Learning Resources

How to Monitor and Evaluate Emergency Operations

Islamic Relief Handbook - May 2007

Atallah FitzGibbon
Performance Improvement Unit
Islamic Relief Worldwide

الإغاثة الإسلامية
Secours Islamique

Islamic Relief is dedicated to alleviating the poverty and suffering of the world's poorest people.

Published by Islamic Relief Worldwide
19 Rea Street South
Birmingham
B5 6LB
United Kingdom
www.islamic-relief.com

Send feedback and comments on this material to piu@islamic-relief.org.uk

Monitoring and Evaluating Emergencies

A practical manual for Islamic Relief Workers on how to structure, design and staff an evaluation operation during an emergency.

Introduction

In order to boost the quality and effectiveness of our work, capture learning and increase accountability Islamic Relief has included within its M&E framework a mandatory evaluation mission within three months of a major disaster where expenditure exceeds €150,000. This measure was brought in to enable the emergency programme to benefit from the learning as the programme happens (real-time evaluation) which may increase inshallah, the saving of life and suffering, rather than post operation when findings can only be used for lesson learning and cannot directly benefit the disaster victims.

However as this document outlines, effective emergency project management requires evaluation to be integrated into every day practice through analysing the changing context, collection of vital information and rapid review.   The evaluation mission falls within the framework of this already existing monitoring and evaluation structure.. This manual provides the basic toolkits to design that monitoring and evaluation framework.

Monitoring and evaluation in emergencies should enable you to:

- Check progress against stated objectives and unexpected results
- Measure the impact our projects and programme activities are having on the lives of the disaster victims.
- Analyse contextual changes to the emergency
- Learn from the real-time experiences of our beneficiaries and ensure activities are adjusted if necessary to address real need during the project
- Provide cost-benefit analysis of our work where required.
- Learn from experience and adapt our work to optimise its impact
- Enable managers to make judgments about project design, strategies and funding prioritisation.
- Provide information and learning to stakeholders and be accountable for our actions and the resources we manage
- Feed learning from our programmes back into the organisation.
- Ensure that our programme work and field offices reflect the quality standards agreed within the Islamic Relief Quality Management Scheme (IRQMS) .Please see section 1.9 of the Manual for the full document.

1. Monitoring & Evaluation Toolkits in Emergencies

1.1 Monitoring

Definition

Monitoring is the continuous and systematic collection of data throughout the life-cycle of a project or programme to enable an assessment of progress against stated goal and objectives.

Purpose of monitoring

The information collected can be used for evaluation of progress to enable those responsible to decide on any adjustments required to improve the project's effectiveness and to construct reports for forward accountability to local communities and backwards to donors and management.

1.2 Organising Monitoring within the Field Team

Monitoring and reporting

It is advisable even in a modest sized emergency operation to employ at least one Monitoring and Reporting Officer who will ensure that:

1. Base-line data is identified and collected
2. Monitoring plans are developed for each project and monitoring tasks assigned meeting the needs of reporting and evaluation
3. Monitoring forms for collection of data are designed and distributed
4. The monitoring forms for the various activities are collected and collated into reports for staff and management
5. Regular review is held and minuted.
6. Data is used to complete accurate and timely reports to management and for Media usage

The post of Monitoring & Reporting Officer would normally report directly to the Head of Mission in a small to medium sized operation and the Programme Manager in a large operation. In some of our larger field offices there are already existing M&E units within which this member of staff would be integrated

Accountability Monitors

Within Larger emergency response operations we advise having in addition an Accountability Monitor, reporting to the area manager and HQ. Their employment contract is with the Emergency Department in HQ, and although they are co-ordinated by the Area Programme Manager, they can only be dismissed by the IR Emergency Manager. Their role takes in the need to establish the full accountability framework, including training of staff in accountability measures, ensuring adequate communication of our role and mandate to beneficiaries and other stakeholders and their participation, M&E and ensuring a robust and effective complaints mechanism,. The role of this post is to provide:

Good Practice and Institutional Learning (80%)

- Design the humanitarian accountability action plan with the Area Programme Manager
- Train and induct staff in accountability measures such as humanitarian standards, designing communication mechanisms for

beneficiaries, managing complaints, designing participatory monitoring etc

- Implement the humanitarian accountability action plan in the field. This will involve seeing that beneficiaries are involved in the design of the assistance they receive and that there is a mechanism for them to give feedback to Islamic Relief's on the assistance.
- Develop good and open relationships with beneficiary communities and maintain a good understanding of their perception of the programme
- Ensuring communication mechanisms are designed and carried out including disseminating information about the programme as appropriate as well as beneficiary entitlements to the beneficiaries. This will include the installation of notice boards etc.
- Participate in and document project reviews and evaluations and ensure learning is understood and disseminated to field and Head office based stakeholders.
- Manage knowledge and information sharing within the programme to identify, document and disseminate good practice, such as SPHERE standards etc.
- Provide information on the impact of Islamic Relief activities to the community in liaison with other programme staff.

External Relationships / Representation (5%)

- Provide required information to the Area Programme Manager and Country Office for relevant inter-agency coordination and donor meetings as required.
- Liaise closely with local community leaders, local government/ministries, Islamic Relief partners and other relevant stakeholders as directed by Area Coordinator.

Administration / Programme Support (15%)

- Establish and maintain an effective filing system in accordance with Islamic Relief standard procedures to ensure that all information is efficiently record and easily accessible, in consultation with the Technical Logistician and Area Coordinator.

