METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Report Number: M2.2/P 31 May 2018



METEOR: MODELLING EXPOSURE THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES



Contributors:

L. Pertrarulo, C. Simon, A. Lyon





British Geological Survey Expert | Impartial | Innovative









ImageCat

AT





Oxford Policy Management





THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES

Document Verification

Project	METEOR: Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines
Report Title	METEOR Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
Related Milestone	M2.2: Final M&E Plan
Reference as	L. Petrarulo, C. Simon, A. Lyon (2018) METEOR: Monitoring & Evaluation Plan. METEOR Report M2.2/P
Release Type	Public / Confidential / Confidential with Embargo Period

Prepared by: Contributors			
Name(s): L. Petrarulo	Signature(s):	Date(s): 31/05/2018	
C. Simon	C	,,	
A. Lyon	Juco Co		
Approved by: Project Manage	r		
Name:	Signature:	Date:	
K. Smith	Kay Smith	31/05/2018	
Approved by: Caribou Digital			
Name: E. Montano	Signature:	Date: 31/05/2018	
Approved by: UKSA IPP Officer			
Name:	Signature:	Date:	

Date	Version	Alterations	Editor
25/05/2018	V2		E. Montano
31/05/2018	V3	Figure and Table cross-referencing	K. Smith



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



Contents

DOCUME	ENT VERIFICATION	1
ACRONY	′MS	4
1. INT	RODUCTION	5
1.1.	Project Summary	5
1.2.	METEOR PROJECT OVERVIEW	5
1.3.	M&E Priorities	6
1.4.	About this plan	6
1.5.	IPP M&E Approach	6
1.6.	STRUCTURE OF THIS M&E PLAN	7
2. PRO	OJECT OBJECTIVES AND ANTICIPATED IMPACTS	9
2.1.	THEORY OF CHANGE	9
2.2.	Logical Framework (Logframe)	
3. GEN	NDER ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY	15
3.1.	SUMMARY OF GENDER ANALYSIS	
3.2.	Gender Strategy	
3.3.	Gender Sensitive	
4. M&	&E USE AND AUDIENCE	17
4.1.	Users	
4.2.	REPORTING FLOW	
4.3.	TIMELINE FOR M&E	
5. EVA	ALUATION PLANNING	20
5.1.	Evaluation objectives	
5.2.	Evaluation questions	21
5.3.	EVALUATION APPROACH	23
5.3.	.1. Economic evaluation	
5.3.	.2. Impact evaluation	
5.3.	.3. Process evaluation	
5.4.	Evaluation Methods and Tools	25
5.5.	DATA COLLECTION ROUNDS	29
5.5.	.1. The counter-factual	
5.5.	.2. Gender considerations	





METEOR: MODELLING EXPOSURE THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES

5.5.3	3. Expected deliverables	
MON	NITORING AND DATA COLLECTION	31
5.1.	LOGFRAME DATA COLLECTION	
RESC	DURCES AND BUDGETS	36
7.1.	Roles and Responsibilities	
7.2.	RACI MODEL	40
7.3.	Budget	41
CON	IMISSIONING EVALUATIONS	42
RESP	PONDING TO AND USING EVALUATION FINDINGS	43
APPE	ENDICES	44
10.1.	DATA COLLECTION AND TOOLS	44
	5.5.3 MOI 5.1. 7.1. 7.2. 7.3. CON RESI APP 10.1.	5.5.3. Expected deliverables MONITORING AND DATA COLLECTION 5.1. LOGFRAME DATA COLLECTION 6.1. LOGFRAME DATA COLLECTION RESOURCES AND BUDGETS 7.1. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 7.2. RACI MODEL 7.3. BUDGET COMMISSIONING EVALUATIONS RESPONDING TO AND USING EVALUATION FINDINGS APPENDICES 10.1. DATA COLLECTION AND TOOLS

Figures

Figure 1: Magenta Book Evaluation Methodology	8
Figure 2: Theory of Change – Graphic	10
Figure 3: Graphic representation of the reporting flow	
Figure 4: METEOR Workplan of main M&E activities	19
Figure 5: Example Evaluation Rubric and Scoring	28

Tables

Table 1: METEOR Logframe	14
Table 2: Evaluation Questions	22
Table 3: Indicative evaluation methods for the evaluation questions	26
Table 4: Summary of M&E roles and responsibilities	39
Table 5: M&E RACI Model	40
Table 6: M&E Budget per Milestone	41





METEOR: MODELLING EXPOSURE THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES

Acronyms

BGS	The British Geological Survey
CAT	Catastrophe
CEA	Cost-Effectiveness Assessment
DfiD	Department for International Development
DMD	Disaster Management Department
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EQ	Evaluation Question
GEM	The Global Earthquake Model
НОТ	The Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team
IDF	Insurance Development Forum
IPP	International Partnership Programme
KII	Key Informant Interview
КР	Knowledge Product
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LDC	Least Developed Country
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
METEOR	Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSET	National Society for Earthquake Technology
ODA	Official Development Aid
OPM	Oxford Policy Management Limited
QA	Quality Assurance
SDGs	United Nations Sustainable Development Goals
UKSA	United Kingdom Space Agency
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
WP2	Work Package 2 - M&E Activities





METEOR: MODELLING EXPOSURE THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES

1. Introduction

1.1. Project Summary

Title	Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines (METEOR): EO- based Exposure, Nepal and Tanzania
Starting Date	08/02/2018
Duration	36 months
Partners	Consortium: The British Geological Survey (BGS) (Lead), ImageCat, The Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT), Oxford Policy Management Limited (OPM), SSBN
	International Partners: The Global Earthquake Model (GEM) Foundation, National Society for Earthquake Technology (NSET) - Nepal, The Disaster Management Department – Tanzania.
Target Countries	Nepal and Tanzania for "level 2" results and all 47 Least Developed ODA countries for "level 1" data
IPP Project	IPPC2_07_BGS_METEOR
Project Lead	British Geological Survey (BGS)
M&E Lead	Oxford Policy Management Limited (OPM)

1.2. METEOR Project Overview

At present, there is a poor understanding of population exposure in some ODA countries, which causes major challenges when making Disaster Risk Management decisions. METEOR (Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines) takes a step-change in the application of Earth Observation exposure data by developing and delivering more accurate levels of population exposure to natural hazards. Providing new consistent data to governments, town planners and insurance providers will promote welfare and economic development in these countries and better enable them to respond to the hazards when they do occur.

METEOR is funded through the second iterations of the UK Space Agency's International Partnership Programme, which uses space expertise to deliver innovative solutions to real world problems across the globe. The funding helps to build sustainable development while building effective partnerships that can lead to growth opportunities for British companies.



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



1.3. M&E Priorities

The main objectives for applying rigorous M&E processes to the project are:

- **Carefully tracking progress** via specific monitoring indicators that will help us understand if and how project activities are contributing to intended results. This will include showing the quantitative improvements against the relevant UN SDGs.
- Feeding back into the programme the insights gained from the monitoring data and the evaluations to allow **learning and adaptive programming**.
- Assessing the added value of the project against a 'business-as-usual' scenario.
- **Assessing the cost-effectiveness** of the project to provide important information about the cost of replicating or scaling up the proposed approach elsewhere.

