

Arbeiter Samariter Bund

Monitoring and Evaluation Policy

Iraq Office

Prepared by: Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

Revised by: Country director

Approved by: Foreigner Aid Department

Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Background	4
1.2. Scope	4
1.3. The purpose of monitoring and evaluation Policy	5
Learning and Improvement	5
Results Based Management.....	5
Accountability	6
Evidence-Based Management	6
2. Roles and Responsibilities.....	7
2.1. HQ commitment	8
2.2. Country Representative(CR)	8
2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.....	8
2.4. Program and Project Managers	10
3. Types of Monitoring and Evaluation at ASB	11
3.1. Categories of ASB's MONITORING AND EVALUATION.....	12
Monitoring	12
Program Monitoring	12
Project Portfolio Monitoring.....	12
Project Monitoring.....	12
Evaluation	12
Policy Evaluation	13
Strategic Reviews	13
Program Evaluations	13
Project Evaluations	14
4. Monitoring and Evaluation Criteria	15
4.1. Monitoring criteria.....	16
4.2. Evaluation criteria	16
4.3. Monitoring and evaluation principles.....	17

5.	Monitoring and Evaluation Tools.....	20
5.1.	Logical Framework Requirements	21
5.2.	Monitoring Tools.....	21
5.3.	Instruments for monitoring and evaluation	21
6.	Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework.....	23
6.1.	Evaluation Planning.....	24
6.2.	Evaluation Costing.....	24
6.3.	Evaluation Management.....	25
6.4.	Evaluation Reporting.....	25
6.5.	Dissemination and Disclosure	26
6.6.	Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development.....	26
7.	Monitoring and Evaluation of Partners	28
7.1.	Role of Partners in Monitoring	29
	Targeting	29
	Baselines	29
7.2.	Role of Partners in Evaluation.....	30
7.3.	Partner Capacity-Building for Monitoring and Evaluation.....	30
8.	Minimum monitoring and evaluation requirements	31
Annex 4.1.	32
	MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRINCIPLES AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	32
Annex 5.1.	38
	Logic framework	38
Annex 5.2	39
	INDICATOR MONITORING SHEET	39
Annex 5.1	40
	Table of Contents for Mid-Term Review/Evaluation	40

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

The drive for the development of Monitoring & Evaluation Policy, which build upon the Monitoring and Evaluation, Head Quarter Foreigner Aid Department (HQFAD) policy was based on a number of factors, with the ultimate aim of improving project and program quality, performance, and learning across the ASB Iraq Country Office (CO). This updated policy contributes to implementing the recommendations from Foreigner Affair Department (HQFAD). ASB closely links Monitoring and Evaluation with planning, with the Monitoring and Evaluation function located in the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (MEU). This enables ASB to continuously use the feedback collected from Monitoring and Evaluation to improve planning processes and this in return improves Monitoring and Evaluation practices and systems. Finally, this Monitoring and Evaluation policy, and the Monitoring and Evaluation function more broadly, must be considered in the context of an internal policy environment that includes Code of Conduct and Anti-Fraud policies.

When preparing the policy some considerations were encompassed to ensure its effectiveness and relevance are reflected:

1. Growing internal and external accountability requirements regarding project and program performance;
2. Providing a clear framework and system to assess the extent to which ASB projects and programs on the ground are contributing to the organization's overall objective to contribute to humanitarian response and sustainable development.
3. As program integration and the need to demonstrate results and impact grow, Monitoring and Evaluation processes become more complex.
4. To ensure a common understanding of what best Monitoring and Evaluation practices look like throughout the project cycle, standard common guidelines for ASB sectors are required.

1.2. Scope

ASB Monitoring and Evaluation Policy is a common structures and standards that govern the application of effective monitoring and evaluation (Monitoring and Evaluation) systems with a view to maximizing the benefits from ASB interventions. More specifically, this policy aims to:

1. Demonstrate ASB's commitment to monitoring and evaluating in its work and using the results to drive performance and impact.
2. Set out minimum requirements, principles to be respected, as well as roles and responsibilities.
3. Provide an overview of and basic introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation at ASB, with additional tools referenced to provide further guidance and information.
4. All ASB staff must comply with this policy and therefore they constitute its primary audience. However, this policy is also aimed at external stakeholders such as donors, partners and users, to provide information on ASB standards and procedures.
5. Hence this policy plays an important role in delivering ASB accountability and transparency on Monitoring and Evaluation.

1.3. The purpose of monitoring and evaluation Policy

Within ASB the purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation policy is three-fold:

Learning and Improvement

Monitoring and Evaluation policy help to understand why, and the extent to which, intended and unintended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders. It is therefore an important agent of change through the provision of useful feedback and a commitment to act on that feedback, thereby driving organizational learning. Furthermore, as a learning tool, Monitoring and Evaluation adds to ASB's body of knowledge with respect to best practices in monitoring, evaluation and conservation.