1.3 The Collection of Base-line Data

In order for Islamic Relief to measure the performance and impact of the project and to review progress and complete evaluation reports there must be robust and efficient monitoring systems to ensure the correct information is collected. In order for the project team to measure impact and performance and make decisions it is also important to have a record of the situation and conditions that existed at the start of the project. 'Baseline' means a starting point, the pre-existing situation before a humanitarian intervention is started.

Staff often feel that accurate base-line data and monitoring is unachievable in a fast moving emergency situation. However in emergencies one has to apply the ‘good enough’ principle. Information is available from initial assessments and is possible to collect in the course of implementation if well organised and integrated into working culture. The emphasis in emergencies has to be on the updating of base-line data at regular review meetings through organised monitoring activities. Due to rapidly changing contexts and transfer of populations etc, original base-line data may be rendered ineffective in measuring impact and progress.

To record this each project team must complete the form below detailing baseline information required on all the performance indicators we have decided to use to measure performance.

Sometimes the identification and recording of baseline data is fairly straightforward. Numbers of malnourished children, deaths per hundred per day at the start of a project, access to clean water, initial incidence of certain diseases or average levels of family food intake may be ascertained and recorded. Very often the base-line data required to monitor and evaluate the project will have been collected as part of the assessment mission.

At agreed monitoring intervals during the life of a project, appropriate samples of similar data can then be collected, analysed, interpreted and compared with the original baseline records. Such comparison will hopefully give adequate evidence of the extent to which satisfactory results have been achieved by the programme. This information is valuable for all stakeholders.

Some basic guidelines on Base-line data collection

The collection of baseline data will always have an economic and a human cost, but so will the lack of it. Sensible choices need to be made about what is essential, what might be desirable, and what is not strictly necessary to the tasks in hand. Pragmatic decisions have to be taken on the basis of financial, human and time resources available when compared with a realistic assessment of the 'need to know' and the ability to manage the risks of uncertainty (what is sometimes called 'optimal ignorance').

In terms of management and accountability, there may be minimum levels of baseline data without which the monitoring of progress and the evaluation of achievement is impossible. Intelligent use of planning methods such as the log-frame can help to clarify what these are, and can lead to the identification in each particular case of what must be discovered and recorded before, during and after any specific development intervention.

A simple tool for determining and planning baseline data required is detailed below in Table 1

A simple tool for recording base line data on each indicator is detailed below in Table 2.

Table 1. Planning Baseline Data Collection

Objectives	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline data required to measure impact on indicators	Is this Information already available within initial Situation analysis	If not who will collect it and how
Goal Wider problem the project will help to resolve	Quantitative ways of measuring or qualitative ways of judging timed achievement of goal	Cost-effective methods and sources to quantify or assesses indicators			
Purpose The immediate impact on the project area or target group i.e. the change or benefit to be achieved by the project	Quantitative ways of measuring or qualitative ways of judging timed achievement of purpose i.e. Must include Proxy Indicators	Cost-effective methods and sources to quantify or assesses indicators			
Outputs These are the specifically deliverable results expected from the project to attain the purpose	Quantitative ways of measuring or qualitative ways of judging timed achievement of outputs i.e. Must include Proxy Indicators	Cost-effective methods and sources to quantify or assesses indicators			
ACTIVITIES These are the tasks to be done to produce the outputs					

Table 2: Form for recording Baseline data required for each project

Objectives	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Baseline Data On each indicator
Goal Wider problem the project will help to resolve **e.g Water borne disease is controlled and other basic Water & sanitation standards are provided to IDPs in Banda Aceh northern district.:**	Quantitative ways of measuring or qualitative ways of judging timed achievement of goal • **Reduction in water borne disease & resultant mortality** • **Hygiene culture within barracks is adequate** • **Sufficient clean water is supplied to families** • **Open defecation has been reduced** • **People are utilising facilities**	Cost-effective methods and sources to quantify or assesses indicators • **Health centre records** • **Observation** • **Community Survey forms filled in during community feedback sessions** • **Monitoring form** • **Case studies (for evaluation & FR purposes)**	Detail on separate pages if required At the time of needs assessment on 28th December 05 • **Level of waterborne disease in target population is 300 in every 1000 per month** • **No. of deaths from water borne disease 50 in every 1000 per month** • **Open defacation, no latrines** • **Contaminated ground water available only.**
Purpose The immediate impact on the project area or target group i.e. the change or benefit to be achieved by the project **Provision of Fresh water supplies, latrines, hygiene training and sanitary items to five barracks in northern Banda Aceh**	Quantitative ways of measuring or qualitative ways of judging timed achievement of purpose i.e. Must include Proxy Indicators • **Communities served** • **Numbers benefiting** • **Sufficient clean water is supplied to families** • **Sufficient latrines & water points are provided** • **Facilities are culturally appropriate**	Cost-effective methods and sources to quantify or assesses indicators • **Community Survey forms filled in during Community Feedback sessions** • **Barrack authorities monitoring forms** • **Monitoring forms filled** • **IDP Survey**	• **Total population of target IDP communities is 5780** • **Population comes from 8 destroyed villages and neighbourhoods including…..**
Outputs These are the specifically deliverable results expected from the project to attain the purpose **Output 1.** **12 Water Supply Points established serving 200 people each**	Quantitative ways of measuring or qualitative ways of judging timed achievement of outputs • **Numbers of water supply points delivered** • **Families are able to access drinking water from the protected source without undue suffering (Queuing time is no more that 15 minutes) maximum 250 per tap** • **Water delivery points are accessible and safe,**	Cost-effective methods and sources to quantify or assesses indicators **Numbers of supply points established** **Average queuing times** **Persons per tap**	**Water was collected from shallow open wells containing contaminated groundwater** **Some families brought fresh water by car**

1.4. Planning Monitoring

Monitoring is the process of collecting information and presenting data, throughout the programme cycle, in order to assess the impact and lead to improvements in the effectiveness of the programme. It is imperative to include monitoring right at the beginning of the programme cycle – as a planned activity. It should be highlighted as a separate activity in the programme proposal and logical framework, and appropriately resourced in terms of human and financial resources.

