

# Note to BRACED applicants to accompany revised programme logframe – July 2014

---

## Introduction

The BRACED programme<sup>1</sup> logframe has been revised by the interim Knowledge Managers in consultation with DFID. It is expected that small further revisions will be required once the permanent Knowledge Managers and Fund Managers are in place, final project selection is known and also when further definition of a few of the indicators is available from DFID.

The individual BRACED projects will all contribute data to the programme level BRACED logframe indicator reporting. Projects have been informed that they all must contribute data for Outcome Indicator 1 on improved resilience (KPI 4) and Output Indicator 1.1 number of people supported to cope (KPI 1).

However there are also a number of other indicators that all or some projects will be asked to contribute information on. Most of these are relatively straightforward and the Knowledge Manager will be able to provide support and assistance<sup>2</sup>. In many cases, projects will already be planning to collect this information, or something very similar for their own logframes and reporting. Therefore it will normally only be necessary to ensure the indicator definitions and methodologies are compatible – so that comparable data can be submitted.

In order to give projects advance warning of what they are likely to be asked for, both for baseline information and for annual reporting, an indicative table is provided below. This table takes the indicators in the Programme logframe and identifies collection responsibilities. It is intended that this will help projects make their own logframes, baseline plans and monitoring plans as compatible with the overall BRACED programme logframe as possible.

## Contents:

- Updated BRACED Programme logframe
- Responsibilities for collecting national level data for the programme indicators
- Analysis of responsibility for individual logframe indicators
- Checklist for project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans

## Notes to readers:

- M&E plans, for projects and programmes are evolving and not yet final. This information is guidance only – not a set of rules
- The Permanent Knowledge Manager (PKM) will finalise the Programme M&E Plan, log frame and related guidance after September 2014.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this document 'programme' is used to refer to the combined total of all the BRACED Projects

<sup>2</sup> Some additional guidance on baseline and indicator collection is in the process of being provided

- Read in parallel with other guidance: KPI 4 guidance, KPI 1, baseline and indicator support plan
- Note on criteria for assessing project proposals: these will be assessed according to the criteria grantees have received in the application guidance, which includes quality of M and E. What this means in practice is that M and E plans are robust and credible in their own right. How well projects plan to report on KPI 4 and 1 will be part of this. Other than that proposals won't be judged in terms of how well they align with these latest revisions to the overall BRACED logframe. The purpose of this is to guide project design and implementation for the next phase.

## Abbreviations

DFID	Department for International Development
FM	Fund Manager (of BRACED portfolio of projects)
IKM	Interim Knowledge Manager
LF	Logframe
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PKM	Permanent Knowledge Manager
ToC	Theory of Change

## Updated BRACED programme logframe

(See attached Excel spreadsheet). Changes to previous version are in red text, comment boxes provide some more explanation for the reasons.

## Responsibilities for collecting national level data for the programme indicators

Some of the data required for the programme logframe refers to national level change (e.g. Output Indicator 1.5 - *The number of countries where women's involvement in decision-making to address climate extremes and disasters has improved*). The outputs delivering such national level indicators will often not be the product of a single BRACED Project – but information on the situation at national level still needs to be gathered, and often will require a degree of local knowledge to assess whether such change can be considered to have happened in the locality.

There have been discussions on whether the individual projects or the Knowledge Manager are best placed to gather national level data. It is currently considered that, in general, those projects working in the country concerned would be best placed to gather this national level data, which would then be submitted to the Knowledge Manager, who would aggregate the submissions from different countries into a programme level figure. This is recommended because:

- (a) Projects working in a country should anyway be aware of the national level data concerning their sector of intervention;
- (b) Projects working in a country are best placed to be able to provide a 'reality check' or 'local knowledge' on the accuracy of Government figures and to be able to provide qualifying comments or alternative sources to the Knowledge Manager if required.

- (c) Gathering some figures within required timeframes may require 'knocking on doors' which is easier done by a project working in the country than by the Knowledge Manager trying to cover 10 or more countries.

However in all cases the Knowledge Manager will be expected to provide technical advice and backstopping to the projects that are gathering this data. The Knowledge Manager will also aggregate the data from different projects across the programme in order to enable the Fund Manager to deliver programme level reports to DFID. This approach will be kept under review by the PKM and may be adjusted if necessary.

Where there is more than one BRACED Project per country, then it is suggested that the projects can decide between them, in consultation with the Knowledge Manager, who will be responsible for which country level indicator.