Results Based Management

According to the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), RBM is a 'management strategy focusing on performance and achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts', collectively known as 'results'. RBM uses a structured, logical approach that identifies expected results and the inputs and activities necessary to achieve these. This management strategy ensures that all business units work towards and report on a common set of goals. At ASB, RBM is based on the following prerequisites:

- A four-year planning horizon based on ASB's Strategic Planning in (HQFAD) This is supported by an annual planning process.

- The integration of planning and budget processes, covering both program and operations.
- Monitoring and reporting tools, from those aimed at measuring delivery of results through to those for measuring finances and risk.
- Utilization-focused evaluation: All evaluations must be designed with a focus on intended users and intended use.
- Data and information collected either through planning, monitoring or evaluation processes are used by senior management to manage for results in all key decision making.

Accountability

ASB is answerable to its staff, partners, ASB bund, German Government, donors and beneficiaries on whether its policies, programs and projects are having the intended results. ASB also needs to demonstrate that resources are used efficiently and effectively. The Monitoring and Evaluation process, together with the required documentation that accompanies it, holds ASB staff and contracted implementing partners responsible for their performance. High quality Monitoring and Evaluation Builds Bund's, donors', users' and partners' confidence in CO- Iraq.

Evidence-Based Management

The results of Monitoring and Evaluation activities are an important input to the decision-making process within ASB and affect a range of management processes, including risk and performance management and decisions to change, expand or contract programs.

2. Roles and Responsibilities

2.1. HQ commitment

ASB has a shared system of roles and responsibilities in performing monitoring and evaluation functions. ASB HQ in Cologne, which includes the Director General of foreigner Aid, the Regional Directors, are the primary users of Monitoring and Evaluation results. These results are used to improve performance, perform adaptive management, control risk, enable learning and provide accountability. Senior Management is an active participant in Monitoring and Evaluation activities in terms of collaboratively setting a work plan, participating in design, considering draft reports and using results in decision making. Senior management also monitors the implementation of changes as recommended by an evaluation.

2.2. Country Representative(CR)

At the country office the CR and the Senior Management Team (SMT) is responsible for overseeing the evaluation function, including approving the Monitoring and Evaluation Policy as well as receiving and considering evaluation reports. This team is also responsible for overseeing and approving annual work plans and program monitoring reports. The Team's role is exercised through the CR, who has responsibility for the monitoring function and for facilitating the evaluation function.

CR provides the overall direction, leadership and management of the CO with the following roles and responsibilities:

- a. Submits ASB's results-based program budget to the Board of Trustees for consideration and adoption;
- b. Submits ASB's Strategic Frameworks, Program Performance Reports, Corporate Evaluation Reports, and other relevant reports to the Board of Trustees for consideration;
- c. Requests the Quality Performance (M and E) Unit to undertake corporate evaluations.

2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

Monitoring and Evaluation Unit is responsible for:

- Oversees the application of the policy framework, identifies bottlenecks and constraints and makes recommendations for updating the requirements or other elements of the framework, in line with international good practice, lessons learned as well as the evolving programming and operational needs and characteristics of ASB;

- Facilitates regular sharing of information with managers and other staff, collects feedback and facilitates learning on the framework;
- Conducts surveys, research, studies and communicate critical and analytical consideration and recommendations to management for compliance with the framework;
- Prepares and circulates guidelines, tools, checklists, templates to facilitate the application of the framework;
- Develops and promotes standards for evaluation and quality assurance;
- In due consultation with the CR, formulates annual corporate evaluation plans within the established budgetary appropriations;
- Acts as focal point for any external evaluation being undertaken by a donor or other partner;
- Undertakes periodic peer reviews of decentralized evaluations for quality assurance purposes;
- Prepares a biennial Program Performance Report based on submissions from program management;
- Prepares a biennial Corporate Evaluation Report based on a review of completed corporate
- and decentralized evaluations;
- Maintains a repository of evaluation reports with a view to ensuring transparency and facilitating the integration of lessons learned and best practices into the broader concept of knowledge management;
- Oversees the development and maintenance of an intranet-based knowledge management tool to store, manage and disseminate lessons-learned from evaluations and performance reporting exercises;
- Promotes knowledge management, organizational learning and lessons learned by keeping abreast of innovative practices in the field of evaluation and monitoring, identifying relevant techniques, tools and methods, and providing divisional units with guidance on the use of respective tools and methods;
- Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned to enhance the quality of the ASB's products and services;
- Contributes to efforts to strengthen partners' evaluation capacities.

- Ensure that all enumerators, field workers and consultants abide with the M and E guidelines.

2.4. Program and Project Managers

Individual project and program managers are primarily responsible for monitoring and reporting and using the results of project and program evaluations.

- Carry out monitoring and evaluation functions in accordance with the present policy framework, including monitoring progress towards results, as well as planning and conducting self-evaluations and assessments;
- Informs implementing partners of ASB's evaluation requirements when preparing and negotiating project agreements and modalities for cooperation, and ensures that monitoring and evaluation requirements are specified in project documents or related agreements;
- Budgets and allocates resources for evaluations in accordance with applicable monitoring and evaluation requirements;
- Informs the CD on the scheduling of evaluations on a rolling basis;
- Submits copies of narrative results and reports of decentralized, self-evaluations to the CD as scheduled.
- Follows-up on findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons-learned of independent evaluations;
- Implements accepted evaluation recommendations and informs CD when implemented; and,
- Commits to sharing best practices and lessons learned with a view to further strengthening the quality of ASB's products and services.