1.4. About this plan

The current version of the M&E Plan has been prepared by Oxford Policy Management as Lead Partner for the M&E work package. It has been prepared during the first quarter of the project, at its inception. The M&E Plan provides the key details of the approach that the team intends to use to monitor and evaluate METEOR. It has been prepared with the collaboration and input from all the consortium partners, and supported by Caribou Digital (UKSA IPP M&E provider). The M&E Plan will be reviewed every time there is something significant that changes the main M&E approaches and details of the M&E system, e.g. a revision of the Theory of Change, the amendment of an indicator in the logframe, etc. Additionally, the M&E Plan will be reviewed at annual intervals to verify that it still reflects the current situation during the project implementation.

1.5. IPP M&E Approach

IPP is required to evaluate and communicate its impact on development challenges around the world. To do so in a rigorous and consistent way, a common methodology is needed across the programme which allows results to be aggregated to speak about the collective impact of the full IPP portfolio. It allows UKSA to understand the programme level results, and not just the individual results of each project.

This approach constitutes:

- a common process for M&E planning, monitoring and evaluation based on similar deliverables and timings of activities.
- a common approach to conducting evaluations, based on HMRC criteria for process, economic and impact evaluations, also incorporating the OECD DAC Criteria for evaluations.
- a common framework for understanding impacts, aligned to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

This sets a standard approach to M&E which all grantees are expected to follow, and provides the structure detailed in chapters and sections of this M&E plan.

The key documents that will be used in this approach are:





METEOR: MODELLING EXPOSURE THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES

- **M&E Plan (this document)**: Which lays out the overall approach to M&E and key parameters for monitoring and evaluation throughout the project lifecycle. It is a 'living' document which is updated over time to reflect changes in the project design and delivery.
- **Baseline Evaluation**: An assessment of the baseline (or starting) conditions which a project is to be implemented in. It assesses the general political, social, economic and environmental context in partner countries, as well as a specific measurement of the starting conditions of logframe indicators.
- **Midline Evaluation**: A formal assessment of interim progress towards targets to date. It assesses if the project is on track to achieve its outcomes impacts. It informs implementation as it allows management to identify changes needed in the project delivery, or M&E approach, to achieve results. As it is a mid-point in the project delivery, it often focuses on progress towards outputs and outcome indicators as impacts are not likely to have materialised yet.
- **Endline Evaluation:** Conducted at the end of a project and is focused on assessing the final outcomes and impacts of the project, as well as its delivery. It includes a measure of progress against the baseline conditions to assess change. As it is at the end of the project, when impacts have materialised, it focuses impact level results.
- Sustainability Plan: To ensure there is sufficient focus and prioritisation on sustainability, all
 projects are expected to complete a formal sustainability plan which outlines various ways in
 which project impacts will be sustained and/or how commercial sustainability will be
 achieved. It is a 'living' document that goes through many iterations to become gradually more
 detailed over time on the specific expectations and activities that will lead to a sustainable
 project.
- **Knowledge Sharing and Communications Plan:** A document clarifying internal communications mechanisms between consortium members and a plan for external knowledge sharing activities with wider space and development communities.
- **Cost-effectiveness Analysis:** An excel model and narrative report that provides robust, quantitative data to communicate why a consortium's space-based solution is a cost-effective method of addressing a problem compared to existing alternatives.

1.6. Structure of this M&E Plan

HM Treasury 'The Magenta Book Guidance for Evaluation' provides guidance considerations when designing an evaluation. UK Space Agency has then built off the Magenta Book within its 'Evaluation Strategy'.

The structure of this document is based on the Magenta Book and UK Space Agency evaluation methodology.

See:

HM Treasury: The Magenta Book - Guidance for Evaluation

UK Space Agency: Evaluation Strategy





METEOR: MODELLING EXPOSURE THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES



Figure 1: Magenta Book Evaluation Methodology



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



2. Project Objectives and Anticipated Impacts

2.1. Theory of Change

Theory of Change - Narrative

The project seeks to contribute to a reduction in the cost, in human and financial terms, of disasters such as earthquakes, landslides and floods. A major challenge when making Disaster Risk Management decisions is poor understanding of the distribution and character of exposure in less-developed countries. Exposure needs to be mapped, monitored, modelled and fed into sectoral policies and plans (e.g. urban, infrastructure, energy) to build resilience and foster growth. This requires that governments, companies, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), the United Nations and religious organisations have strategies and practices that minimise the chance of a disaster occurring, and mitigate the consequences if such an event happens.

In the medium term the project will contribute to three objectives. Working in Tanzania and Nepal specifically, the project will strengthen the ability of government to demonstrate good practice in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Disaster Risk Management (DRM). This will strengthen prepositioning, emergency response and ability to prioritise mitigation activities such as land use planning, land acquisition programmes, and building codes. Both countries will act as 'lighthouses' of good practice, sharing their experience and lessons with other nations in their respective regions, using international networks and collaborations. The second objective is also specific to those two countries and involves the wider community of organisations involved in DRR and DRM, particularly the private sector and civil society, so that they are also demonstrating good practice, based on good quality data. The third objective is a wider one that recognises that the datasets, the protocols and the learning experience around their use can influence practice across the globe.

For governments to change their practice, the project will train staff in order to improve their skills and knowledge and will improve the quality of data available – including understanding its limitations. The wider DRM community will also benefit from access to improved data, and freely-available training materials METEOR takes a step-change in the application of Earth Observation exposure data by developing and delivering rigorous and open routines (protocols) and standards to allow quantitative assessment of exposure, with explicit uncertainties. The project will contribute to the third objective by providing access to open source data on all 47 Least Developed Countries (LDCs), together with communications materials designed to improve policies, plans and practice in DRR/ DRM.







Figure 2: Theory of Change – Graphic



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



2.2. Logical Framework (Logframe)

	Objective	Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Impact	Policies, plans, and practice are better informed by Disaster Risk Reduction and Management, particularly disaster loss estimation systems, across public and private sectors, and civil society	 Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters (of similar magnitude and impact) per 100,000 population (disaggregating males and females) (aligned with SDG indicators 11.5.1 and 13.1.1) Disaster-related loss and damage (in GBP £) identified by partner national disaster agencies in Nepal and Tanzania Qualitative indicator: progress towards integration of DRR good practice into policy changes across the public and private sectors, and civil society 	 A XX% reduction in disaster-related deaths and affected persons A XX% reduction in disaster-related loss and damage Target TBC during inception 	 Official national statistics Official loss and damage estimation by national partners Key Informant Interviews and workshops in baseline and endline evaluations 	
Outcomes	 The governments of Tanzania and Nepal utilise project datasets to improve their national sectoral policies, plans and practice 	 Qualitative indicator: progress towards integration of DRR good practice into government policy Feedback from relevant Ministry (or decision- maker) of the usefulness of the datasets for improving their national DRR/DRM 	 Target TBC during inception Positive feedback from relevant Ministry (or decision-maker) of the usefulness of the datasets for improving their national DRR/DRM (KPI 1) 	 Key Informant Interviews and workshops in baseline, midline, and endline evaluations Feedback from the Ministries 	 Natural disasters occur up to one year after the project and are of similar magnitude and location of those before the project. Relevant stakeholders are constrained to





