime objective of an intervention but it is likely to be important at all levels (national, district and community) for the success and sustainability of most DRM interventions.</p> <p>Strengthening political support for DRM includes ensuring that political and traditional leaders understand the importance of DRM activities and the options available for addressing disaster risk. As a result, political leaders will enable DRM activities and supply stakeholders with the means, knowledge or opportunity to participate in DRM activities.</p> |
| Examples of possible indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Use of DRM information provided to political leaders: e.g., in a speech, legislation or an interview</i> • <i>Changes to community activities as a result of lobbying traditional leaders for changes in local practices</i> |
| How should we measure this? | <p>Indicators for this sub-outcome are likely to measure whether or not an action has been taken as a result of awareness-raising activities.</p> <p>The exact form indicators will take will vary depending on the programme. It is important to think through carefully the way in which the programme activities, realistically, will lead to raising awareness or political support for DRM, and at what level. Ideally, programmes will develop a 'theory of change', which is just a step-by-step explanation of how programme activities and outputs will link to this outcome.</p> <p>Where interventions are aimed at strengthening motivation to achieve effective DRM, there may not be direct contact between the ultimate beneficiaries and the project, except for the purposes of monitoring. Where the activity is direct lobbying of policy-makers and decision-makers, it may be possible to identify results in terms of actions taken but it is more likely that measurement of the indicator will involve either interviews or surveys, or a combination of the two.</p> |
| Where can we find the necessary data? | <p>This information will not be collected on a regular basis as part of routine programme monitoring. Therefore, it is important that funding for surveys and interviews be included in the project budget.</p> <p>Ideally, it may be possible to have a baseline survey, with a follow-up survey at a later date. If not, it will be necessary to structure the data-collection tool carefully to assess retrospectively whether or not attitudes and support have been affected by the activities of the project.</p> |
| Who should be responsible for measuring it? | <p>As information for measuring this indicator is unlikely to be collected as part of regular M&E reports, it could be collected instead by an independent evaluator as part of a mid-term or final evaluation. If an independent evaluation is not taking place, then it could be collected as part of end-of project activities by a team under the supervision of the M&E staff.</p> |

Sub-outcome 3.2 The capacity-building programme has strengthened the motivation of communities and individuals to reduce their vulnerability to disasters.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>What does this mean?</p> | <p>Raising awareness may not be the prime objective of a capacity-building programme but it is necessary for the success of most DRM interventions. The awareness and motivation of individuals and communities must be raised in order to maintain support for disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and recovery. This is particularly important at community level, because, in many cases, effective DRM will depend on communities themselves understanding and acting on the relevant information.</p> <p>Strengthening the motivation of individuals and communities to reduce their vulnerability includes activities to promote realistic alternative options and providing support for the uptake of such approaches.</p> |
| <p>Examples of possible indicators</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of people showing changed behaviour, e.g., livelihoods practices, as a result of the capacity-building programme</i> • <i>Percentage of the target group whose attitudes have changed (measured through a KAP survey)</i> • <i>Percentage of the population whose behaviour related to DRR has changed as a result of a media campaign or public information event</i> |
| <p>How should we measure this?</p> | <p>Indicators for this sub-outcome are likely to measure whether or not some action has been taken as a result of awareness-raising activities. Which indicator should be used will vary depending on the programme activities and objectives. The example indicators above would require a survey.</p> <p>It is important to think through carefully the way in which the programme activities, realistically, will lead to raising awareness or support for DRM and at what level. Ideally, programmes will develop a 'theory of change', which is just a step-by-step explanation of how programme activities and outputs will link to this outcome.</p> <p>Where interventions are based on broad public-awareness campaigns to strengthen support for DRM, there may not be direct contact between the ultimate beneficiaries and the programme staff, except for the purposes of monitoring. If the capacity-building activity is aimed at a general audience, using different methods of dissemination, then a survey will be necessary, possibly a KAP survey to track perception and behaviour change.</p> |
| <p>Where can we find the necessary data?</p> | <p>This information will not be collected on a regular basis as part of routine programme monitoring. Therefore, it is important that funding for surveys and interviews be included in the project budget.</p> <p>Ideally, it may be possible to have a baseline survey, with a follow-up survey at a later date. If not, it will be necessary to structure the data-collection tool carefully to assess retrospectively whether or not attitudes and support have been affected by the activities of the project.</p> |
| <p>Who should be responsible for measuring it?</p> | <p>As information for measuring this indicator is unlikely to be collected as part of regular M&E reports, it could be collected instead by an independent evaluator as part of a mid-term or final evaluation. If an independent evaluation is not taking place, then it could be collected as part of end-of-project activities by a team under the supervision of the M&E staff.</p> |