3. Types of Monitoring and Evaluation at ASB

3.1. Categories of ASB's MONITORING AND EVALUATION

ASB's Monitoring and Evaluation work generally falls in one of the categories

Monitoring

Monitoring is a management tool to improve organizational delivery and performance. At ASB monitoring is almost always undertaken internally (including by project staff), although it is not unusual at the project level for donors to undertake monitoring of their own, ASB's organization monitoring and reporting efforts focus on the below.

Program Monitoring

Program monitoring measures the contribution of ASB program to the achievement of ASB' Program results through a set of result and impact indicators. Every ASB program reports on regular basis on implementation progress and delivery of results. This is aggregated into an interim and annual Program Reports, shared with ASB's main donors and partners. Impact results are collected every four years and are presented in the Final Program Report at the end of the intersessional period.

Project Portfolio Monitoring

This measures the performance and risks associated with a program portfolio, including growth/decline, reliance on unsecured income, cost recovery and risks associated with project implementation. ASB programs report on a quarterly basis against agreed risk indicators.

Project Monitoring

This type of monitoring measures and reports on the implementation progress of a project while it is being implemented. The format and deadlines for reporting are typically determined by the project donor and reporting is often against a logical framework and set of indicators agreed at the start of the project, otherwise this monitoring is conducted on regular bases and reporting on 3 months against the logical frame.

Evaluation

Evaluations are formal organizational activities that provide evidence of the achievement of results and organization performance. Evaluation is a periodic and systematic assessment, as impartial as possible, of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of an activity in context of stated objectives. Evaluations focuses on different ASB activities, including

programs, projects, policies and organizational units. Evaluations should provide credible, reliable and useful information, enabling timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into relevant decision-making processes. Evaluations is commissioned internally or externally, and implemented by internal or external teams, and sometimes mixed teams. ASB undertakes two broad categories of evaluations: corporate and decentralized evaluations. Corporate evaluations are independent assessments conducted and managed by the Foreigner Aid department. They may be undertaken at the FAD own discretion within its approved budget, or at the request of the CR.

The main types of evaluation carried out at ASB are:

Policy Evaluation

These assess the results of ASB's policy influencing efforts and the implementation of ASB Strategy and Recommendations. Most ASB evaluations include a policy evaluation aspect.

Other studies carried out by ASB when relevant and useful include meta-evaluation and synthesis of evaluation findings. A meta-evaluation is a systematic review of evaluation reports conducted internally to determine the quality of evaluation reports. Synthesis studies are produced on request from the senior management in order to summarize the evaluative evidence, findings and recommendations on a specific topic.

Strategic Reviews

These annual reviews address the organizational performance of ASB as a whole or of its regional offices and thematic programs. ASB practices organizational assessment review intended to assess any unit of the Federation in terms of its organizational performance, organizational capacity, organizational motivation and external environment.

(HQFAD) and ASB regional offices and the main ASB framework partners jointly commission an External Strategic Review of ASB every four years, which assesses organizational performance as a whole.

Program Evaluations

This type of evaluation covers ASB's regional and thematic programs, and includes the work of the ASB Bund where appropriate. Program evaluation again assesses relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the program. ASB defines, internally, a series of program

level evaluations of strategic importance, normally reviewing organizational units or other topics of strategic importance.

Project Evaluations

These cover projects, which are time-bound sets of activities aimed at delivering a set of agreed results. A project rests within a program unit or region and contributes to the intended results of that program and of the ASB(HQFAD). A project evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the project. Project evaluations are undertaken as agreed with the project's donor(s), normally at the mid-term of the project schedule and at its termination.

4. Monitoring and Evaluation Criteria

4.1. Monitoring criteria

ASB acknowledges that not all criteria may apply to all monitoring and evaluations and that decisions on which criteria shall apply to a given undertaking should be based on the type of evaluation, the main evaluation questions and considerations related to methodology and feasibility. ASB and Partners will develop and execute monitoring plans and / or systems that are appropriate to the initiatives for measuring performance, outcomes and progress towards impact. In doing so, indicators shall adhere to SMART criteria:

- a. Specific: Target a specific area for improvement and appropriately relate to the achievement of an objective
- b. Measurable: The monitoring system and indicators are amenable to quantitative or qualitative measurement. Partners must agree on common and practical ways to track progress.
- c. Achievable and Attributable: The monitoring system / plan identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the initiative and whether the results are realistic. Attribution requires that indicators track changes in relation to the initiative.
- d. Relevant and Realistic: The monitoring system selects performance indicators that are relevant to the objectives and are likely to be achievable within the period of initiative implementation.
- e. Time-bound: The monitoring system allows progress to be tracked periodically and in a cost-effective manner.