### **Analysis of concept note project logframes and responsibility for individual logframe indicators**

A brief analysis of some of the indicators in the concept note project logframes revealed significant diversity between how indicators measuring similar outputs were defined. Although not a problem at concept note stage, there will be distinct advantages if more consistency and comparability is achieved for some indicators in the final project logframes. This will enable more comparability and learning across similar projects and much more simple aggregation of data into the programme level reporting. Therefore this is particularly important for those indicators delivering baseline and monitoring data for the programme logframe.

In order to facilitate this process the indicators from the programme logframe are listed below with a description of what will be needed to be collected to be able to produce a robust programme level baseline and programme level monitoring data. This approach will be kept under review by the PKM for each indicator with regard to feasibility and will be adjusted if needed. Notes indicate areas to be confirmed at a later date by the PKM.

**Table 1 – Project level indicator baseline and monitoring data collection needed for the overall BRACED Programme**

A = Annual, GOS = Gathered from Other Sources (e.g. non-project), KM = Knowledge Manager

Indicator	Baseline	On-going Monitoring			
		All Proj.	Some Proj.	Once per country	Freq.
<b>Impact 1</b> Number of deaths caused by climate extremes and disasters.	This number needs to be gathered <sup>3</sup> for each of the countries (or sometimes parts of countries) in which BRACED Projects are operating. It will hopefully be available for the last few years – perhaps 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013.			✓ GOS	A <sup>4</sup>
<b>Impact 2</b> Number or Proportion (tbc) of children under 5 who are suffering from global acute malnutrition (GAM) and severe acute malnutrition (SAM) as a result of climate extremes and disasters.	GAM and CAM are internationally defined. However defining 'climate extremes and disasters' to count in each country each year requires a value judgement using a clear definition <sup>5</sup> . It is suggested that this can be collated by project holders on a country basis, but will often involve data from shock events <sup>6</sup> . Ideally figures for the baseline can be found for the last few years – perhaps 2010-2013.			✓ GOS	A or less freq. <sup>7</sup>
<b>Outcome 1</b> Number of people whose resilience has improved as a result of BRACED support – disaggregated by gender (KPI 4)	Baseline number will be 0. However each project will have to calculate baseline indicator values against which to measure change in subsequent years	✓			Begin Mid End Ex-post <sup>8</sup>
<b>Outcome 2</b>	Baseline number will be 0			✓	A

<sup>3</sup> By using the term 'gathered' it is assumed that the data has been collected in the field (perhaps by Government, international organisation or NGOs) and the task is to locate the data, be clear on what the data covers and how it was collected, and have some view on the likely accuracy. The responsible project will gather such data together and submit to the BRACED KM for aggregation.

<sup>4</sup> Although this indicator may be considered to change at a relatively slow pace, deaths are still best recorded on an annual basis, even if annual numbers are later amalgamated to illustrate longer term trends.

<sup>5</sup> It is suggested that a list of climate related events could be agreed – e.g. droughts, floods, wildfire, extreme temperatures, cyclones etc.

<sup>6</sup> GAM and SAM are often collected as part of assessment and response to a geographically localised disaster event (such as a drought). These numbers are likely to be much more BRACED relevant than national data which are likely to have significant 'non-climate noise' (e.g. national and international economic and food price trends). Advice from the KM on the appropriate sample frame will probably be required on a country by country basis and possibly also on an event by event basis. The number of children is likely to be the preferred measurement rather than the proportion – because the latter varies enormously according to the sample i.e. a low proportion at the national level may still be a very large number of children, a high proportion of a small sample frame most affected by a crisis may or may-not represent a small number of malnourished children.

<sup>7</sup> If annual nutrition survey data is not available in a particular country, it may be appropriate to submit data on a less frequent basis. The PKM should be in a position to advise on a country by country basis.

<sup>8</sup> KPI 4 may require specific and expensive surveys. The minimum would be beginning and end, preferable would be as shown – e.g. middle and ex-post as well.