I. Using the logical framework or project design frame for monitoring

Once the project proposal and logical framework have been completed, there should be a clearer understanding of the purpose of the programme and its planned outputs, activities and inputs. If the project design, objective hierarchy and logical framework is well formulated at the beginning it will provide the outline for all subsequent monitoring and reporting activities including review and evaluation. In particular, because the logframe outlines indicators of achievement and means of verification, it can be used as a valuable aid for creating monitoring forms and reporting formats, as well as providing data for comparing planned activity to actual achievement.

What information to collect?

In identifying the correct information to collect it is also important to analyse the end use for collecting information.

End Use of Monitoring Information	Type of information needed
1. Reporting & Media	• Record of outputs delivered & standards of delivery • Numbers of beneficiaries • Information and Statistics relating to key performance indicators in the achievement of project goal and objectives (ie reduction in malnutrition, mortality) • Case studies of significant change • Photographic evidence • Base-line data
2. Project management and learning in real-time through review	• Monitoring information as above • Stakeholder feedback & statistics from local govt. & agencies • Beneficiary surveys & feedback • Service compliance with industry standards(SPHERE)
3. Audit	• Beneficiary distribution receipt forms • Contracts for purchase of labour and services (ie in cash or food for work) • Monitoring forms for services undertaken by

	hired labour, cash for work etc
4. Evaluation	• Monitoring information as above in 1&2 • Baseline data • Participatory derived feedback from community members through focus group meetings etc. • Service compliance with industry standards(SPHERE & RCC)

II. Monitoring & Audit

Audit normally means the examination of records related to asset and financial management in order to determine that resources were used effectively and properly. There is a considerable overlap in the requirement of information between project monitoring staff and auditors since both will need to verify whether goods and assets were directed correctly at the legitimate beneficiaries. However auditors will rarely venture into the field, but rely on monitoring reports, inventories, and distribution receipt lists etc being collected by staff in the field. A failure by staff to produce sufficient evidence of correct resource usage will lead to a loss of confidence in the organisation by donors, damage to our international reputation and potentially the withdrawal of partnership status and funding

It is essential that staff appreciate the audit needs of the programme. Many international donors may require an independent audit and certainly Islamic Relief will require an internal audit. There is a common misconception that auditors simply look at financial transactions. In aid work there is usually no point of sale and therefore no sales receipt, so auditors have to examine evidence that goods and services were actually received by beneficiaries.

This requires the project team to be able to provide evidence of stated outputs in the form of inventories, activity and distribution receipt forms signed by beneficiaries, contracts relating to employment and results of contracts signed. Collecting data for audit purposes is a major tool to combat fraud in the delivery of goods and services because it produces forwards and backwards accountability and is easily cross checked.

Forms to fulfil the audit and monitoring requirements for distribution of relief items are contained in Appendix 2

III. Developing the Monitoring Plan

Table 3 below is an example of an adequate project monitoring plan. The plan should be developed in a participatory fashion prior to commencing the project and with the input of all staff including people such as water delivery officers (truck drivers) as well as community representatives. The reason for this is that staff and community members need ownership over the plan and must understand the reason for having it. They will also act as your practical monitors for various parts of the activities and will be more motivated to collect the information if they see how it will be used to improve services and provide accountability.

Incorporating SPHERE Standards

The proposal will obviously follow SPHERE standards in relation to indicating the numbers of facilities and supplies, amount of water delivered etc.

The performance indicators and analysis also must take into account adherence to SPHERE standards

Use of both qualitative and quantitative indicators in monitoring

It is vital to include both qualitative and quantitative indicators when designing the monitoring plan. The SPHERE handbook can be used to find appropriate indicators to measure performance. Ie:

Table 3: Use of quantitative and qualitative performance indicators utilising SPHERE.

Outputs	Performance Indicator	Means of Verification
1. Installation of 12 Water Supply Bladders	12 Bladders delivered Water delivery points are accessible and safe, particularly for women to use (Within 500 Metres) Families are able to access drinking water from the protected source without undue suffering(Queuing time is no more that 15 minutes) There are no more than 250 people per tap.	Project Reports & photographs Observation, Community Feedback forms
2. Delivery of 12000 litres of fresh water every two days to five barracks	Water is Clean Sufficient water is provided to serve the population (15 litres per day) and is available consistently on a regular basis.	Bi-weekly water test results Bi-weekly count of users in the vicinity Analysis of how much is in the bladders when refilled, and if none, when they were emptied

Table 4: Monitoring tool for ensuring adequate data is collected- Monitoring Plan: Water & sanitation to IDPs in Aceh