4.2. Evaluation criteria

In general, ASB evaluations explore the six major criteria outlined below. Any ASB evaluation must first consider all six criteria and decide which ones are the most important given the context. Evaluations shall in general report against the following internationally established criteria:

- a. Relevance: the extent to which the initiative was suited to the priorities of the recipient or beneficiary group, partner and the Bund. The analyses should include an assessment of changes in the validity and relevance of the initiative over time.

- b. Effectiveness: the extent to which initiative objective was achieved or likely to be achieved, including assessment of influencing factors for achievement and / or failure.
- c. Efficiency: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources available using efficient and timely processes.
- d. Results / Impact: the extent the initiative has achieved positive or negative changes, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended on beneficiaries. For the Bund this will involve an assessment of socio-economic, environmental, scale-up and replication effects taking into external factors.
- e. Sustainability: is concerned with the extent initiative benefits are likely to continue after Bund funding has been withdrawn. The Bund is particularly interested in financial, socio-economic and environmental sustainability of initiatives and partner organizations.
- f. Scalability: the extent to which the results achieved by the initiative have been (or have the potential for) able to effect wider systemic change (industry and societal).

4.3. Monitoring and evaluation principles

ASB and partners are guided by the following set of principles:

- a. Credibility: Monitoring shall be based on valid and reliable data or observations quantitative and qualitative. Monitoring reports shall adhere to and reflect clearly structured data collection methods and analyses. Improving the quality of evaluations in ASB is a critical aspect of the credibility of its evaluation work.
- b. Utility: Monitoring must serve the information needs of the intended users at initiative level. ASB and partners shall ensure that monitoring is relevant, timely, clearly presented, performance and results orientated.
- c. Impartiality: Monitoring reports, self-evaluations and produced review of initiative implementation performance must be free of bias. Monitoring and Evaluation processes should be complete and fair in their examination and record the strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, project or organizational unit under consideration.
- d. Transparency and Disclosure: Openness and consultation with all major stakeholders involved in initiative monitoring is essential. Clear communication with stakeholders concerning the purpose of the monitoring and/or evaluation work, the key questions and

intended uses of the results of the Monitoring and Evaluation process, along with standards for the design, data collection and analysis will maximize the transparency of the Monitoring and Evaluation process.

- e. Participation: Working in Partnership initiatives are undertaken through and with partners and Nongovernmental Organizations, private sector, communities and others. Monitoring shall be carried out with the participation of relevant partners at the local level. Such involvement will make evaluations better understood, promote contributions and acceptance, and will increase the likelihood of use.
- f. Accountability: that supports the management and governance system in providing provides guidance to managers, and requires information from managers about performance and learning. System controls for accountability for inputs are primarily left to internal audit.
- g. Improving Planning and Delivery Monitoring and Evaluation activities must provide useful findings and recommendations. Those under consideration should see Monitoring and Evaluation as an asset aimed at improving results and thereby strengthening the organization. Sustained involvement in, and ownership of, Monitoring and Evaluation processes contributes to better planning, decision-making and strategy formulation at all levels.
- h. Quality Control: Monitoring and Evaluation involves the systematic integration of a wide assortment of knowledge and information related to a set of questions posed. As a result of gathering, analyzing and making judgements, ASB staff and their stakeholders make important decisions related to the quality of their work at the policy, program, project and organizational level.
- i. Supporting an Evaluation Culture: All staff should see the Monitoring and Evaluation process as a tool that can help them improve their work and their results.
- j. Ethics: Monitoring and Evaluation shall consider the welfare, beliefs, and customs of those involved or affected, avoiding conflict of interest. Stakeholder rights and interests shall be respected, particularly with regard to respecting culture and customs, fundamental values, the right to or not to participate, and ensuring confidentiality of individual stakeholders. External evaluators must receive a copy of this policy as an appendix to their contract (Annex

4.1). Internal evaluators will, in addition, adhere strictly to ASB Code of Conduct and Professional Ethics and Ethical M and E standards (Annex 4.1). If wrongdoing is uncovered or suspected in Monitoring and Evaluation activities, reporting should follow the procedures for reporting ethical misconduct as outlined in the ASB Code of Conduct.

- k. Impartiality: As much as possible, Monitoring and Evaluation procedures should guard against distortion caused by personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation Tools

5.1. Logical Framework Requirements

ASB recognizes the usefulness of logical frameworks or other results formulations/ presentations as a tool to manage for results. Project documents or proposals should include logical frameworks or other appropriate formulations/ presentations of results and specify major activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. (Annex 5.1)

Performance indicators and means of verification: should be specified for output and outcome level results; for projects or other undertakings in which an impact evaluation is to be performed, indicators of achievement and means of verification should also be specified for intended impacts. indicators sheet (Annex 5.2)

Performance indicators should include baseline and target measures for expected results. In the event baseline information may not be available in the design phase or at the submission time of a project document or proposal, managers should plan to obtain baseline or other relevant information within a reasonable period from project start-up (e.g. inception workshop) to ensure evaluability of results. When projects or undertakings are to be implemented jointly, logical frameworks should be discussed and agreed with respective partners