Indicator	Baseline	On-going Monitoring			
		All Proj.	Some Proj.	Once per country	Freq.
The number of countries in which the use of climate information to inform responses to climate extremes has improved (KPI 13)	However a baseline level of use will need to be set for each country in which there are BRACED projects. Scorecard to be developed by KM and completed by a project in each country.				
<b>Outcome 3</b> Number of countries where BRACED interventions are likely to have a transformational impact (KPI 15)	Baseline value will be 0 It is expected that some projects will opt into trying to create transformational change. Those that do will need to provide a baseline against which to measure the change.			✓	A
<b>Outcome 4</b> Number and type of assets protected per household.	Indicator methodology still to be defined by DFID and this is likely to determine the baseline data needed.		✓ (tbc)		A
<b>Output 1.1</b> Number of people supported to cope (KPI 1) - disaggregated by Intensity (category A high and B medium) and Gender as well as detailed disaggregation by i) targeted/not targeted for category B, ii) programme type, iii) age and iv) % of programme beneficiaries who are poor and extremely poor.	Baseline value will be 0 Information about the proposed target group will be part of project baselines including intensity, gender, age and % of programme beneficiaries who are poor and extremely poor	✓			A
<b>Output 1.2</b> Number of countries (and interventions) where BRACED supported large scale interventions have been established, disaggregated by region (Sahel and Other), number and type of intervention	Baseline value will be 0 No baseline data required. Knowledge Manager will report on number of interventions.	No project action required. Collection and aggregation by FM/KM			A
<b>Output 1.3</b> Number of effective partnerships built to	Baseline value will be 0 Some baseline information on the pre-braced levels of partnership/collaboration	✓			A

Indicator	Baseline	On-going Monitoring			
		All Proj.	Some Proj.	Once per country	Freq.
deliver interventions, disaggregated by type of partnership e.g. between NGOs, local government and private sector.	should be recorded				
<b>Output 1.4</b> The number of countries where the quality of stakeholder engagement in decision-making to address climate extremes and disasters has improved	Baseline value will be 0 It is expected that only certain projects will work to deliver this indicator. Those that do will need to provide baseline information and monitor change using a scorecard developed by the Knowledge Manager.		✓		A
<b>Output 1.5</b> The number of countries where women's involvement in decision-making to address climate extremes and disasters has improved	Baseline value will be 0 It is expected that only certain projects will work to deliver this indicator. Those that do will need to provide baseline information and monitor change using a scorecard developed by the Knowledge Manager.		✓		A
<b>Output 2.1</b> Number of countries with improved early warning systems for climate extremes disaggregated by region.	Baseline value will be 0 It is expected that only certain projects will work to deliver this indicator. Those that do will need to provide baseline information and monitor change using a scorecard developed by the Knowledge Manager.			✓	A
<b>Output 2.2</b> Number of countries with improvement in selection of TAMD Track 1 indicators and indicators from the Guidance on Measuring Disaster Resilience (Scorecard to be developed by the PKM)	Baseline value will be 0 It is expected that only certain projects will work to deliver this indicator. Those that do will need to provide national level baseline information and monitor change using a scorecard developed by the Knowledge Manager.			✓	A
<b>Output 2.3</b> Number of organisations in which BRACED evidence has contributed to improved plans to address climate related shocks and stresses (adapted KPI 13) – could use scorecard approach.	Baseline value will be 0 It is expected that only certain projects will work to deliver this indicator. Those that do will need to provide baseline information and monitor change using a scorecard developed by the Knowledge Manager.		✓		A

Indicator	Baseline	On-going Monitoring			
		All Proj.	Some Proj.	Once per country	Freq.
(Disaggregate by Nat. Gov., Local Gov., Civil Soc. and P. Sector)					
<b>Output 3.1</b> Number of evidence studies and documents produced on climate change adaptation and DRR to climate extremes.	Baseline value will be 0 No baseline data required. Numbers tracked by Knowledge Manager	By KM. No project reporting action required			A
<b>Output 3.2</b> Number of strategic level evaluations (including beneficiary participation) commissioned and published.	Baseline value will be 0 No baseline data required	By KM. No project reporting action required			A
<b>Output 3.3</b> The number of project level evaluations commissioned and published, and the percentage of project level evaluations that have fed into the strategic level evaluations (SLE) under Output Indicator 3.2	Baseline value will be 0 No baseline data required	By KM. No project reporting action required			A
<b>Output 3.4</b> The percentage of relevant <sup>9</sup> new and existing DFID climate change adaptation and DRR programmes whose design and/or implementation approaches are informed by the evidence from BRACED M&E and knowledge work.	Baseline value will be 0 No baseline data required	By KM/DFID. No project reporting action required			A
<b>Output 3.5</b> Number of ICF and DRF indicators that BRACED is collecting data for and reporting against.	Baseline value will be 0 No baseline data required	By KM. No project reporting action required			A

<sup>9</sup> where relevant will be defined as those programmes addressing DRR from a climate change perspective

## Checklist for project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans

This brief checklist has been put together to assist projects in the development and evolution of their M&E plans, as they finalise their BRACED proposals and into full phase implementation. The checklist is intended as a helpful guide only. PDG grantees are advised to look at the issued application guidelines<sup>10</sup> and the latest BRACED Q&A document as they prepare their applications.