	Measurable Indicators of achievement	What information to collect:	How to collect the information:	Frequency:	Who will collect information:	How will it be analysed:	How will information be used:
Project goal: Water borne disease is controlled and other basic water and sanitation standards are provided to IDPs in Banda Aceh northern district	Reduction in water borne disease and resultant mortality	Incidences of diarrhoea, dysentery, typhoid, hepatitus and cholera	Health centre records	Every two weeks	Watsan area officers	Used bi-weekly for review by Project team	▪ to review strategy ▪ To report to HQ and donors ▪ For fundraising
	Hygiene culture within barracks is adequate	Usage of latrines, hygiene culture being practised by adults & children. Cleanliness of facilities	Observation Community Survey forms filled in during Community Feedback sessions	Every two weeks		Individually by project manager	
	Sufficient clean water is supplied to families	Barrack populations & amount of water delivered Remaining water in tank at the time of re-supply Time water supplies ran out after supply.	Monitoring form	Every week	Camp leader		
	Open defecation has been reduced	Level of people still practicing open defecation	Observation Community Survey forms filled in during Community Feedback sessions	Every two weeks	Watsan officer		
	People are utilising facilities	Level of usage	Observation Community Survey forms filled in during Community Feedback sessions Case studies (for evaluation & FR purposes)	Every four weeks			

Project Purpose Provision of Fresh water supplies, latrines, hygiene training and sanitary items to 2500 people living in five barracks in northern Banda Aceh	Numbers of Communities served	The source communities from where IDPs come from Numbers of barracks benefitting	Community Survey forms filled in during Community Feedback sessions	Every Four week reporting period	Reporting officer	Analysing quarterly progress review information	▪ to review strategy ▪ To report to HQ and donors
	Numbers benefiting	Calculation of community size	Barrack authorities monitoring forms				▪
	Sufficient latrines & water points are provided	Numbers of IDPs per latrine	Monitoring forms filled IDP Survey	Every two weeks		Individually by project manager	▪ For fundraising
	Facilities are culturally Appropriate	Community views	Community Feedback forms	Every Four week reporting period			
	Numbers of hygiene sessions delivered	Numbers of Hygiene sessions delivered	Project Reports Photographs				
Project Outputs							
Output 1. 12 Water Supply Points established serving 200 people each	Numbers of water supply points delivered Families are able to access drinking water from the protected source without undue suffering(Queuing time is no more that 15 minutes) maximum 250 per tap Water delivery points are accessible and safe,	Numbers of supply points established Average queuing times Persons per tap	Project Reports, Photographs Community feedback forms Observation	Bi-weekly Bi Weekly	Watsan Officer	Project Manager & Staff	Reports Review Evaluation

	particularly for women to use (Within 500 metres)	Feedback from the community on safety and accessibility	Community feedback forms Observation				
Output 2: Delivery of 12000 litres of fresh water every two days to five barracks	Water is Clean Sufficient water is provided to serve the population (15 litres per day) and is available consistently on a regular basis.	Bi-weekly water test results Confirmation of water delivery Bi-weekly count of users in the vicinity Analysis of how much is in the bladders when refilled, and if none, when they were emptied	Test report Beneficiary delivery Receipt Project Monitoring document	Every two-weeks Bi-weekly Every two weeks	Watsan officer Driver Driver Driver		Project Review
Output 2. 125 latrines installed adjacent to barracks serving 2500 people	Numbers of latrines installed are appropriate to population (Max 20 Toilets are both safe and private for women especially Latrines are usable by all sections of the population Allow for disposal of sanitary protection items and for	Numbers of latrines installed Camp population Observation, Community Feedback forms Community Feedback meeting to include consultation with females	Project Reports Photographs Project Monitoring form Community Feedback sessions	Four weekly reporting period Bi-weekly	Watsan Officer	Individually by project manager	Project Review

	washing & drying sanitary protection cloths Latrine design conforms to SPHERE Pit latrines are at least 30 metres from groundwater sources and the bottom of the pit is at least 1.5 metres above water table.	& elderly. Details of latrine design, siting arrangements, provision of water, cleaning arrangements etc.					
Output 3. Distribution of 150 potties to families with small children	All families with small children under 3 receive potty. Open defecation by small children is prevented Faeces are disposed of safely	Evidence of families receiving goods Community feedback	Distribution receipt forms Community feedback forms filled at meetings	Bi-weekly	Watsan officers		
Output 4. 20 Hygiene training sessions delivered to families within 5 barracks (4 each)	Numbers of sessions provided Attendance at Hygiene sessions Bedding and clothing are aired regularly People have increased knowledge of vector control Mothers know how to make and use salt/sugar solution or ORS People wash their hands after defecation and before eating and food preparation Families are disposing of young children's faeces safely	Project Monitoring Attendance at hygiene sessions Indicators of behavioural change	Staff reports Attendance Sheets Community Feedback monitoring	Bi-weekly	Hygiene Officer		

III. Monitoring forms

As the monitoring plan indicates various monitoring plans will need to be developed to record progress on the various outputs and indicators.

The above monitoring plan requires three different types of monitoring form for collecting information:

1. **Results Monitoring Form** - Staff monthly Monitoring Activity Plan (MBO) to qualitative and quantitative outputs delivered
2. **Impact Monitoring Form** - for staff to record evidence of change on qualitative indicators of change
3. **Community Feedback Monitoring Forms** - for recording feedback on the service from users.

Table 5: Project Results Monitoring Form - Staff monthly monitoring plan to record qualitative and quantitative outputs delivered.

Project Results Monitoring Form: N.Banda Aceh Water & Sanitation Project **Barrack 1- NandaPaal Month: January 05** **Staff Member Name: Sidi Fulan Position : Watsan Officer**							
Planned Outputs	**Performance Indicators to be regularly monitored**	**Method of verification**	**Week 1**	**Week 2**	**Week 3**	**Week 4**	**Action Taken**
Output 1 12 Water Supply Points established serving 250 people each **Output 2** Delivery of 12000 litres of fresh water every two days to five barracks	Number of taps and water supply points is sufficient	Camp population vs Number of taps					
	Sufficient water (15 litres per day per person) is being delivered and is available consistently on a regular basis.	Camp population					
		Amount of water delivered					
		Was Water exhausted and when					
	Queuing time is no more that 15 minutes per person	Queuing time					
	Water is Clean	Water Test					
Output 2. 125 latrines installed adjacent to barracks serving 2500 people	Numbers of latrines installed are appropriate to population (Max 20 pp)	Camp population					
	Latrines are being maintained and cleaned	Inspection					
	All groups within barracks are using latrines (ie children, elderly etc)	Discussion with residents					

Table 6: Impact Monitoring Form.