5.2. Monitoring Tools

ASB uses various tools to monitor progress towards results from the corporate to the individual levels. These tools include medium-term strategic frameworks, results-based program budgets, work planning and project logical frameworks.

a. Medium-term strategic frameworks: At the corporate level, medium-term plans are prepared every four years providing direction in areas of strategic priority.

b. Results-based budgets: Results-based program budgets are prepared on a biennial basis outlining objectives and expected results. ASB units are required to monitor and report progress on achieving pre-defined performance indicators.

c. Annual work plans: ASB units are required to prepare and monitor annual work plans based on the approved budget.

d. Individual work plans: All regular staff members are required to prepare and monitor individual work plans.

5.3. Instruments for monitoring and evaluation

ASB has introduced various instruments to monitor progress towards results from the corporate to the individual levels. This includes:

a. Annual reports: The annual report is an important monitoring instrument and, at a later stage, also serves as input for mid-term reviews and/or program evaluations. An annual report consists

of a detailed content and a financial section. The content section contains progress reports of the intervention, and the results thereof within the CO.

b. Mid-term review: The 'mid-term review' offers the opportunity to analyze an ongoing program (or sections thereof) and to learn lessons from this. An MTR looks deeper at the results than the annual report, details the effects and provides a well-founded estimate of the possible impact. Based on the conclusions resulting from the MTR, modifications can be made in the design or planning of a program.

MTR is a standard procedure for programs that run for four years and have a total budget of over two million euro. MTRs are planned for such programs once they have been running for two years. For other programs (with shorter timeframes or lower budgets), an MTR may be carried out on an ad hoc basis.

c. Final report: The final report contains the last annual report for a project of program plus a general indication of the development and results thereof over the entire period of the program. The CR CO is responsible for drawing up and submitting the final report, based on input from the PMs and M and E. In addition to program content, a final financial report is also supplied.

d. Evaluation: Evaluations are always carried out for programs that run for a minimum of three years and have an average annual budget of over 500,000 euro. For other programs (of shorter duration or lower budget), evaluations may be carried out on an ad hoc basis. If required, this may be included in the contract conditions. Evaluations take place during the last year of the contract.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework

6.1. Evaluation Planning

All projects, activities and other undertakings should be conceived in a results-based manner to ensure evaluability, all donor-funded projects or other undertakings subject to evaluation should include a clause in the project document/proposal specifying evaluation requirements and relevant modalities. In the absence of such a document, the relevant letter or memorandum of agreement should specify monitoring and evaluation modalities. During formal evaluations ASB focuses on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the financed intervention(s).

Program evaluations specifically look at whether the strategy chosen offers the expected value, plus the relevance in the light of the context, and the quality and quantity of the support provided. In addition, the evaluations present 'hard' data on the effects (i.e. improvement in the functioning of ASB and partners) and makes detailed judgements of the impact. An important question here is the extent to which the capacity building results are sustainable. The evaluation also draws conclusions that can be important for the organizations involved.

For corporate evaluations, the Planning, Performance and Results Section shall formulate an annual evaluation work plan within the established budget appropriations.

For mandated independent project evaluations, terms of reference will be prepared using international standards and good practice, and include the following elements: the context and purpose of the evaluation, scope, main evaluation questions, methodology (data collection tools and analysis), work plan, learning products of the evaluation, intended use of results and qualifications.

6.2. Evaluation Costing

The costs to carry out evaluation vary depending on the purpose/type/scope of the evaluation, evaluation questions to be addressed, data collection methods and other factors. Adequate resources should be identified and made available for both decentralized and corporate evaluations and be reflected in project budgets.

Mandatory independent project evaluations should be costed at 2.5 per cent of the project's budget, unless otherwise determined by the Planning, Performance and Results Section in

consultation with the relevant divisional entity, and be identified on a separate budget line. These costs are distinct from project monitoring and narrative reporting costs.

6.3. Evaluation Management

In conducting evaluations, ASB acknowledges that different evaluation designs as well as quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods for data collection and analysis exist. The most appropriate design(s), method(s) and approach should be selected, taking into consideration the evaluation question(s), scope, criteria, human and financial resource requirements and availability, as well as guiding principles and good practice standards.

All independent evaluations should include a peer review for quality assurance purposes prior to finalization. All independent evaluations should include a response from management in relation to the evaluation's findings, conclusions, and recommendations and lessons-learned.

In managing mandatory independent project evaluations, the Planning, Performance and Results Section may access the expenditure account within the ledger account of the relevant project and raise obligations for expenditure.

In due consultation with the Executive Director and Management, the Planning, Performance and Results Section may issue and disclose final evaluation reports.

6.4. Evaluation Reporting

Results from the ASB's monitoring and evaluation activities are to be recorded in the following formats: Program Performance Reports, Results Summaries, Completion Reports, Independent Evaluation Reports, Corporate Evaluation Reports and Peer Reviews of Decentralized Evaluations. Other types of reporting formats, including inception reports, midterm reviews, annual progress reports, final narrative or implementation reports, etc. may also be used if required or preferred by donors.

