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Why Guidance Note No. 5

How do we move forward with resilience M&E at the project level?

Questions from the field

• Are outcome and impact indicators adequate to capture whether resilience is built?
• How can we integrate resilience measurement in M&E plans?
• What should we measure in the absence of a shock or stress?
• How do we right-size resilience measurement?
What we covered

✓ Integration of resilience measurement into activity M&E plans based on activity size, scope and complexity

✓ Understand when and what to monitor/evaluate for resilience programming in the context of a shock or stress; as well as in the absence of a shock or stress

✓ Select, adapt, or develop indicative questions, tools, and methodologies for monitoring and evaluating resilience based on the resources available to them.

And what we didn’t

☒ What kind of activities does M&E tell us are best for building resilience?

☒ What are the best tools to measure resilience at the activity level?
But first…some principles

- Meeting standards of resilience
- Literature reviews and relevant assessments with a focus on shocks and stresses
- A resilience theory of change is developed
- Resilience activity M&E staff have been trained or exposed to basic resilience concepts
- Internal M&E capacity is understood
- M&E requirements are understood
- Internal expectations are clear
What is so different?
Resilience M&E at the project level

Basics

• Deep understanding of ToC and other frameworks
• An M&E system, along with sufficient and capable staff
• An M&E plan that guides staff in defining a results chain and indicators

Resilience “Add-ons”

• A resilience-focused results framework with:
  • Resilience capacities you aim to strengthen, shocks and/or stresses expected
  • The set of responses we expect will result from the use of resilience capacities
  • Resilience capacity and response questions
  • Objective and subjective measures for shock and stress monitoring
Results Frameworks

The basis for a Results Chain

Typical results framework

- Inputs & Outputs
- Sub-Purpose/ Sub-Intermediate Result
- Purpose/ Intermediate Result
- Goal/ Development Objective

Resilience-focused results framework

- Interventions & Outputs
- Resilience Capacities
- Responses to Shocks/ Stresses
- Intermediate Outcomes
- Well-being Outcomes
Resilience Logframes

Impact Framework

- Well-being outcomes
- Intermediate outcomes
- Resilience responses
- Resilience capacities

Shock and stress monitoring

- Subjective and Objective indicators
- Severity and Exposure

Output Framework

- Day-to-day activity data
- Output monitoring
- Monthly/quarterly progress
# Resilience Impact Logframe

## Capacities and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result level</th>
<th>Result Chain Statement</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>CAPACITY questions</th>
<th>RESPONSE questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESPONSE:</strong> Farmers use financial services continuously post-shock/stress</td>
<td>Farmers use savings, credit and insurance during a shock/stress to manage risk</td>
<td>Number/% of farmers benefiting from financial services due to activity support</td>
<td>Do farmers save for emergencies? Do farmers know how to open a savings account/request loan? Do they know insurance products available? Do farmers feel like they are prepared for a shock/stress in terms of financial services? Do farmers report self-efficacy in financial management? Were barriers to access, knowledge, use pre-shock/stress still an issue? To whom?</td>
<td>Did farmers use their savings according to plan following a shock/stress? Were farmers able to adapt or change their plans without resorting to negative coping strategies? Are farmers able to claim insurance benefits? Are they satisfied with the insurers’ response? Were barriers to respond to shock/stress still an issue? To whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of informal financial service providers supported</td>
<td>Have informal service providers planned for defaulting members in case of a shock/stress?</td>
<td>Do informal service providers continue services (and for how long) following a shock/stress?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of formal financial intermediaries serving poor households</td>
<td>Do providers offer products in preparation to a particular shock? Are providers promoting products with the farmers who need them? Are non-supported providers replicating supported-providers’ products? Were barriers to access clients to prepare for shocks/stresses still an issue for providers?</td>
<td>Are providers still accessible to affected farmers during and post shock/stress? Do insurers provide payouts in a timely manner? Are providers encountering barriers to respond to the shock/stress?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Shock and Stress Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHOCK AND STRESS MONITORING</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shock/ Stress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shock/ Stress Characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shock 1: Drought</strong></td>
<td>Shock exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shock severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress 1: Land degradation</strong></td>
<td>Stress exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress severity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do I do actually measure?