Below is an example of how the monitoring of outputs and indicators requiring change might be recorded**:**

Objective/ Output	**Indicator**	**Some change**	**Major change**	**No change**	**Negativ e change**	**Current situation**	**Action required**
Output 4. 20 Hygiene training sessions delivered to families within 5 barracks (4 each)	Families are disposing of young children's faeces safely	✓				Distribution of 5,000 potties carried out Children's excreta less visible Mothers say that progress is being made	Continue discussing with parents regarding disposal of babies' excreta Start child to child activities
	Mothers know how to make and use salt/sugar solution or ORS		✓			Training in progress, random interviews at clinics indicate increase in knowledge	Continue programme activities
	Families collect drinking water from the protected source		✓			80% tapstands now functioning for 4 hours per day – queues force some people to go to the river.	Continue work on remaining tapstands
	Rubbish is being disposed of in bins and being removed		✓			Bins are overflowing attracting rats	Increase number of bins

Some of the above indicators draw on the **Sphere Minimum Standards.** Certain indicators for the Minimum Standards also provide proxy indicators of impact.

Table 7: Community Feedback Monitoring Forms - for recording feedback on the service from users

Community Feedback Form for Project: **Community Name** **Location:** **Date of Consultation:** **Attendance: Women: Men: Children** **Staff Member Name**				
Objective/ Output	Performance Indicator	Outcome/Result	Reasons	Advised Action
Project Goal: Water borne disease is controlled and other basic water & sanitation standards are provided to IDPs in Banda Aceh northern district **Output 1** 12 Water Supply Points established serving 250 people each **Output 2** Delivery of 12000 litres of fresh water every two days to five barracks	Reduction in water borne disease	We feel diarrhoea is 60% down but contamination continues. No cases of cholera now	Through users not washing their hands after latrine use and then using water taps	Run an extra hygiene session focussing on this.
	Hygiene culture within barracks is adequate according to SPHERE and local norms	Cross contamination from flies feeding in latrines Rubbish is not being disposed of in bins provided or overflows Rats are appearing in the barracks	No covers for latrine slabs Bins are not emptied often enough	Make latrine covers Increase rubbish collection to daily Hygiene session on dangers of not disposing properly of rubbish
	Sufficient clean water is supplied to families	Average water usage is adequate per person. Water tends to run out on Fridays because of bathing for Juma a	Excessive water use by camp members	An extra delivery on Fridays Train community on water conservation
	Water is accessible and queues not unreasonably long	Average queuing time is 10 minutes, with about 90 people per tap		
	Open defecation has been reduced	50% of Children are not using latrines during the day. Women not using the latrines at night	They perceive the holes are too large and may fall in. Because of poor lighting	Redesign latrine slabs Train children on safe usage Install lighting
	Potties have been distributed to all families with children under 3	Some new families have not received potties and are taking children to the fields	Lack of awareness of entitlements to potties.	Watsan officer to deliver 15 potties for distribution.
Output 3 125 latrines installed adjacent to barracks serving 2500 people	Numbers of latrines installed are appropriate to population (Max 20 per person)	On the whole the number of latrines is adequate and at appropriate distances		
	Toilets are cleaned adequately	Toilets are not cleaned regularly, resulting in some falling into disuse and resulting in fould smells and increased number of flies	Community members are not fulfilling their responsibilities for keeping latrines clean. Barrack sub-committee not meeting regularly	Extra hygiene session organised to raise awareness of latrine management. Sub-committee to meet urgently
	Toilet design is usable by all groups in the community (elderly, childrenetc)			

.

Some of the above indicators draw on the **Sphere Minimum Standards.** Certain indicators for the Minimum Standards also provide proxy indicators of impact.

1.4. Data Analysis & Project Review

Using information collected through monitoring

It is important to remember that information gathered through monitoring needs to be evaluated. It is no good just collecting data if it is not going to be collated and compared to expected results or baseline data. **i.e do not gather more extensive information than you can use**. The conclusions drawn from the monitoring data then need to be fed back into programme design, planning and activity, if it is to serve the purpose for which it has been collected. Sufficient time and resources need to be allocated for this activity.

Regular comparison of progress against expected results is imperative if the emergency programme is funded by one of the major institutional donors (particularly ECHO). Islamic Relief will have agreed a certain contract with the donor, and if there are going to be changes in the programme (activities, timing, inputs, etc.) they will need to be communicated to the donor as soon as possible so a revised contract can be negotiated. If they are not, then Islamic Relief risks losing the donor funding.

The Organisation of Review
Project Review lies in between the processes of monitoring and evaluation but borrows elements of both to enable rapid assessment at one point in time of the progress of a project or programme based on analysis of the collated information, data and stakeholder views emerging from the project. A review enables a much broader and extensive assessment of progress than is available from monitoring but is less comprehensive, time consuming and rigorous than an evaluation. It is also usually an internal exercise whereas evaluation is normally external.

A review enables management to make decisions regarding the design of a project in order to correct obvious failures.

Frequency of Reviews
Depending on the rapidity of change and the need to adjust project activities to contextual change, the project review should be organised at suitably regular intervals. This may be weekly, monthly or bi-monthly.