Objective	Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
 Improved use by end users of DRR/DRM data in decision-making and practice in Tanzania and Nepal 	 Qualitative indicator: progress towards integration of DRR good practice into civil society and private sector practices End users report improved capacity to use DRR/DRM protocols and open source datasets(disaggregating males and females) 	 Target TBC during inception At least 70% of end users report improved capacity to use DRR/DRM protocols and open source datasets (KPI 3) 	 Key Informant Interviews and workshops in baseline, midline, and endline evaluations End user surveys 	 improve their DRR/DRM policy and planning by a lack of knowledge and awareness of the proper protocols, tools and data. Political will is in place Resources are
 METEOR Knowledge Products (KPs – protocols, datasets, communication products) are used and adopted by the wider DRR community globally 	 Qualitative indicator: Feedback from UNICEF, UNSDR partners and insurance companies in respect of usefulness of datasets and protocols Qualitative indicator: progress towards creating insurance products Number of KPs and dataset downloads by different users 	 Positive feedback on usefulness of the data and protocols generated by the project by UNICEF, UNISDR and insurance companies (KPI 4) #1 new insurance product has been created using METEOR KPs #XX of KPs and dataset downloads by different users 	 Key Informant Interviews in baseline and endline evaluations Key Informant Interviews in baseline, midline, and endline evaluations Online platforms stats 	 allocated End users have willingness to change Capacity levels of emergency plan implementers are adequate





		Objective	Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
S	1.	Enhanced skills and knowledge in the use of DRR/DRM protocols and EO-based datasets	 Percentage of trained professionals in Nepal and Tanzania reporting increased knowledge and capacity (1-to-10 scale disaggregating males and females) Number of professionals trained in Nepal and Tanzania (disaggregating males and females) 	 XX% of trained professionals in Nepal and Tanzania reporting increased knowledge and capacity (1-to-10 scale disaggregating males and females) #XXX professionals trained in Nepal and Tanzania (disaggregating males and females) 	 Training feedback surveys and KIIs in baseline, midline, and endline evaluations Training logs 	 Decision-makers are willing to use the datasets they approve and find useful Trained stakeholders are able to use the knowledge gained during training to increase the overall capacity of their organisation
Outputs	2.	Open access to Level 2 national scale multi- hazard exposure datasets of Nepal and Tanzania	1. Percentage of Nepalese and Tanzanian territory covered by Level 2 multi-hazard exposure data (aligned with SFDRR Global Target g and Priority Area 1)	 100% of the territory of Nepal and Tanzania is covered by Level 2 multi- hazard exposure data (KPI 2a) 	1. Data on online platforms	 Trained organisations in Tanzania and Nepal and end users downloading project outputs elsewhere are
	3.	Protocols for capturing and communicating exposure data uncertainty delivered	 Workplan on track to achieve completion within deadline Percentage of approached users reporting a high satisfaction level with METEOR protocols (disaggregating males and females) 	 Protocols for capturing and communicating exposure data uncertainty are delivered within deadline XX% of approached users reporting a high satisfaction level with METEOR protocols 	 Project records Midline and endline evaluations; Online user surveys 	willing to use them and share their knowledge



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



		Objective	Indicators	Targets	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	4.	Open access to Level 1 exposure data for 47 LDCs Communication products shared (CPs - Policy papers, training materials, publications, conference presentations, case studies etc.)	 Number of Level-1 datasets for LDCs uploaded on online platforms (aligned with SFDRR Global Target g and Priority Area 1) Policy paper on the use of national-scale exposure data for insurance and other risk- transfer mechanisms published and shared Number of communication products shared Number of conferences or workshops hosted or attended by consortium members at which METEOR's findings are shared or discussed 	 #47 Level-1 datasets for LDCs uploaded on online platforms (KPI 2b) #1 policy paper on the use of national-scale exposure data for insurance and other risk-transfer mechanisms published and shared #XX communication products shared #XX conferences or workshops hosted or attended by consortium members at which METEOR's findings are shared or 	 Data on online platforms Data on online platforms Data on online platform Monthly Reporting to UKSA 	
Note	e: Pl	ease note that currently u	 Indefined targets (identified with XX) will be finalis	discussed ed during the inception phase	in discussion with th	ne relevant stakeholders.

Table 1: METEOR Logframe





3. Gender Analysis and Strategy

3.1. Summary of Gender Analysis

Several studies have demonstrated that women are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts, especially during natural disasters. For instance, it has been suggested that women may be up to 14 times more likely than men to die during a natural disaster¹. This is due to prevailing social inequalities and social norms in many ODA countries, including Nepal and Tanzania. For example, women are more likely to be indoors when a disaster like an earthquake or a tsunami strikes because women are primarily responsible for domestic duties, or often women are not taught how to swim or climb trees. Likewise, after a calamity, the pre-existing higher vulnerability of women to issues of personal safety, sexual and reproductive health, violence, and access to scarce resources is accentuated. A report by the DfID² refers to this as "double disaster", i.e. where indirect or secondary impacts worsen life for women.

3.2. Gender Strategy

METEOR is not operating at the community level, therefore we will track the gender-disaggregated benefits of the capacity building work done under the project by ensuring that the skills of female DRR professionals are also strengthened. Furthermore, by strengthening national DRR/DRM policy and planning in Nepal and Tanzania and substantially improving the access to more accurate disaster risk information in other ODA countries, this project will allow both female and male DDR professionals to better allocate pre- (e.g. both soft and hard disaster prevention) and post-disaster (e.g. subsistence and reconstruction) resources to reduce the likelihood of "double disaster" scenarios. Finally, acknowledging the fact that women are disproportionally affected by natural disaster compared to men as explained in the previous section, by aiming at improving national policies, plans, and practice in DRR/DRM, this project is likely to indirectly benefit women's exposure to natural disasters more than the one of men. This is a logic general assumption that is worth mentioning, but it goes beyond the scope of the project to monitor and evaluate such indirect impact.