- a. Program Performance Reports (PPRs) record program performance based on expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and performance measures, as recorded in results-based budgets. PPRs should be prepared by all ASB units, including both operational

and programming divisions and submitted to the Planning, Performance and Results Section by the end of the first quarter of the subsequent biennium.

- b. Results Summaries provide a narrative summary of the project, record results in relation to performance targets and integrate some degree of evaluative thinking. Results summaries are typically used for small scale projects budgeted at \$100,000 or less.
- c. Completion Reports provide a narrative summary of the project, record findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (if relevant) and integrate some degree of evaluative thinking based on self-assessments. Completion Reports should be prepared by all divisional entities if an evaluation required.
- d. Independent Evaluation Reports and record findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from independent evaluations. Corporate Evaluation Reports (CERs) are issued by the M and E Unit at the end of each biennium based on a review and analysis of completed decentralized and corporate evaluations. The CER will highlight outcome-level results and summarize recommendations and lessons-learned, as well as provide an assessment of how evaluation processes have generated learning, quality improvement and enhanced decision-making.
- e. Peer Reviews of Decentralized Evaluations are independent reviews conducted by the M and E unit, report of decentralized self-evaluations, primarily for quality assurance purposes.

6.5. Dissemination and Disclosure

Reports from corporate and external evaluations will be accessible in a public depository with a view to ensure transparency and facilitate knowledge management and application of lessons learned. Selected narrative reports from divisional entities which include a significant evaluation component and meeting quality standards will be included in the public repository.

6.6. Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development

Monitoring and Evaluation are both important function in both national and international humanitarian and developmental services. The policy framework recognizes the importance of strengthening monitoring and evaluation capacities within ASB for an enhanced monitoring and

evaluation function, through training and other appropriate means. Also ASB believes in building national evaluation capacities at the country level is important for development activities.

The creation, storage, management, dissemination and uptake of knowledge is essential, including knowledge produced from evaluative undertakings. To promote evaluation use, organizational learning and quality improvement of the ASB's products and services, a learning forum will be organized periodically to share lessons learned on evaluation processes and outcomes.

7. Monitoring and Evaluation of Partners

As a partnership based agency, most of ASB's field programs are implemented by local partner agencies. Hence, the partner organizations have the initial responsibility for monitoring and evaluation at field level as part of their own project cycle management systems. Partner programs generally operate to a three-year cycle, but may have shorter or longer cycles in some cases.

7.1. Role of Partners in Monitoring

Partner organizations are expected to visit each project area on a quarterly basis at a minimum and to provide monitoring reports (to a standard format) to ASB on a quarterly basis. The project results framework is utilized as a guide for checking progress against each activity area. Partners are expected to include beneficiaries in the project monitoring activities and discussions. Apart from reporting on activities, outputs and outcomes (where possible), partner monitoring reports will also include reference to specific accountability and learning issues.

Targeting

The identification of the target beneficiary group for each project is a basic requirement at the initial stage of project design, and is an essential step in facilitating the development of a results framework. The target population is clearly defined both in terms of numbers and categories of people. A clear distinction is made also between the intended direct beneficiaries of projects, and other indirect beneficiaries. Specific baselines and targets for each category of beneficiaries are included in the results framework, with a particular emphasis on particularly marginalized or vulnerable groups that may have been identified in advance. The process for identification and targeting of beneficiaries is guided by ASB's Targeting Policy and the targeting policy of the implementing partner.

Baselines

All partners are required to develop a results framework for each project at the beginning of the project cycle. Ideally, the baseline study should be conducted before the project begins, but in practice it may not be always feasible to do so. A maximum period of three months from the project start date is allowed at the beginning of a project for the completion of the baseline study and establishment of all target outputs and outcomes for the full project cycle. Partners are encouraged to utilize external expertise in the establishment of targets and baselines where

necessary, with financial support for this being included in the project budget. Local communities and other local development agencies are expected to be consulted and / or directly engaged in the identification of priority beneficiaries.

7.2. Role of Partners in Evaluation

Mid-term and final evaluations will normally be conducted in the context of ASB's overall program of work i.e. evaluation of several partner projects may well be taking place as one part of the exercise. Partners will have a key role to play in agreeing the Terms of Reference for the evaluation with ASB, facilitating the evaluation itself, and ensuring full and objective participation of beneficiaries in the evaluation process.

7.3. Partner Capacity-Building for Monitoring and Evaluation

Under the Partner Capacity Building Approach, ASB provides specific support to partners in relation to the development of their overall Project Cycle Management (PCM) capacity, including their ability to monitor and evaluate programming work. As for other aspects of capacity support, the specific PCM support to be provided to a partner is based on organizational needs and priorities, as identified under the Organizational Self-Assessment (OSA).

Also capacity building on M and E reporting tools, this is included in all reports (annual and final reports) for both projects and programs. Each partner is required to use a basic uniform format when submitting reports, including progress reports for the project and/or program. In addition to a description of inputs used, activities, outputs and results, scores are required for a number of dimensions.