Stakeholder involvement
It usually takes the form of a staff meeting attended by all staff as well as the programme and project manager. As part of the review it is important to involve other stakeholders who are impacted by the project including beneficiaries, community leaders and local government representatives. It may be advisable if sensitive issues are to be discussed to arrange the meeting in two parts with stakeholders present in one part.

The following table outlines the purposes and content of a review

Table 7: Format for a Project Review

Where should the report be sent?	The report forms the regular project report for the field office which needs also to be sent to the RPM and Communications Co-ordinator at HQ in Birmingham. It then feeds through into our international progress reviews and impact reports as well as media outlets.
Timing	**Emergency Project Progress Review (EPPR)**
Purpose of EPPR & Terms of Reference	• Review performance against stated objectives and outputs • Receive feedback from Staff, beneficiaries and stakeholders • Basic Impact assessment • Decide what adjustments are required to project strategy • Review expenditure and budget • Collect the required information for the quarterly Report for Head Office.
Led by:	Programme Manager or Country Director (in smaller field offices)
Who should be involved?	Country Programme Manager Project Manager Finance Manager All Project Staff Beneficiaries & Stakeholders as required
Content	1. **Completion of Project Framework Monitoring Sheet** 2. **Completion of Feedback from Stakeholder exercise** 3. **Project Impact** - summary of impact calculated on the basis of agreed performance indicators and other achievements 4. **Review of Project Monitoring performance and planning** 5. **Staffing issues** 6. **Sustainability & withdrawal issues** (as appropriate) 7. **Adherence to Project Implementation plan** – any changes required, will they be acceptable to the donor? 8. **Adjustments to Project strategy**. What activities and outputs will have to be adjusted? Are there any new activities needed? 9. **Project expenditure & budgetary management** – are any budget lines over or under spent? Have donors or HQ been informed of any budgetary changes required?

2. Evaluations in Emergency Situations

Evaluations of emergency projects could be broadly categorised as of two kinds; **ex-post** evaluations, carried out after operations have wound down and **real-time** evaluations conducted during operations. The ex-post evaluations follow the standard TOR format and criteria outlined in appendix 1. The following document focuses heavily on real-time monitoring and evaluation because this is the priority to be mainstreamed within the organisation in order to improve performance in our emergency operations.

Real-Rime Evaluations

In recent years humanitarian organisations have come to value evaluations of emergency operations conducted during operations (real-time) as an important tool for improving the effectiveness and accountability of emergency aid programmes. However evaluations in emergency are structured and designed differently to take account of the nature of the work, the priorities of saving life and the speed of change both in the context and requirements of the programme. They tend to focus less on impact and more on performance, with a view to seeing how this can be improved through immediate feedback to programme managers.

Because it is rapid and involves a strong element of monitoring, real-time evaluations in emergencies (RTEs) challenge the conventional categorisation of activities as ‘monitoring’ or ‘evaluation’. RTEs have been adopted by front-line agencies out of concern that traditional after-the-fact evaluations come too late to affect the operations they were assessing and save lives and suffering. Given that institutional memory is weak in many organisations, there was also concern that these evaluations were not influencing future operations either. (Herson & Mitchell, 2005)

2.1 Real-Time Evaluation Methodology

The methodology adapted by Islamic Relief for RTEs involve two main components:

1. The establishment of relevant monitoring mechanisms and regular review by the project team against performance indicators. Review may be weekly, bi-weekly or monthly depending on the context.
2. An evaluation mission within three months to appraise the project against a range of criteria and facilitate a strategic review.

The following points reflect the requirements of RTE in Islamic Relief:

- RTE takes place during the course of implementation. It should start as soon as possible. If management take on the responsibility for monitoring and evaluation near the beginning, this will be more conducive to creating 'ownership' over the process and results, and fostering a climate of trust and co-operation with operational staff.
- Like monitoring, evaluation in the form of review aims to be iterative rather than one-off, hence the idea of an on-going evaluation.
- The time frame is short, with external evaluation typically lasting days, rather than weeks, and project review held at appropriate intervals.
- The methodology pays the usual attention to secondary and primary sources of information, but is then interactive. Most RTEs are carried out through field visits combined with Country Office meetings.
- RTEs rely on internal 'consultants' and staff, rather than, or alongside external staff. It fits well with the use of 'Accountability Monitors' who are employed to set up and manage monitoring processes with independent line management to HQ.
- The full use of the standard evaluation criteria detailed in the standard project evaluation TOR is restricted, with a greater emphasis placed on process. So instead of focussing on sustainability and ownership issues, more emphasis is placed on the quality and standards of delivery.
- The emphasis is on immediate lesson learning over impact evaluation or accountability.
- 'Quick and dirty' results enable a programme to be changed in mid course. This brings RTE closer to monitoring, which primarily tracks progress, than to evaluation, which makes value judgements.

2.2 Evaluation Outcomes in Emergency Situations

A real-time evaluation is an *improvement-orientated* review. If it can be carried out with programme or project staff, it can be regarded more as an internal function than an external process. Having said that, it is important that management initiate and support the RTE, and own the results.

Unlike the majority of final ex-post evaluations, the process and products of a real-time evaluation are integrated within the programme cycle. Interaction with programme staff and managers during the course of implementation means that discussion can help to bring about changes in the programme, rather than just reflect on its quality after the event. A real-time 'evaluator' is actually a 'facilitator', encouraging and assisting…staff…to take a critical look at the operation and to find creative solutions to any difficulties they are encountering. With all the tensions and stress that build up in an emergency situation this in itself can be cathartic and helpful.