Examples of tools from the field

• Variety of tools that can be adapted to specific contexts
• Tools for different types of measurement, analysis, and learning
• A focus on balance between quantitative and qualitative
• A living list: let’s continue to update it as a community!
Resilience Measurement in Practice

Jill Scantlan
Regional Resilience MERL Advisor (Mercy Corps)
Overview

• Go over results chains step-by-step

• Discuss case studies that illustrate key concepts in the guidance note #5

• Discuss challenges and solutions for integrating resilience measurement into program design
Results Chains
What value do they add?

- Allows teams to walk through logical steps for how activities are contributing to building resilience
- Identifies gaps in theory of change and synergies between program intervention areas
- Builds buy-in and common understanding of resilience approach
Results Chains Step-by-Step

Start with what you know

Wellbeing Outcomes

Individual/household-level outcomes connected to program goal

Interventions

Technical sector or integrated program approach
Results Chains Step-by-Step

Identify Shock / Stress

Wellbeing Outcomes

Individual/household-level outcomes connected to program goal

What is the primary shock/stress that the program is trying to address?

Interventions

Technical sector or integrated program approach
Results Chains Step-by-Step

Identify Capacities

**Wellbeing Outcomes**
Individual/household-level outcomes connected to program goal

**SHOCK/STRESS**
What is the primary shock/stress that the program is trying to address?

**Capacities**

**Resources and Strategies**

**Interventions**
Technical sector or integrated program approach
Results Chains Step by Step

Identify Expected Responses

**Wellbeing Outcomes**
Individual/household-level outcomes connected to program goal

**Responses**
How do you expect people to use capacities to respond to a shock/stress?

**SHOCK/STRESS**
What is the primary shock/stress that the program is trying to address?

**Capacities**
Resources and Strategies

**Interventions**
Technical sector or integrated program approach
Results Chains Step-by-Step

High-Level Outcomes

- **Wellbeing Outcomes**: Individual/household-level outcomes connected to program goal

- **Intermediate Outcome**: How does this help address the drivers or effects of shock or stresses?

- **Responses**: How do you expect people to use capacities to respond to a shock/stress?

- **SHOCK/STRESS**: What is the primary shock/stress that the program is trying to address?

- **Capacities**: Resources and Strategies

- **Interventions**: Technical sector or integrated program approach

**JUNE 2018**
Result Chain Step-by-Step

Map Activities to Result Chain & Integrate Activities

Challenge
Activities are siloed by sector, which increases time burden on communities and leads to inefficiencies in program implementation

Solution
Integrate activities based on results chain

• Integrate by location
  – Community group meeting, market actor / enterprise, etc.

• Redesign activity to embed multiple sectors
  – Decision-making in household budgeting / financial literacy training
Results Frameworks

The basis for a Results Chain

Typical results framework

Resilience-focused results framework

Shock

Stress
Case Study #1 – Results Chains
Case Study #1 – Results Chains

Challenges

• Not clear how different program sectors are working together to build resilience

• Results chains are developed in the beginning, but not revisited later in the program

• It is not clear whether results are being achieved
Case Study #1 – Results Chains

Result Chain Review

Sector leads presented on:

- Summary of current activities
- What evidence illustrated achievement of results in results chains
- What gaps in data or program implementation are observed
- What key actions should be taken

Address critical questions:

- Where can we integrate activities
- How the activity leads to a market systems change
- Is the activity / approach sustainable • What is the strategy to scale activities
Case Study #1 – Results Chains

Enabling Environment / Market System Change
*Output, feed, animal health, breeding markets *Rangeland laws / plans *sustainable water

Wellbeing

Reduced livestock loss

Resilient behaviors

Dzud, livestock disease, drought

Access to pasture / climate info
Access to financial services
Improved social capital
Improved livestock practices
Case Study # 2
Activity
Integration
Case Study #2 – Integrating Activities

Managing Risk through Economic Development (MRED) – Nepal and Timor-Leste

Program was designed with integration in mind

- Planting sugarcane on erosion-prone riverbanks to prevent river cutting while increasing productivity of marginal lands and increases income
- Planting fodder species in marginal lands of hilly areas to mitigate landslides while also contributing as an input for the growth of dairy sub-sector
Case Study #2 – Integrating Activities

Challenges

• Results from first phase of the project revealed gaps in achievement by participant’s gender

• Results chains reflected change in gender norms, behaviors, and practices but activities did not

• Time burden of too many activities
Case Study #2 – Integrating Activities

Ways to integrate activities

1. Combine multiple separate activities into one
   - Household dialog sessions to promote joint decision-making integrated into financial literacy module