3.3. Gender Sensitive

In order to monitor the gender aspects of this project, we have included the following specific gendersensitive indicators in METEOR's logframe:

- Impact Indicator 1: Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters (of similar magnitude and impact) per 100,000 population (disaggregating males and females)
- **Outcome Indicator 2.2:** End users report improved capacity to use DRR/DRM protocols and open source datasets (disaggregating males and females)

¹ Peterson, K. (2007). "Reaching Out to Women When Disaster Strikes." <u>http://www.soroptimist.org/</u>

² Bradshaw & Fordham (2013) Women, Girls and Disasters, A review for DfID <u>http://tinyurl.com/hwd8c8t</u>





- **Output Indicator 1.1:** Percentage of trained professionals in Nepal and Tanzania reporting increased knowledge and capacity (1-to-10 scale disaggregating males and females)
- **Output Indicator 3.2:** Percentage of approached users reporting a high satisfaction level with METEOR protocols (disaggregating males and females)





4. M&E Use and Audience

4.1. Users

The project's end users can be grouped into three main categories according to their expertise and specific needs:

a) Policy makers, DRR experts and other stakeholders with the remit to develop and implement strategies to reduce the impact from natural disasters (e.g. DMD of Tanzania or the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development, and Ministry of Urban Development of Nepal). This group of users requires reliable information identifying the regions more prone to natural disasters, and the associated expected losses. We will support these users by providing nation-wide exposure datasets, and by working with the local technical experts to generate the required risk metrics.

b) Local experts with a technical background and the remit to evaluate disaster risk in their countries. Institutions such as NSET, Ardhi University or the University of Dar Es Salaam have expressed repeatedly their urgent need for reliable national-scale exposure datasets. These institutions have been assisting DRR agencies in the respective countries for decades. This project will provide them with state-of- the-art exposure datasets for multi-hazard risk assessment, and improve their capacity to use EO data to generate information relevant for risk reduction.

c) This project will support the **catastrophe (CAT) modelling community**, which in turn can improve the insurance uptake. Past experience has demonstrated that regions with a high insurance penetration tend to recover from natural disasters more rapidly, and usually in a sustainable manner. However, they require the availability of realistic exposure and vulnerability datasets at the national scale.







Figure 3: Graphic representation of the reporting flow



4.3. Timeline for M&E

METEOR - WP2: M&E



Project month	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
Calendar month	Mar-18	Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Apr-19	May-19	Jun-19	Jul-19	Aug-19	Sep-19	Oct-19	Nov-19	Dec-19	Jan-20	Feb-20	Mar-20	Apr-20	May-20	Jun-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sep-20	Oct-20	Nov-20	Dec-20	Jan-21	Feb-21
M&E Plan																																				
Baseline evaluaiton												$\langle\!\rangle$																								
Annual Learning Event 2019																																				
Midline evaluation																																				
Annual Learning Event 2020																																				
Endline evaluation																																				
Annual Learning Event 2021																																				
Monitoring																																				

Figure 4: METEOR Workplan of main M&E activities

Please note the Annual Learning Events will be part of the METEOR Advisory Meetings 3-5





5. Evaluation Planning

OPM altered the structure of this section in a way which we hope better communicates our objectives, approach, methods and deliverables. We begin with the evaluation objectives, which apply to the baseline, midline and endline evaluations and will be met by our approach and methods (therefore we haven't included objectives in our approach section). Similarly, the evaluation questions we have developed apply at all levels of the evaluation and therefore are presented after the objectives (instead of separately for each of the base-, mid- and endline). Following this we detail the approach and methods and tools which will apply at all levels, and then explain the variations at the base-, mid- and endline. We then present our approach to the counterfactual, gender considerations and expected deliverables.

5.1. Evaluation objectives

The primary objectives of the evaluation are to answer the evaluation questions which are linked to the theory of change and are described herein. These questions address the DAC criteria of the OECD related to: efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and relevance³. In summarised form, this evaluation will:

- Assess the **efficiency and effectiveness** of project activities in contributing to intended results, allowing learning and adaptive programming in cases where intended results are not being achieved;
- Determine the **impact** and likely **sustainability** of project results, allowing for adaptive programming where significant sustainability risks are identified;
- Provide **operational learning** to consortium members and other stakeholders on how to best implement similar projects in other contexts, answering related questions on **relevance**.

For the baseline specifically, the project team seeks to:

- Ground the evaluation in a clear picture of the social, political, and economic context in which this project sits. This includes clearly **describing the institutional framework** which governs the use of exposure data in disaster risk management policy and planning in Nepal and Tanzania, identifying public and private stakeholders at both the national and international level who have clear interests and influences on project objectives and goals.
- Calculate baseline figures for the project logframe and determine appropriate targets to help measure longer-term success.





5.2. Evaluation questions

To frame the evaluation, the project team has identified five key questions, each of which addresses one of the DAC evaluation criteria. **Table 2** presents the evaluation questions (EQs) by DAC criteria along with several indicative supporting questions that will help guide the design of methods and tools to collect the most relevant information needed to answer each question.

EQ1 Efficiency: Did the project design and deliver level-one exposure data and protocols for most ODA countries and level-two data and protocols for Nepal and Tanzania? Was the delivery cost-efficient? What worked well and not so well?

EQ2 Effectiveness: To what extent did the design and delivery of exposure data, protocols, and training lead to improvements in the capacity and ability of national stakeholders to knowledgably utilize exposure data, improving their work products related to DRR and DRM?

EQ3 Impact: Is there evidence to suggest that the project has improved in-country DRR/DRM policy and planning? And, if so, is there a reasonable expectation that, in the event of a disaster, countries will experience an improved response, reducing disaster-related deaths, loss and damage?

EQ4 Sustainability: Is there sustained interest by the insurance industry and the humanitarian community in these data and protocols?

EQ5 Relevance: In developing countries, is there a real need and/or demand for exposure data protocols that validate the uncertainty process?

Criteria	Evaluation Question	Indicative supporting questions
Efficiency	Did the project design and deliver level-one exposure data and protocols for most ODA countries and level-two data and protocols for Nepal and Tanzania? Was the delivery cost-efficient? What worked well and not so well?	 Do the protocols/data sets provide more representative exposure data (not skewed to known urban areas)? How has the consistency and quality of the exposure data in pilot countries (Nepal and Tanzania) improved overtime? Has the project delivered open-source exposure data? Is the provision of protocols and level two data cost- efficient to make it feasible and practical to replicate efforts in Tanzania and Nepal across other ODA countries?
Effectiveness	To what extent did the design and delivery of exposure data, protocols, and training lead to improvements in the capacity and ability of national stakeholders to knowledgably utilize exposure data,	 Are Nepal and Tanzania using the data in their planning processes? Are users satisfied with the tools? Are they providing the right level of information? Have national experts improved their capacity to use EO data to generate information relevant for risk reduction?



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



	improving their work products related to DRR and DRM?	 Are national technical experts better positioned to serve as regional experts or 'lighthouses' in the space?
Impact	Is there evidence to suggest that the project has improved in-country DRR/DRM policy and planning? And, if so, is there a reasonable expectation that, in the event of a disaster, countries will experience an improved response, reducing disaster-related deaths, loss and damage?	 How and in what ways have the protocols and project activities led to improved national DRR/DRM policy and planning? Has the project led to improved, rapid access to relevant information on exposure? Has the information lead to improvements in decision-making process of NGOs, policy makers and insurers? Is there evidence to suggest that the project has led to improved mitigation strategies and the regional distribution of resources? Do we see changes/improvements in DRR resource allocation?
Sustainability	Is there sustained interest by DRR/DRM stakeholders (e.g. other LDC governments, NGOs, the insurance industry and the humanitarian community) in these data and protocols?	 Is there evidence to suggest that humanitarian actors such as UNICEF are or plan to use these tools when evaluating loss and damage related to a disaster? Do the protocols and datasets improve and support the development of insurance products for use in developing countries?
Relevance	In developing countries, is there a real need and/or demand for exposure data protocols that validate the uncertainty process?	 Has the project strengthened the discipline around the development of exposure data? Is there evidence that the project has improved the lineage and characterization of uncertainty? Have other ODA countries expressed interest in these data? Has there been uptake of level one data by other ODA countries? Do we see broader uptake and use of the protocols? Assuming the lack of data is the issue that governments face

Table 2: Evaluation Questions





5.3. Evaluation approach

This section first describes how we will approach the economic, process, and impact evaluations and then discusses the methods and tools to be used for each evaluation.