The actual report that the RTE produces may therefore be of less importance as the process by which it was arrived at, since its conclusions should have been immediately acted upon by field staff once they had been drawn out in the rapid review process. It is therefore a vital aid to dynamic project and programme management.

Indeed by the time the report is produced and circulated it will probably be out of date, especially if the process has helped to encourage change. Nevertheless it should also constitute a written record for longer-term institutional lesson-learning.

2.3 Terms of reference for evaluations of emergency interventions.

It is vital that the TOR for emergency evaluations is developed looking as much at short-term learning objectives and performance issues as well as longer term management and technical learning.

Suggested priority learning objectives:

1. The operation's relevance and design
2. Progress in achieving the operation's objectives (ie results)
3. Gaps in provision or unintended impact
4. Coherence with other aid actors, authorities etc.
5. Effectiveness and efficiency of the mode of operation
6. Appropriateness and application of operational guidelines and policies (Quality Standards, including Red Cross & IR Code of Conduct, SPHERE)

See appendix 1 below for full format:

2.4 Findings and Recommendations in the report

The judgements made in real-time evaluations in emergencies in general concern *how* results are being achieved: they look at process, rather than impact. Impact is not only in general harder to pin down, but, given the rapidly changing context of an RTE, meaningful and accurate statements about impact may be unrealistic. However, with regard to impact, an RTE can play a valuable part not only in illustrating some sort of descriptive base-line at the point at which it was carried out, for the use of future evaluations. It can also propose areas for any later ex-post evaluation to concentrate on.

Real time evaluations in emergencies may not enhance accountability backwards towards donors, unless there is a commitment to publish reports or submit them. However, it may promote forwards accountability if it involves the consultation in the field with actual or potential beneficiaries.

In summary, it is likely that recommendations will focus more on real-time programmatic change and improvement, rather than longer-term issues and outcomes.

Appendix 1 Country: Project Title & Evaluation Date

Objectives of the Evaluation

- Evaluate Project performance based on Outputs, Impact and Programming indicators
- To review Project organisational performance against stated organisational objectives and the required standards in IRQAS
- Feedback views of Staff and stakeholders with regards to Project and organisational performance
-

Who is it for?

Clarify which department or office actually has final ownership of the report and distribution rights. Who will get a copy?
The evaluation should be primarily for Project and Programme staff who will contribute to it and get access to the final report. In addition it may be circulated and made available to Funders, senior management, fundraising offices and the IR Audit committee.

What do we want to find out?

The Evaluation will assess outputs to results, Programme impact and appropriateness and programming quality. Below are Evaluation Logframes which detail the Projects Goal, Purpose, Outputs and Activities. The logframes also contain key questions to be answered and evaluation methodologies. As stated previously, Islamic Relief requires Evaluations to review Output, Impact and Programming indicators. These are defined as:

Output – Is / Has the Project delivered what it said it would do?
Impact – What have been the direct and indirect changes to livelihoods, community mobilisation and vulnerability? How have Beneficiaries lives changed?
Programming –

- Has the Output and Impact been achieved in the most relevant and appropriate way?
- Was the community fully involved and was ownership and sustainability written into Project deliverables?
- Was the Project Coherent with and Connected to other actors and agencies within the locale?
- Was the project efficient and cost effective?
- Did the Project conform to relevant Islamic Relief Quality Standards?

Methodology

To be reviewed

Specifications for the evaluation team

To be reviewed

Timetable

To Be Reviewed

Analysing and presenting the results – Conclusions & recommendations. The initial findings will be analysed, shared and discussed with the programme team in Country, and then collated in a report following the team's return.

Project Evaluation Logframe

Logframe – Project Title

Intervention Logic	*Objectively verifiable indicators*	*Progress in achieving stated objectives & Specific Questions to be asked*	*Evaluation Methodology*
Goal:		Were there any unintended impacts?	
Purpose:			
Outputs:			
Activities:			

4. Project Evaluation Criteria

	Indicators of Achievement	**Sources and means of Verification**	**Methodology & Questions**	**Arrange ments to be made**
Relevance & Appropriateness *The ability to tailor humanitarian activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost effectiveness; appropriate according to:- internal policies, perceptions of target population, national policies; timeliness of a response can be part of an intervention's appropriateness*	Quality of situation & stakeholder Analysis		*Covered through evaluation itself*	
Timeliness *How timely was the delivery of the project in relation to peoples' needs*				

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Coverage *The extent to which project activities reached the specific target population and or to what extent the beneficiaries had access to our services; can involve examining 'within-population' differences in resources they receive or have access to*	• Geographical coverage • Community • Have we covered what we wanted to cover? • Have we utilised the most appropriate technology? • Are there any alternatives available? • Are there any gaps in our programme? • Are there any cases of prejudice amongst the communities in the use and access to the services			
Connectedness *Whether short-term emergency responses are carried out in a context which takes longer-term problems into account*	• Long term development plans in the area	Requires an examination of existing programmes	1.	
Community involvement & ownership *Involvement of beneficiaries in the planning, delivery, management and review of services*	Involvement of beneficiaries in the planning, delivery, management and review of services		Covered through interaction with Communities	

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Coherence *Whether relief activities were carried out with an effective division of labour among the actors, maximising the comparative advantage of each, avoiding gaps and overlaps, acknowledging the responsibilities of all involved; co-ordination of the response can be part of coherence*	• Integration with IR programme • Integration with International community		*Meetings with Communities and government departments*.	
Efficiency *Measures the outputs (qualitative or quantitative) in relation to the inputs; can require the alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to examine if the most efficient process has been used; whether resources have been optimally used to address the needs; managerial efficiency can be used to examine the decision making process, human resource management, logistics; cost-efficiency, the lowest cost to produce or achieve specific outputs (doesn't imply effectiveness) can be a related term*	1. Did our purchasing policies ensure that the best and lowest prices were obtained – what were the constraints to these mechanisms? 2. How close were the original planned costs (material, human, running), and actual costs in order to achieve project outputs? 3. Were Human Resource needs adequate?		4.	