2. Have multiple activities in one place / through one actor
   - Improved agriculture practices, market information, early warning system information all through agriculture extension workers
Case Study #3 Logframe Alignment
Case Study #3 – Logframe Alignment

Challenges

• Typical measurement frameworks not aligned with resilience framework

• Indicators are decided before results chains exercise and can’t change

• If measuring all anticipated results in results chains, there are too many indicators
## Case Study #3 – Logframe Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result Level</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> A COMPETITIVE AND RESILIENT LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY SUSTAINS INCREASES IN INCOME AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING DESPITE SHOCKS AND STRESSES</td>
<td>1. Amount of net additional income change (NAIC)</td>
<td>Enterprise-level surveys conducted at regular intervals</td>
<td>No economic crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1:</strong> Robust and modernized livestock production models</td>
<td>1.1 Volume and value of incremental sales (collected at farm level) attributed to project implementation</td>
<td>Herders survey, farm survey/record</td>
<td>Favorable climate condition, No economic crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2:</strong> Financial inclusion, business knowledge, and innovative green financing</td>
<td>2.1 Percentage of male and female farmers and other value chain participants who used financial services (savings, agricultural credit, and/or agricultural insurance)</td>
<td>Population based survey</td>
<td>Government support to financial institutions, No economic crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3:</strong> Improved governance systems</td>
<td>2.2 Percentage of individuals reporting increased confidence in government actors</td>
<td>Quantitative and Qualitative survey, Key Informant Interview</td>
<td>Government support, No economic crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Study #3 – Logframe Alignment

### Wellbeing Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logframe Result Level</th>
<th>Result Chain Result</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal: A competitive livestock industry that sustains increases in income and social wellbeing despite shocks and stresses</td>
<td>Goal Outcome 1: Protected and improved income and livelihood</td>
<td>Goal Indicator 1: Amount of net income change (NAIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Outcome 3: Reduction in negative coping mechanisms</td>
<td>Goal Indicator 2: Coping Strategies Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Outcome 4: Protected and improved psychosocial wellbeing</td>
<td>Goal Indicator 3a: Level of control over their own life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Indicator 3b: Ability to recover from shock or stress in the future</td>
<td>Baseline/Endline Monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intermediate Outcomes and Crosscutting Capacities

| Outcome 1: Robust and modernized livestock production models | Intermediate Outcome: Herders, meat entrepreneurs, fattening enterprises and other market actors improve quantity and value of livestock sales | Indicator 1.1: Volume and value of sales of livestock | Baseline/Endline Monitoring | Recurring monitoring | Qualitative monitoring | Quantitative monitoring | Other |
|                                                          | Intermediate Outcome: Herders reduce losses in livestock after shock / stress | Indicator 1.2: # of livestock lost | Baseline/Endline Monitoring | Recurring monitoring | Qualitative monitoring | Quantitative monitoring | Other |
| Crosscutting Outcome 3: Improved governance system | Crosscutting Capacity: Herder households view government as being accountable to their community | Indicator 3.1: Percentage of individuals reporting increased confidence in government actors | Baseline/Endline Monitoring | Recurring monitoring | Qualitative monitoring | Quantitative monitoring | Other |

### Capacities & Responses

| Intermediate Outcome 2.1: Access to financial services | Resilience Response: MSMEs and herder coops to invest in embedded services, feedlots, and upgrading processing facilities | Indicator 2.1: Percentage of male and female farmers and other value chain participants who used financial services (savings, agricultural credit, and/or agricultural insurance) | Baseline/Endline Monitoring | Recurring monitoring | Qualitative monitoring | Quantitative monitoring | Other |
|                                                          | Resilience Response: Small herders use savings to respond to shocks and stresses | | Baseline/Endline Monitoring | Recurring monitoring | Qualitative monitoring | Quantitative monitoring | Other |
|                                                          | Resilience Capacity: Small herders continuously deposit savings into the bank (demand deposit accounts) | | Baseline/Endline Monitoring | Recurring monitoring | Qualitative monitoring | Quantitative monitoring | Other |
|                                                          | Resilience Capacity: Herder coops & MSMEs access improved loan products | | Baseline/Endline Monitoring | Recurring monitoring | Qualitative monitoring | Quantitative monitoring | Other |
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Resilience MEL for Complex Programs
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Overview