5.3.1. Economic evaluation

The economic evaluation involves a light-touch cost-effectiveness assessment (CEA) to determine whether project resources are being spent efficiently. The CEA will be undertaken in line with the guidance provided by Caribou Digital.

5.3.2. Impact evaluation

One challenge of the METEOR project is that several of the impact indicators (e.g. reductions in disaster related deaths and reductions in disaster related losses) are linked to the response in the event of a disaster. Since the project has no control over when and when a disaster may strike, it is impractical to plan for a household-level impact evaluation. As such, it was agreed upfront that the impact evaluation would focus on the measurable outcomes and impacts related to improvements in policies, plans, practice around DRR/DRM and increased usage and satisfaction in exposure, hazard, and vulnerability data. The contingent KPIs (or those that rely on a disaster unfolding within the timeframe of the project) will be tracked using official national statistics.

Since the project is guided by a theory of change, we will use a theory-based approach and a variety of qualitative methods and tools to evaluate impact. Notably, the evaluation will draw on best practices of contribution analysis to methodically assess (i) whether the projects outcomes and impacts have been achieved; and (ii) the project's contribution to these expected outcomes and impacts. The objective will be to trace how and in what ways METEOR outputs related to data, protocols, and capacity-building change the way stakeholders do their job and how METEOR influences broader processes around DRM/DRR and disaster response.

The impact evaluation has two workstreams which are organized around several distinct sets of stakeholders, described below.

Workstream #1: Country Case Studies. In the baseline, this workstream will examine in-depth the institutional framework that governs disaster risk management within our two pilot countries of Nepal and Tanzania, exploring relationships between and among various stakeholders. We will also establish baseline levels of capacity, awareness, and understanding around topics and data related to exposure, risk, vulnerability, and disaster planning and response. Over the course of the project, leveraging monitoring data, we will track user uptake, use, and satisfaction of METEOR outputs. In the endline, the case studies will examine more closely how the delivery of level-two exposure data, protocols, and

capacity-building unfolded, exploring whether and how project outputs changed or influenced processes of decision-making and action on topics related to DRM/DRR and disaster response. The key stakeholders in this workstream include:



THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES

METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



In-country (Nepal and Tanzania) technical experts working in DRM/DRR: This stakeholder group includes experienced government, NGO, and private sector actors in Nepal and Tanzania with technical education and expertise working with datasets, methods and tools used in DRR/DRM.

In-country (Nepal and Tanzania) national-level policy makers. This stakeholder group includes the decision-makers within government who set policy and allocate budgets related to DRM/DRR. The impact evaluation will explore overtime how METEOR outputs contributed to improvements in disaster preparation and response through improvements in policies, plans, and practice.

Workstream #2: Global Study. This workstream focuses on international stakeholders with a vested interest in METEOR outputs. Interviews with this stakeholder set will reveal key information about project relevance and sustainability, tracing overtime growing awareness, interest, and uptake of METEOR outputs outside the pilot countries. The key stakeholders in this workstream include:

Members of the humanitarian response community. Organizations such as UNICEF, the World Bank, DFID, UNISDR, UNITAR, or international and national NGOs, who may be able to use METEOR protocols to better inform their work.

Policy-makers from other ODA countries. By interviewing stakeholders in this group, we can assess both interest and barriers to uptake by the larger ODA community.

Insurance / Reinsurance industry. This group represents a touchstone to broader questions sustainability to gauge their willingness to create insurance products for LDC countries based on the exposure and hazard data. A likely interlocutor will be the Insurance Development Forum (IDF), a public-private partnership led by the insurance industry and supported by international organisations. As written in their brochure⁴, the IDF aims to "optimise and extend the use of insurance and its related risk management capabilities to build greater resilience and protection for people, communities, businesses, and public institutions that are vulnerable to disasters and their associated economic shocks".





5.3.3. Process evaluation

The process evaluation will examine how, why, and under what conditions a project and its outcomes were delivered. In our theory-based design, the process evaluation questions are necessarily posed to many of the same stakeholders who will be asked questions related to the economic and impact evaluations. As such, the process evaluation will accordingly use the same methods and tools and will be included seamlessly in the baseline, mid-line and endline reporting. That said, the midline evaluation will be focused on issues related to process and delivery. At midline, we will compare baseline findings with monitoring data to identify key opportunities and stress points within the existing implementation structure. This way, we can emphasise and replicate positive findings and course-correct where there are issues. The endline evaluation will then follow-up on the midline findings.

5.4. Evaluation Methods and Tools

- To collect data for the various evaluations types and workstreams, the project team will use a variety of qualitative methods and tools, described below and summarized by evaluation question in Table 3Error! Reference source not found.



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



				М	ethod	ls & Too	ls	
Evaluation Question	Evaluation Type	Timing	Desk Research	Stakeholder mapping	KII	Online survey	Satisfaction Survey	Participatory evaluation workshop
EQ1: Did the project design and deliver level-one exposure data and protocols for most ODA countries and level-two data and protocols for Nepal and Tanzania? Was the delivery cost-efficient? What worked well and not so well?	Economic Process	Midline			x		Х	х
EQ2: To what extent did the design and delivery of exposure data, protocols, and training lead to improvements in the capacity and ability of national stakeholders to knowledgably utilize exposure data, improving their work products related to DRR and DRM?	Impact Economic Process	Baseline Midline Endline	х	х	x	Х	Х	х
EQ3: Is there evidence to suggest that the project has improved in- country DRR/DRM policy and planning? And, if so, is there a reasonable expectation that, in the event of a disaster, countries will experience an improved response, reducing disaster-related deaths, loss and damage?	Impact	Midline Endline			х	X	Х	X
EQ4: Is there sustained interest by DRR/DRM stakeholders (e.g. other LDC governments, NGOs, the insurance industry and the humanitarian community) in these data and protocols?	Impact	Midline Endline			х	x	х	х
EQ5: In developing countries, is there a real need and/or demand for exposure data protocols that validate the uncertainty process?	Impact Process	Midline Endline			х	х	х	Х

Table 3: Indicative evaluation methods for the evaluation questions

Desk research: As part of the baseline case study, the team will review existing documentation related to the DRR/DRM processes that currently exist in the pilot countries of Nepal and Tanzania. Documents include national plans and policies related to DRR/DRM, sector strategies/policies, literature on risk exposure representation and modelling, literature on disaster risk insurance in



THROUGH EARTH OBSERVATION ROUTINES

METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



developing countries, and national and international statistics. These documents will be identified and reviewed as part of the inception phase and included in the baseline case study analysis.