8. Minimum monitoring and evaluation requirements

The following minimum requirements must be adhered to by all ASB staff:

- All ASB programs will provide data supporting measurement of the result and impact indicators defined in the ASB HQ annual evaluation meeting on an annual basis;
- In addition, all ASB programs will define and measure four-year results indicators and provide annual updates
- Every ASB program will also provide an annual report of implementation of annual results from the previous year
- Every project, as required by donors, will define and implement a monitoring and evaluation plan, including indicators and plans for one or more evaluation(s)
- Irrespective of donor requirements, every ASB project will develop and implement a monitoring plan with indicators and plan for an end of project evaluation
- Every ASB project with multi years will add a midterm evaluation to its monitoring and evaluation plan
- Every evaluation will trigger the development of a management response.

Annex 4.1.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRINCIPLES AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Potential respondents for any Monitoring and Evaluation activity should be informed of the purpose of the data collection (including what it is looking to find out), how the information will be used, and whether it will be published.

Potential respondents should also be informed of the interview ground rules including:

- option of confidentiality;
- means of information gathering and recording;
- the participation requirements.

For key informant interviews this can be done with an Interview Protocol Card or equivalent

Once rules have been explained, respondents' consent for participating should be sought. Note that when collecting information directly from minors (under 18 years), informed consent from a parent or guardian must be secured.

Note that collecting data without informing the individuals or communities involved and gaining their assent could also expose you, the organization, or the project to risk (e.g. approval)

informed consent clause

“Hello. We are working for Arbeiter Samariter Bund, a German nongovernmental humanitarian organization. We would like to ask you some questions about your family to better understand

your experience with ASB’s project and ways we can improve it. The survey usually takes about 20 minutes to complete. Any information that you provide will be kept strictly confidential. This is voluntary and you can choose not to answer any or all of the questions. However, we hope that you will participate since the information you will provide is essential to evaluate your situation and improve the assistance we provide.

Do you agree to participate in the survey?”

Yes/No

- A person’s right to provide information in confidence and anonymously should be built into data collection, with potential respondents asked about their preference for anonymity. Any sensitive information should not be traceable to its source.
- Where necessary names can be replaced by “Respondent One,” “Respondent Two,” or similar type of coding etc. If one respondent is made anonymous, it may be appropriate for all respondents at that location to be anonymous.
- Any sensitive information should not be traceable to its source. This does not of course mean that all monitoring data is or should be anonymous (and in some cases it is necessary that it’s not), but rather that respondents are provided with the option.

Data Storage and Security of Personal Information

- Collecting and storing personal information or personally identifiable information (PII) from local populations poses ethical obligations for Monitoring and Evaluation to avoid compromising individuals' privacy and security.
- PII consists of information from which an individual can be identified, such as names, ID numbers, physical, postal or email addresses, telephone numbers, photographs, age, gender or biometrics.

Guidelines

- Collect only the minimum amount of PII data needed.
- Any data that encompasses individuals' PII should be kept in secure locations, in restricted folders or locked filing cabinets.
- Consider password-protecting sensitive files, beneficiary lists, health records or anthropometric data.
- Access privileges should be considered for data that is not anonymous but is traceable to specific persons.
- Data storage should take into consideration any current and future ASB policies/requirements for storage and access.
- For more, see OCHA Policy Paper: "Humanitarianism in the Age of Cyber-warfare: Towards the Principled and Secure Use of Information in Humanitarian Emergencies"
- Right to privacy People may not want to openly discuss issues and should always be given the option to decline.

Do no harm

- The 'do no harm' principle has been adopted from medical ethics to humanitarian work. It arose from the recognition that aid can be misused and may have unintended, negative consequences on local populations. The principle requires humanitarian organizations to strive to 'minimize the harm they may inadvertently be doing by being present and providing assistance. Important considerations include:
- Data collectors and those disseminating Monitoring and Evaluation findings/reports should take into account where information might endanger or embarrass respondents or those non-community members involved in conducting the Monitoring and Evaluation.

- While the integrity of findings should not be compromised given the legal and ethical responsibility to report evidence of criminal activity or wrongdoing that may harm others (e.g. child abuse or domestic violence), no harm should come to those involved.
- Care should be taken when working with marginalized groups (e.g. internally displaced people or ethnic minorities) or following traumas (e.g. natural disaster, conflict, or domestic violence).

Systematic Inquiry

- All research should be thorough, using appropriate methods of enquiry and the highest technical standards, and based on valid data. Information should be validated using multiple approaches and sources.
- All reasonable efforts should be made to remove or minimize bias. Staff should remain neutral and promote evidence based inquiry and reporting.
- Clearly communicate the methodology or approach to allow stakeholders to understand and critique Monitoring and Evaluation activities.
- Methodologies should include tools and questions to capture both the intended and unintended project impact, whether positive or negative.