Introduction to Complex Programs

- MEL Requirements
- What Works and Challenges
- Apolou, FSP and PAHAL-Mercy Corps
- BRACED-Blumont
- Key Takeaways
- Poll
Complex Programs

Mercy Corps has more stringent programming requirements for programs which it deems “Complex”:

- $10 + million budget
- Multiple partners
- Operate in complex environments
- Have more rigorous MEL requirements

These programs have seen both technical and operational successes and challenges.
**Complex Programs**

The following programs have implemented resilience MEL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Community Initiatives for Resilience to Climate Extremes (BRACED)</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>$7 million, DFID funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja Food and Nutrition Security Activity (Apolou)</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>$37 million, USAID funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Agriculture, Health, and Alternative Livelihoods (PAHAL)</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>$37 million, USAID funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kivu Food Security Project (FSP)</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>$32 million, USAID Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEL and Complex Programs

Requirements

- 3-5 components
- Monitoring, Evaluation and Research activities
- TOC, Logframe
- Indicators (25-140)
- Beneficiary tracking
- Multiple MEL partners sometime with competing priorities
Key Factors for Integration of Resilience FSP and Apolou

What Works:

- Participatory STRESS
- Dissemination of STRESS findings
- Resilience capacity outcomes mapped to existing TOC/Logframe
- Result Frameworks/Chains
- Resilience Indicators
- Post–Shock/Stress monitoring
- Baseline and Endline Surveys
Key Factors for Integration of Resilience FSP and Apolou

Challenges:

- MEL Plan at design vs. start-up
- Adequate budget for MEL
- Adequate staffing
- Competing priorities for teams including donor deliverables and requirements
- Disconnect between technical team and MEL team
- Planning for “learning”
### Outcome and Output Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome and Output Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of beneficiaries who believe that those responsible for conflict management in their area are able to prevent and/or resolve conflicts, shocks and stresses in their community.</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP 47: Number of people gaining access to basic drinking water services as a result of USG assistance</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP 21: Percentage of farmers who used financial services (savings, agricultural credit, and/or agricultural insurance) in the past 12 months (BL + 20%)</td>
<td>BL/FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of beneficiaries reporting that civil society organizations are actively working to solve community needs</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of men/women who believe they can influence decisions of local government officials or customary/traditional leaders at the local level</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resilience Indicators

- At farm and hill level, changes in soil quality and erosion
- How many farms are affected by crop pests/disease, the extent of crop pests/diseases on their production, and related losses
- At HH and community level, events of crop theft and estimated losses
- At HH and community level, instances of land conflict and insecurity
- Among producer groups and targeted businesses, instances of perceived unfair, illegal or non transparent tax levying
- Instances of illnesses from waterborne disease at HH level; or, for serious outbreaks, extent of affected HHs at community level.
BRACED MALI – Resilience to Climate Shocks

Refine and Implement Phase Critical – 6 months

• Conducted Resilience Profile Assessment
• Shared findings with key stakeholders
• Revised activities, indicators and targets
• Budgeted for piloting of index and post shock monitoring
Composite Socio-Economic Index Score/Resilience

Components

• Capacities (income diversifications, access to education, employment)
• Access to basic services
• Assets
• Food security

Partners

Humanitarian Response and Development Lab at USC and Mercy Corps

• Assessment
• Post shock/stress monitoring
• Baseline and Endline
PAHAL

Team Structure and Operations

Barriers – Implementing in Silos

Knowledge/skills

• Joint work planning
• Lack of vision of what integrated workplan requires

Management Priorities

• Hierarchical planning
• Senior and MEL management team turnover

Operational systems and structures

• Donor candidate approval processes
• Siloed activities led to community overloads
PAHAL

Team Structure and Operations

Solutions

Hired sector managers – ecosystems, social systems, etc.

Each group has a manager; work planning happens within group

- Training to assist staff in visualizing joint work planning and practicing - a lot of team-led innovation

- Visualization exercises - sectoral managers discussed together. Identified nexus points; used this process for activity and work planning

- Experienced MEL manager
Resilience MEL

Key Steps for Complex Programs

1. Management support for integrated team!
2. Resilience approach embedded in all phases
3. Adequate budget and staff for MEL
4. Lessons learned from refine and implement phase
5. Involvement of critical stakeholders
6. Building digestible results frameworks
7. NOT reinventing the wheel: use existing indicators, secondary data, etc.
8. Planning and budgeting for learning activities including after action reviews, quarterly data reviews reflection sessions
Thank You
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Thank You
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