Stakeholder mapping. This baseline exercise involves identifying all the key stakeholders in the project (for both workstreams), describing their interests and role in the project, and defining their relationship to one another. This exercise will help define the political landscape in which the project operates and provide a better understanding of how all the actors interact. The process of identifying stakeholders begins with interviews of in-country project partners from METEOR's consortium. From there, the process will use a snowball sampling strategy, where each new actor interviewed reveals additional actors. This mapping will begin in the inception mission and will end with a full description of the project landscape in the baseline report.

Key informant interviews (KIIs): KIIs, or in-depth interviews with key informants, will be used in both the country case study and global study workstreams. For the case study workstream, KIIs will be conducted in Tanzania and Nepal at the national level (and in some cases possibly at the municipal level) with government, civil society, and private sector actors involved in DRR/DRM. In the baseline, these interviews will explore in greater depth how each actor currently interacts with exposure, vulnerability, and hazard data and get their perceptions on what additional information is needed/wanted and any challenges they face. In the mid-line and end-line, many of these stakeholders will be invited to the annual participatory evaluation workshops (see below) where progress towards program goals, outcomes and impacts are discussed and assessed. In the endline, we will revisit many of these stakeholders to understand how the project has impacted their work and get their perceptions on the success of the project and meeting project goals. The Global Study workstream will also involve KIIs, mostly focused on global actors such as UNICEF and UNISDR and with the insurance industry. The questions will be similar and focus on how actors current interact/use exposure, vulnerability, and hazard data for issues/disasters related to LDCs.

Online survey. This tool will be used for the Global Study as a means of, in the baseline, assessing interest and barriers to uptake of METEOR products by the larger ODA community; and, in the endline, as a means of tracking awareness/perceptions of the METEOR project across a broader set of stakeholders. There are not resources to interview stakeholders in all LDCs; but we can do a light-touch tracking of awareness and perception of the METEOR project by sending out an online survey to key actors in other LDCs, the insurance industry, and other global donors and NGOs who operate in space.

Satisfaction survey. This tool will be used for the country case study workstream to track overtime user satisfaction with METEOR trainings and products. This survey will be implemented after each training workshop.

Participatory Evaluation Workshops. The participatory evaluation workshop is the focal point of the evaluation and involves an annual gathering of key in-country stakeholders. The purpose of these workshops is twofold. First, the information collected during these workshops will provide the



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



evidence needed to make an informed rating of progress towards the program's outcomes and impacts. Second, the workshops will serve as a platform for learning, where stakeholders discuss challenges and address issues, making course corrections where needed. At the workshop, a facilitator will lead the group through the Theory of Change and ask stakeholders to descriptively provide evidence on how they contributed to different results. For example, take Outcome #1 - "Thegovernments of Tanzania and Nepal utilise project datasets to improve their national sectoral policies, plans and practice." Sector representatives and other stakeholders will discuss activities that they have undertaken that demonstrate progress towards change. While in the early years policies may not have changed, there could be progress towards change such as meetings held on specific DRM/DRR topics, drafts policies circulated, public declarations, etc. demonstrating progress towards end goals. Once this information is gathered, the group will use it as evidence to 'grade' efforts towards achieving the result, using an agreed upon rubric. An example rubric is described in Figure 5Error! Reference source not found.. Please note this is just an example. The actual definition of the criteria and scoring will be discussed and agreed upon in the first workshop. Each year, at the conclusion of the workshop we will have 'grades' for each indictor and action steps for the coming year. In the following year, this progress will be reviewed and updated. The evidence gathered at these workshops will be the centrepiece of describing the contribution story.

Criteria	Score
No progress has been made in any sector	0
Some discussions/activity but no substantive progress in any sector	1
Some progress made in 1-2 key areas	2
Substantive progress made in 1-2 key areas and some progress made in 1-2 other areas	3
Substantive progress in 3-4 key areas, including resourcing	4
Goals achieved in at least one area, substantive progress in other areas	5
Goals achieved in 2 or more areas	6

Criteria	Evidence	Score
OUTCOME 1: The governments of Tanzania and Nepal utilise project datasets to improve their national sectoral policies, plans and practice	 Agriculture sector policy disseminated draft of revised policy that includes more specific and actionable DRR/DRM, including x,y,z. Office of the president announced increase in National budget support for DRR/DRM Revised building code in the process of development Remains weak enforcement of building codes 	3





Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



5.5. Data collection rounds

Data to inform the economic, process and impact evaluations will be collected in three rounds at various stages during the project and summarized into three evaluation reports: baseline, midline, and endline.

METEOR

Baseline: The baseline data collection round will happen at the beginning of the project, providing descriptive data on the project areas and the relationships between stakeholders, informing baseline indicator data, and identifying potential challenges and barriers to project success. In this first round, the project team will conduct a desk review and initial interviews with project team members and others to produce a stakeholder mapping for both the case study and global study workstreams. The information collected in this first step will then be used to identify and select key stakeholders for more in-depth interviews with key informants. During this phase we will also identify key aspects of programme delivery to be tracked through monitoring data, thus providing baseline evidence for the process evaluation.

Midline: The midline data collection round involves a light touch check-in with stakeholders to ensure the project is on track. For the midline, the project team will start by reviewing baseline data and comparing results to monitoring data, generating a list of project questions that may need clarification. Team will then organize a participatory evaluation workshop to gather concrete evidence to date on project results. Workshop findings will be supplemented by a limited number of interviews with in-country stakeholders to follow-up on key issues emerging from the workshop. The focus for the midline will be on programme delivery, addressing in detail, implementation successes and challenges that can inform the process evaluation.

Endline: Endline data collection will involve a comprehensive review of the project. A second participatory evaluation workshop will be held with key stakeholders to review progress against logframe results and indicators, to help inform program contribution towards change. The workshop will be followed by a series of targeted interviews with KIIs. In the endline evaluation we will provide two country case studies which describe how the project unfolded in each location. For the endline we will also repeat the online survey and collect KIIs to inform the Global Study workstream. Currently, no legacy evaluation is planned.

5.5.1. The counter-factual

The impact evaluation focuses on two key areas: (i) describing the project's progress in contributing to the desired outcomes and impacts as outlined in the ToC and (ii) identifying the drivers or barriers faced in achieving project objectives. With these evaluative goals in mind, our approach to the counter-factual draws on best practices from contribution analysis, using triangulated data to determine the project contribution story. The contribution story will methodically examine in what ways the project influenced behaviours and how these vary or comply with those theorised in the theory of change.



5.5.2. Gender considerations

The evaluation recognises the importance of addressing issues related to gender equality and women's empowerment both in the project design and the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation. In addition to tracking gender disaggregated indicators through the monitoring system, the project's evaluation activities will also have a gender focus. The evaluation will target both men and women to ensure appropriate inclusion of all relevant stakeholder groups. The endline data collection will record evidence on these and triangulate data to generate an assessment of the changes occurring in men and women at the national level to which the project contributed.

5.5.3. Expected deliverables

Evaluation deliverables will come in the form of three evaluation reports for the baseline, midline and endline.