Cost effectiveness *Whether the project outcomes could have been achieved at a lower cost; examines the relationship between costs and outcomes or impact; or whether greater impact could have been achieved for the same cost; requires sectors to monitor expenditure to achieve outcome. Cost-effectiveness is seldom feasible if costs are compared to impact, as it is confronted with the same constraints as impact.*		Evaluate according to other schemes perhaps government?	*Finance team will assist with audit*	
Financial Management *Was the financial management of the project efficiently carried out?*			*Was budgetary management properly managed?* *Covered largely by financial evaluation & internal audit*	
Human Resource Management	• Training provision • Staff turnover & satisfaction • Staff utilisation		• *Arrange Staff meeting and review of procedures and policies* • *Follow through with meeting with HQ department at CO level*	

Project Management	• Quality of original situation analysis • Quality of Project Design • Implementation planning & procedures • Quality of M&E & Review • Was project learning used? • Reporting		Arrange staff meeting and review of procedures and policies	
Quality Standards	• Did the project observe standards laid out in the IR Code of Conduct and SPHERE? • Did the Project deliver the required accountability standards covering transparency, participation and provision for complaints?			
Emergency Preparedness	• The extent to which the project contributes to emergency preparedness or mitigation		Through field staff and community and through follow up with E & R	

Security of Relief workers	• The extent to which the security of staff and beneficiaries was planned for		Field staff discussion and with community	
Gender & Human rights issues	• The extent to which the rights of the local population were respected and strengthened by the project.		Staff meetings and community discussions	

Appendix 2: Aid Distribution Form

AID DISTRIBUTION FORM

ISLAMIC RELIEF <BRANCH>

DATE	
PROJECT	
LOCATION	
Distributed by:	
Unit of Measure	
Type of Items Distributed	

No.	Name	Quantity	Recipient Signature	Comment
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				

Prepared by				Verified by

CAMP AID DISTRIBUTION SHEET

Appendix B31

CAMP:

LOCATION:

Distribution Date	**Time**
Distributed by:	
Unit of Measure	
Type of Items Distributed	

Reg#	Name of House Hold	Plot No.	HH Size			HH age group				Quantity	Recipient Signature	Remarks
			M	F	T	<5	5-18	19-59	≥60			
0001					0							
0002					0							
0003					0							
0004					0							
0005					0							
0006					0							
0007					0							

0008					0							
0009					0							
0010					0							
0011					0							
0012					0							
0013					0							
0014					0							
0015					0							
0016					0							
0017					0							
0018					0							
0019					0							
0020					0							
0021					0							
0022					0							
0023					0							
0024					0							
0025					0							
0026					0							
0027					0							
0028					0							
TOTAL			0	0	**0**	0	0	0	0			

SC = Separated children UE= Unaccompanied **page 1** elder

UM= Un-accompanied Minors
FH= Female Headed

Reg#	Name of House Hold	Plot No.	HH Size			HH age group				Quantity	Recipient Signature	Vulnerability & Remarks
			M	F	T	<5	5-18	19-59	≥60			
0029					0							
0030												
0031												
0032												
0033												
0034												
0035												
0036												
0037												
0038												
0039												
0040												
0041												

0042												
0043												
0044												
0045												
0046												
0047												
0048												
0049												
0050												
0051												
0052												
0053					0							
0054					0							
0055					0							
0056					0							
0057					0							
0058					0							
0059					0							
0060					0							
0061					0							
0062					0							
0063					0							
0064					0							
TOTAL			0	0	**0**	0	0	0	0			

SC = Separated children UE= Unaccompanied **page 2** elder

UM= Un- accompanied Minors FH= Female Headed

Reg#	Name of House Hold	Plot No.	HH Size			HH age group				Quantity	Recipient Signature	Vulnerability & Remarks
			M	F	T	<5	5-18	19-59	≥60			
0065					0							
0066												
0067												
0068												
0069												
0070												
0071												
0072												
0073												
0074												
0075												
0076												
0077												
0078												
0079												
0080												
0081												
0082												
0083												
0084												

0085												
0086												
0087												
0088												
0089					0							
0090					0							
0091					0							
0092					0							
0093					0							
0094					0							
0095					0							
0096					0							
0097					0							
0098					0							
0099					0							
0100					0							
TOTAL			0	0	**0**	0	0	0	0			

SC = Separated children UE= Unaccompanied elder

page 3

UM= Un- accompanied Minors FH= Female Headed

Reg#	Name of House Hold	Plot No.	HH Size			HH age group					Recipient	Vulnerability & Remarks
			M	F	T	<5	5-18	19-59	≥60	Quantity	Signature	
0101					0							
0102												

0103												
0104												
0105												
0106												
0107												
0108												
0109												
0110												
0111												
0112												
0113												
0114												
0115												
0116												
0117												
0118												
0119												
0120												
0121												
0122												
0123												
0124												
0125					0							
0126					0							
0127					0							

0128					0							
0129					0							
0130					0							
0131					0							
0132					0							
0133					0							
0134					0							
0135					0							
0136					0							
TOTAL			0	0	**0**	0	0	0	0			

SC = Separated children UE= Unaccompanied elder

UM= Un- accompanied Minors FH= Female Headed

page 4