There are multiple different formats that an M&E plan may take. Some M&E plans can be relatively basic explanatory tables, which sit alongside a project's log frame. Others may provide detailed contextual and explanatory background. Different BRACED projects will suit different M&E plan formats. Therefore this checklist is not prescriptive about the format, order or structure of projects' M&E plans. It provides an outline of the main components we would suggest are included in any comprehensive M&E plan. Additionally we have indicated some optional, 'nice-to-have' components which grantees may wish to consider including if practicable and appropriate.

### Logical framework design

Topic	Requirements	Additional considerations for grantees
Identification of KPIs	Identify where and how the mandatory ICF KPIs have been integrated into the logical framework design (KPIs 1 and 4). <b>Essential</b>	
	Identify where and how any other relevant ICF KPIs have been integrated into the logical framework design	
Resilience	Identification of how grantees plan to approach resilience measurements (based on available KPI 4 guidance). <b>Essential</b>	
Number of people supported	Disaggregation of this indicator by A) high and B) medium intensity of support, and optionally within B medium whether targeted or not targeted (see guidance). <b>Essential</b>	
Description of logical framework	Evidence that logical framework is developed from project's Theory of Change, and where relevant, the Programme's logical framework. <b>Essential</b>	
	Any other necessary explanation/justification of selection of impacts, outcomes and outputs and the associated indicators	

### Baseline data collection

Topic	Requirements	Additional considerations for grantees

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/building-resilience-and-adaptation-to-climate-extremes-and-disasters-programme-braced#documents-for-project-grant-applicants>



Planning		Baseline Data Collection Plan to provide details on timeframe, steps that will be undertaken, budget, expertise needed, etc
Implementation details	Definition of indicators	Projects may want to consider participating in peer-to-peer support and exchange on baseline data collection
	Source(s) of data for each indicator	
	Method(s) of data collection for each indicator	
	Identify means of verification for collected data (enables accuracy of reported data to be cross checked)	
	Responsibility for data collection for each indicator	
	Any other resources required to undertake monitoring (human, financial, material) for each indicator	

### Monitoring

*Monitoring: A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. (OECD DAC Glossary).*

Topic	Requirements	Additional considerations for grantees
Implementation details	Definition of indicators for each indicator	Projects may want to consider participating in peer-to-peer support and exchange on monitoring
	Source(s) of data for each indicator	
	Method(s) of data collection for each indicator	
	Identify means of verification for collected data (enables accuracy of reported data to be cross checked)	
	Frequency & schedule of data collection for each indicator	
	Responsibility for data collection for each indicator	
	Any other resources required to undertake monitoring (human, financial, material) for each indicator	

### Evaluations and periodic reviews

*Evaluation: The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project or programme, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. (OECD DAC Glossary).*

*Review: An assessment of the performance of an intervention, periodically or on an ad hoc basis. Reviews are usually less comprehensive and/or in-depth than evaluations. They tend to emphasize operational aspects. (OECD DAC Glossary)*

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Requirements</b>	<b>Additional considerations for grantees</b>
Planned evaluations (e.g. Mid-Term Reviews/ Final evaluations)  Planned reviews	Purpose of evaluation(s)/reviews	It may be possible to link project evaluation questions to BRACED strategic evaluation questions.
	Proposed evaluation/review questions	
	Proposed evaluation criteria, and justification for selection	
	Outline methodology	
	Timings of evaluations/review, including milestones	The key evaluation questions will be finalised by the permanent Knowledge Manager.  Sets of evaluation criteria/frameworks are not necessarily mutually exclusive (e.g. OECD-DAC, TAMD) and where appropriate projects may seek to use a combination of criteria
	Evaluation/review audience(s)	
	Planned modes of disseminating findings	
	Action plans for how evaluation/review findings and recommendations will be used (project level and beyond)	

#### **Some other additional considerations for grantees**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Requirements</b>
Use of information	Details of any known decision making processes, events etc. that will draw on findings, during and after the projects lifetimes, could be discussed in the M&E plan
	Partner activities (e.g. major M&E activities of partners or stakeholder that will contribute to projects' M&E activities) could be discussed in the M&E plan
Capacity building	If any capacity building activities (local, national etc.) are linked to M&E plans, these can be elaborated in the M&E plan
Advisory channels	If any existing/new forums will be utilised to provide one-off or on-going advice on any aspects of M&E activities, these can be described in the M&E plan. E.g. steering groups.
BRACED Strategic & Thematic evaluations	Grantees are invited to set out plans on if/how they would engage with the Knowledge Manager on these planned evaluations, and set out a case for participation.

Internal learning	Review of how M&E information has been used to improve real time operational effectiveness and efficiency of BRACED, and other, projects.
-------------------	---