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



6. Monitoring and Data Collection

6.1. Logframe Data Collection

	Indicators	Data source and Means of Verification	Who will collect the data?	Frequency of Data Collection
Impact	 Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters (of similar magnitude and impact) per 100,000 population (disaggregating males and females) Disaster-related loss and damage (in GBP £) identified by partner national disaster agencies in Nepal and Tanzania Qualitative indicator: progress towards integration of DRR good practice into policy changes across the public and private sectors, and civil society 	 Official national statistics Official loss and damage estimation by national partners Key Informant Interviews and workshops in Baseline baseline and endline evaluations 	 Ganesh Kumar Jimee (NSET Lead) for Nepal; Charles Msangi (DMD Lead) for Tanzania Ganesh Kumar Jimee (NSET Lead) for Nepal; Charles Msangi (DMD Lead) for Tanzania Claire Simon (Evaluation Specialist) 	 Baseline, Endline Baseline, Endline Baseline, Endline





	Indicators	Data source and Means of Verification	Who will collect the data?	Frequency of Data Collection
S	1.1. Qualitative indicator: progress towards integration of DRR good practice into government policy1.2. Feedback from relevant Ministry (or decision- maker) of the usefulness of the datasets for improving their national DRR/DRM	1.1. Key Informant Interviews and workshops in baseline, midline, and endline evaluations1.2. Feedback from the Ministries	 Bimal Regmi (M&E Officer Nepal) for Nepal; Shamim Zakaria (M&E Officer - Tanzania) for Tanzania Evaluation team 	1.1. Baseline, Midline, Endline 1.2 Baseline, Midline, Endline
Outcome	2.1. Qualitative indicator: progress towards integration of DRR good practice into civil society and private sector practices2.2. End user satisfaction level (disaggregating males and females)	2.1. Key Informant Interviews and workshops in baseline, midline, and endline evaluations2.2. End user surveys	 2.1. Bimal Regmi (M&E Officer - Nepal) for Nepal; Shamim Zakaria (M&E Officer -Tanzania) for Tanzania 2.2. Ganesh Kumar Jimee 	2.1. Baseline,Midline, Endline2.2. End ofrelevant trainingevents
			(NSET Lead) for Nepal; Charles Msangi (DMD Lead) for Tanzania	





	Indicators	Data source and Means of Verification	Who will collect the data?	Frequency of Data Collection
	3.1. Qualitative indicator: Feedback from UNICEF, UNSDR partners and insurance companies in respect of	3.1. Key Informant Interviews in baseline and endline evaluations	3.1. Claire Simon (Evaluation Specialist)	3.1. Baseline, Midline, Endline
	usefulness of datasets and protocols 3.2. Qualitative indicator: progress towards creating	3.2. Key Informant Interviews in baseline, midline, and endline evaluations	3.2. Claire Simon (Evaluation Specialist)	3.2. Baseline, Midline, Endline
	3.3. Number of KPs and dataset downloads by different users	3.3. Online platforms stats	3.3. Charles K. Huyck (ImageCat Lead)	3.3. Quarterly
utputs	 1.1. Percentage of trained professionals in Nepal and Tanzania reporting increased knowledge and capacity (1-to-10 scale disaggregating males and females) 1.2. Number of professionals trained in Nepal and Tanzania (disaggregating males and females) 	1.1. Training feedback surveys andKIIs in baseline, midline, andendline evaluations1.2. Training logs	 1.1. a) Training feedback surveys: Ganesh Kumar Jimee (NSET Lead) for Nepal; Charles Msangi (DMD Lead) for Tanzania. b) KIIs: Claire Simon (Evaluation Specialist) 	1.1. a) Training feedback surveys: End of relevant training events. b) KIIs: Baseline, Midline, Endline
Ō			1.2. Ganesh Kumar Jimee (NSET Lead) for Nepal; Charles Msangi (DMD Lead) for Tanzania	1.2. Monthly (reported in Monthly Activity Reports)





Indicators	Data source and Means of Verification	Who will collect the data?	Frequency of Data Collection
2.1. Percentage of Nepalese and Tanzanian territory covered by Level 2 multi-hazard exposure data	2.1. Data on online platforms	2.1. Charles K. Huyck (ImageCat Lead)	2.1. Monthly (reported in Monthly Activity Reports)
3.1. Workplan on track to achieve completion within deadline3.2. Percentage of approached users reporting a high satisfaction level with METEOR protocols (disaggregating males and females)	3.1. Project records 3.2. Midline and endline evaluations; Online user surveys	3.1. Vitor Silva (GEM Lead) 3.2. Claire Simon (Evaluation Specialist)	3.1. Monthly(reported inMonthly ActivityReports)3.2. Midline,Endline
4.1. Number of Level-1 datasets for LDCs uploaded on online platforms	4.1. Data on online platforms	4.1. Charles K. Huyck (ImageCat Lead)	4.1. Monthly (reported in Monthly Activity Reports)





Indicators	Data source and Means of Verification	Who will collect the data?	Frequency of Data Collection
 5.1. Policy paper on the use of national-scale exposure data for insurance and other risk-transfer mechanisms published and shared 5.2. Number of communication products shared 5.3. Number of conferences or workshops hosted or attended by consortium members at which METEOR's findings are shared or discussed 	5.1. Data on online platforms5.2. Data on online platform5.3. Monthly Reporting to UKSA	5.1. Vitor Silva (GEM Lead) 5.2. Vitor Silva (GEM Lead) 5.3. Relevant partner's lead	 5.1. Monthly (reported in Monthly Activity Reports) 5.2. Monthly (reported in Monthly Activity Reports) 5.3. Monthly (reported in Monthly Activity Reports)





7. Resources and Budgets

7.1. Roles and Responsibilities

Name of Individual	Organisation	Role in M&E	Contact Information
Luca Petrarulo M&E Manager	ΟΡΜ	 M&E system primary contact Coordinate and contribute to production of and updates to M&E plan Provide support to production of Evaluation and Monitoring Reports Coordinate inputs from Monitoring and Evaluation Specialists Lead design and implementation of cost-effectiveness assessment Participate to evaluation missions in Tanzania and contribute to evaluation activities in Tanzania 	- <u>Luca.petrarulo</u> @opml.co.uk
Aileen Lyon Monitoring Specialist	ΟΡΜ	 Contribute to production of M&E plan Design the monitoring templates Coordinate and QA the production of Monthly Activity Reports Lead the development of Quarterly Monitoring Reports Support the M&E Manager in designing and undertaking the Cost-Effectiveness Analysis 	- <u>aileenlyon@hot</u> <u>mail.com</u>





Name of Individual	Organisation	Role in M&E	Contact Information
Claire Simon Evaluation Specialist	OPM	 Contribute to production of M&E plan Lead design of the evaluations Lead design of data collection methods, including participatory evaluation workshops Lead production of evaluation reports (both for global and country studies) Participate to evaluation missions in Nepal and contribute to evaluation activities in Nepal Lead the design and facilitation of Annual Learning Events to be held on the back of project Annual Advisory Meetings no. 3-5. 	<u>csimonny@gmail.com</u>
Lucrezia Tincani M&E Quality Assurer	ΟΡΜ	 Provide QA of Evaluation and Monitoring Reports Provide strategic overview and guidance on the design and implementation of the M&E Workpackage 	<u>Lucrezia.tincani@opml.</u> <u>co.uk</u>
Bimal Regmi M&E Officer (Nepal)	OPM Nepal	 Lead evaluation activities in Nepal Support NSET in the provision of monitoring data Support the Evaluation Specialist in the organisation of the Annual Learning Event in Nepal 	<u>bimal.regmi@opml.co.u</u> <u>k</u>
Shamim Zakaria M&E Officer (Tanzania)	OPM Tanzania	 Lead evaluation activities in Tanzania Support DMD in the provision of monitoring data Support the Evaluation Specialist in the organisation of the Annual Learning Event in Tanzania 	<u>shamim.zakaria@opml.</u> <u>co.uk</u>