Competence

- Data collectors, enumerators, and analysts should be equipped with the appropriate training, skills, and experience to undertake their respective tasks and should only be expected to work within the limits of their professional training and competence.
- There should be continuous striving to improve methodologies and practice skills.
- ASB organizational procedures, standards and code of conduct should be adhered to as part of any Monitoring and Evaluation and any real or potential conflict of interest should be raised to the relevant people.
- Misrepresentation of data and results should be avoided and any wrongdoing should be reported.
- Honor agreements made with stakeholders regarding Monitoring and Evaluation activities (e.g. timing, sharing results)

- Beneficiaries often give significant amounts of their own time to answer enumerator questions, so make it a priority to share Monitoring and Evaluation information with communities in which you are working.
- Monitoring and Evaluation should not be a solely extractive exercise in data collection to satisfy the requirements of donors and implementers. Rather, it should be fed back to communities.
- Ensure, to the best of your knowledge and ability, that Monitoring and Evaluation data are accurate. Address and correct any questionable Monitoring and Evaluation practices observed during data collection or analysis, whether due to negligence or mistakes by Monitoring and Evaluation team members
- Ensure that Monitoring and Evaluation results are accurately represented and attempt to prevent their misuse.

Respect and cultural sensitivity

Local customs on dress code, personal interaction, religious beliefs and practices, should be respected and cultural sensitivity shown.

Differences in religion, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, and ethnicity should be taken into account in all Monitoring and Evaluation.

Time constraints

People may be extremely busy and their participation in Monitoring and Evaluation can be burdensome. Ample notice should be given as much as possible and demands on time minimized.

Responsibility for outputs

Criticism can have serious consequences for individual and organizational reputations. Those collecting and reporting on data should be mindful of any potential consequences, in terms of security and local presence.

Accountability

- Monitoring and Evaluation should be in line with the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Terms of Reference (where applicable) agreed and results presented accurately, identifying any limitations or uncertainties that could impact interpretations.
- All expenditures should be accounted for to ensure value for money.

- Present Monitoring and Evaluation findings in a way that is accessible to all stakeholders (whilst ensuring participant confidentiality is maintained as necessary)

Omissions

When issues and findings not directly part of Monitoring and Evaluation but related to a project arise, they should be acknowledged and discussed with the relevant staff.

Maximize Benefits and Minimize Harm

- Monitoring and Evaluation activities should maximize benefits and minimize harm.
- Both the human and financial time and resources required to conduct the Monitoring and Evaluation activity should be outweighed by the benefits of knowledge gained or results demonstrated. Respondents should not be put at risk physically, subject to discrimination, or disadvantaged in any way due to their participation in the Monitoring and Evaluation activity.
- Care should be taken when working with marginalized group (e.g. internally displaced people or ethnic minorities) or following traumas (e.g. natural disaster, conflict, or domestic violence)

Code of Conduct, Transparency, and Anti-Corruption

- ASB has clear policies of transparency in the utilization of funds and zero tolerance on corruption.
- Monitoring of potential or actual corruption in projects and communities should continuously be reviewed and checked.
- Internal audit and program quality processes can support the definition of systems and tools, as well as the detection of corruption and fraud throughout the implementation process.

Annex 5.1.

Logic framework

Project Logical Framework

Project title					
Program					
Starting Date					
Duration					
Partners					
Target Area					
Beneficiaries					
Cost					
Funding Source					
Goal					

	PROJECT SUMMARY	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	RISKS / ASSUMPTIONS	
Goal					
Outcomes					
Outputs					
Activities					

Annex 5.2

INDICATOR MONITORING SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: For each indicator listed in the previous logframe tables describe precisely what the indicator is and how it will be measured. An example is shown below. Copy and paste the table as many times as required for completing all the indicators for all the projects. If two projects have the same indicator in both logframes you don't need to describe the indicator twice in this section, only once.

Indicator	
Definition	
Purpose	
Baseline	
Target	
Data Collection	
Tool	
Frequency	
Responsible	
Reporting	
Quality Control	

Annex 5.1

Table of Contents for Mid-Term Review/Evaluation

1. Executive summary

The executive summary contains the main findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

2. Introduction

Background and justification for the mid-term review or evaluation, as well as methodology used.

3. Context analysis

Description and analysis of the broader policy and ASB context, including the (changed) position of target groups.

4. Overview of main program achievements

This relates to the original intervention logic and planned activities laid down in the original program documents. The review/evaluation gives an overview of partners, inputs, activities, outputs, and results. This should be confined to factual information.

5. Overview of findings

This heading of the review or evaluation will list the main opinions and views expressed on the questions stated in the terms of reference (ToR). Naturally relevant issues arising during the research (that were not included in the ToR) should be featured here.

6. Analysis of program achievements

This heading should cover the areas (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) and specific questions defined in the ToR. Program achievements, findings and context analysis will form the main guidelines.

7. Conclusions and lessons learned

Here the review/evaluation team will formulate its conclusions and identify lessons learned that are relevant for further program/policy development.

8. Recommendations

If required, the review/evaluation team formulates recommendations to sustain, change or improve the program or policy.

Annexes: ToR, research schedule, and bibliography