Name of Individual	Organisation	Role in M&E	Contact Information
Ganesh Kumar Jimee NSET Lead	NSET	 Support design and implementation of Participatory Evaluation activities in Nepal Support design and implementation of Country Case Studies on Nepal Provide Monthly and Quarterly Activity Reports on project activities to the M&E Manager and Monitoring Specialist 	gjimee@nset.org.np
Charles Msangi DMD Lead	DMD	 Support design and implementation of Participatory Evaluation activities in Tanzania Support design and implementation of Country Case Studies on Tanzania Provide Monthly and Quarterly Activity Reports on project activities to the M&E Manager and Monitoring Specialist 	<u>charles.msangi@pmo.g</u> <u>o.tz</u>
Kay Smith METEOR Project Manager	BGS	 Responsible for reporting on project performance (against project indicators) using monitoring data received from partners Responsible for making adaptations to project implementation in response to M&E data received 	<u>kmcm@bgs.ac.uk</u>
Colm J. Jordan BGS Lead & METEOR Principal Investigator	BGS	 Provide Monthly and Quarterly Activity Reports on project activities to the M&E Manager and Monitoring Specialist 	<u>cjj@bgs.ac.uk</u>
Charles K. Huyck ImageCat Lead	ImageCat	 Provide Monthly and Quarterly Activity Reports on project activities to the M&E Manager and Monitoring Specialist 	ckh@imagecatinc.com



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



Name of Individual	Organisation	Role in M&E	Contact Information
Vitor Silva GEM Lead	GEM	 Provide Monthly and Quarterly Activity Reports on project activities to the M&E Manager and Monitoring Specialist 	<u>vitor.silva@globalquake</u> model.org
Mhairi O'Hara HOT Lead	НОТ	 Provide Monthly and Quarterly Activity Reports on project activities to the M&E Manager and Monitoring Specialist 	<u>mhairi.ohara@hotosm.</u> org
Chris Sampson SSBN Lead	SSBN	 Provide Monthly and Quarterly Activity Reports on project activities to the M&E Manager and Monitoring Specialist 	<u>c.sampson@fathom.glo</u> <u>bal</u>

Table 4: Summary of M&E roles and responsibilities



METEOR Monitoring & Evaluation Plan



7.2. RACI Model

	METEOR Project Manager	M&E Manager	M&E Officers	Monitoring Specialist	Evaluation Specialist	Consortium Members' Leads	Caribou	UKSA
M&E Plan								
Report writing		Α		R	R		С	
Report review	R	Α		R	R	R	R	
Sign off								Α
Baseline	•			•				
Data collection		Α	R	R	R	С		
Analysis		Α	R		С			
Report writing		Α	R		R	С	С	
Report review	R	Α		R	R	R	R	
Sign off								Α
Midline	_	-	-				-	
Data collection		Α	R		R	С		
Analysis		Α	R		С			
Report writing		Α	R		R	С	С	
Report review	R	Α		R	R	R	R	
Sign off								Α
Endline								
Data collection		Α	R		R	С		
Analysis		Α	R		С			
Report writing		Α	R		R	С	С	
Report review	R	Α		R	R	R	R	
Sign off								Α
Regular monitoring								
Data collection				Α		R		
Analysis		Α	R	R				
Quality control		Α		R				
Regular reporting								
Quarterly progress reporting		Α	R	R		R		
Taking action based on progress	Α					R	I	Т
Annual Learning Events								
Coordination	Α	R		С	С	I		
Synthesis of M&E findings		Α		R	С			
Adaptive response to M&E findings	A					R		

Table 5: M&E RACI Model





7.3. Budget

The following budget is an estimation of the main costs of the project to deliver the milestones falling under the Work Package 2 - M&E Activities. As it stands, the budget for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning activities (£418,384.96) corresponds to **14.8% of the total UKSA grant (£2,821,221.34)**.

Code	Milestone	FEES	EXPENSES	TOTAL
MW 2.2	Final M&E Plan	£8,346.75	£600.00	£8,946.75
MW 2.3	Baseline Design Document	£32,646.75	£11,950.00	£44,596.75
MW 2.4	Final Baseline Evaluation Report	£54,235.75	£17,500.00	£71,735.75
MW 2.5	Midline Design Document	£5,133.75	£0.00	£5,133.75
MW 2.6	Final Midline Evaluation Report	£49,697.25	£18,200.00	£67,897.25
MW 2.7	CEA Report	£6,241.50	£0.00	£6,241.50
MW 2.8	Endline Design Document	£12,890.25	£0.00	£12,890.25
MW 2.9	Final Endline Evaluation Report	£67,116.75	£18,600.00	£85,716.75
	Monitoring	£71,204.25	£1,500.00	£72,704.25
	WP2 Project Management	£36,598.50	£3,000.00	£39,598.50
	CONTINGENCY			£2,923.46
	TOTAL	£344,111.50	£71,350.00	£418,384.96

Table 6: M&E Budget per Milestone



8. Commissioning Evaluations

BGS invited OPM into the consortium to design and implement the evaluations for this project. OPM are tasked to act as an independent entity within the consortium, focussed only on M&E.

All evaluation activities will be carried out by consortium members; none will be commissioned by independent agencies





9. Responding to and Using Evaluation Findings

The METEOR Project Manager will receive evaluation findings from OPM after each of the baseline, midline and endline evaluations, as per the schedule in section 4.3. These will be discussed at the Annual Learning Event, and implications for project implementation considered.

The baseline findings will allow the project to calibrate the design based on information gleaned about the context within which DRR/DRM systems are operating.

The midline evaluation findings will inform the implementation approach in the following ways:

- Assessing the effectiveness of project activities in contributing to intended results will allow adaptive programming in cases where intended results are not being achieved.
- Assessing the likely sustainability of project results will allow adaptive programming in cases where significant sustainability risks are identified.
- Providing operational learning for consortium members, on how to better roll-out and adapt the risk exposure data delivered, and how to engage national stakeholders in using them.

The Annual Learning Events allow for an adaptive programming approach. OPM will present relevant evaluation and monitoring information to the consortium each year, during which actions will be agreed for what management response is needed, given the latest M&E information, to increase the likelihood that agreed project targets will be reached. Following the workshop, OPM will produce a brief learning note summarising the lessons learned and the management actions agreed. BGS, as the consortium lead will be accountable to implement the management response.

The Annual Learning Events will be held on the back of the project Annual Advisory Meetings n. 3-5.





10. Appendices

10.1. Data Collection and Tools

These will be developed once the rest of the M&E components have been agreed with Caribou and the consortium.