



USAID | **NEPAL**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Project Annual Performance Report April – September 2015

Date: October 30, 2015

Version: Draft Final

Award Number: AID-367-C-15-00001

Activity Start Date and End Date: April 15, 2015 – April 14, 2020

Submitted by: **CAMRIS International**
6931 Arlington Road, Suite 575
Bethesda, MD 20814
Tel: 301-770-6000
www.camris.com

The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of CAMRIS International and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADS	Automated Directives System
AO	Agreement Officer
AOR	Agreement Officer's Representative
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
CO	Contracting Officer
COP	Chief of Party
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
CRP	Community Resilience Program
DO	Development Objective
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
EGRP	Early Grade Reading Program
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
GIS	Geographic Information System
IGP	Integrated Governance Project
IMET	Integrated M&E Team
IP	Implementing Partner
IR	Intermediate Result
KISAN	Knowledge-based Integrated Sustainable Agriculture and Nutrition
KM	Knowledge Management
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PIRS	Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
PITT	Performance Indicator Tracking Table
PMP	Performance Management Plan
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Contents

List of Abbreviations	ii
Contents	iii
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Annual Performance.....	4
Progress toward achievement of purpose	4
Progress toward completion of outputs and deliverables	4
Progress of indicators against targets	5
Major Activities	10
List of deliverables and outputs	10
Coordination and Collaboration	16
Challenges and Looking Ahead	17
Plan for the Next Quarter	18
Annex A: Self-Assessment of M&E Competencies and KM Practices of USAID/Nepal Program Staff	22
Annex B: Self-Assessment of M&E Processes of USAID/ Nepal’s Implementing Partners and M&E Competencies of their Technical Staff.....	26
Annex C: Proposed MEL Project Summary Performance Indicator Tracking Table	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) project is to support the achievement of USAID/Nepal's Country Development Cooperation Strategy Development Objectives (DOs) by assisting the mission in planning, designing, conducting, disseminating, and learning from more rigorous monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of development activities. This includes designing and implementing both quantitative and qualitative evaluations and assessments as well as providing expert analysis and technical assistance to USAID/Nepal's programs.

USAID/Nepal uses the products and deliverables from the MEL project to 1) facilitate informed program management, 2) shape the longer-term strategic direction of programs and decision making within the mission, and 3) enable USAID/Nepal to comply with Agency accountability and M&E requirements.

During the reporting period, natural disasters, political protests, strikes, blockades and other events beyond control of the project have posed challenges to MEL project implementation. On April 25, 2015, 10 days after the MEL contract was effective, Nepal experienced a major and deadly earthquake registering 7.9 on the Richter scale, followed by hundreds of powerful aftershocks, causing more than 9,000 fatalities, 23,000 injuries and significant loss of property. These events were followed by numerous strikes and conflict relating to approval of Nepal's constitution, then a blockade of the border with India, causing major disruptions in the availability of fuel and other essential imports.

Although these disruptions caused some delays in implementation—and have occasioned an amendment formally delaying some deliverables—the MEL project was able to hire all senior staff, open its project office, and establish administrative and financial procedures as planned. The project also completed and delivered its first annual work plan along with the corresponding M&E plan, as well as a comprehensive review of the mission's performance management plan (PMP).

Under the leadership of USAID Agreement and Contracting Officer's Representatives (AOR/CORs), MEL project staff also carried out routine activity M&E plan reviews, data quality assessments and technical support to the mission's DO teams across a range of M&E needs.

During the reporting period, the MEL project initiated a capacity assessment of the professional M&E skills and knowledge of technical staff from both the mission and from among its implementing partners (IPs), based on both online self-assessments and interviews with cognizant USAID personnel.

The project also completed preliminary design of the Early Grade Reading Program impact evaluation and initiated a mid-term performance evaluation of the Knowledge-based Integrated Sustainable Agriculture and Nutrition project.

The project also initiated a comprehensive assessment of the knowledge management practices of USAID/Nepal and its IPs and hosted workshops on resilience to natural, political, and economic shocks and stresses, advising the mission on revisions to its PMP from a resilience lens.

This is a report on the MEL project's performance in fiscal year 2015, from project inception in April through the end of September. Following an introduction, the report presents a summary of the MEL project's performance in terms of achievement of its purpose, completion of outputs and deliverables, and indicators of progress.

The report then discusses MEL project coordination and collaboration, some of the challenges it faces looking ahead and the status of its budgeted expenditures. A final section presents the project plan for the first quarter of the coming fiscal year.

Annexes A and B present online questionnaires utilized for the first MEL annual survey conducted in September 2015. Annex C presents a proposed revision to the Summary Performance Indicator Tracking Table for the MEL project, incorporating the results of the first MEL annual survey.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) project is to support the achievement of USAID/Nepal's Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) Development Objectives (DOs) by assisting the mission in planning, designing, conducting, disseminating, and learning from more rigorous monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of development activities. This includes designing and implementing both quantitative and qualitative evaluations and assessments as well as providing expert analysis and technical assistance to USAID/Nepal's programs.

The MEL project also supports the mission to measure the effectiveness of its efforts to promote gender equality and inclusion of persons with disabilities, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex individuals, and historically disadvantaged caste and ethnic groups.

USAID/Nepal uses the products and deliverables from the MEL project to 1) facilitate informed program management, 2) shape the longer-term strategic direction of programs and decision-making within the mission, and 3) enable USAID/Nepal to comply with Agency accountability and M&E requirements.

The MEL project has three Components as outlined below:

Component 1: Support greater rigor and coherence in USAID/Nepal's M&E efforts

- Provide technical assistance for the performance management plan (PMP) and project- and activity-level M&E plans.
- Strengthen the capacity of USAID/Nepal staff to conduct M&E tasks and use data effectively.
- Strengthen the performance monitoring capacity of USAID/Nepal implementing partners (IPs).

Component 2: Design and conduct analyses, evaluations, surveys, studies, and assessments

- Conduct performance and impact evaluations.
- Conduct surveys, studies, assessments, and analyses.

Component 3: Support improved knowledge management within the mission

- Assist the mission to improve its knowledge management (KM) practices—including use of AIDTracker Plus or other USAID performance monitoring or KM systems.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE

Progress toward achievement of purpose

The initial stages of MEL project initiation were marked by a strong earthquake with a magnitude of 7.9 on the Richter scale, which jolted Nepal on April 25, 2015, followed by another earthquake with a magnitude of 7.8 on May 12, 2015. These two major earthquakes were followed by hundreds of powerful aftershocks that caused severe damage to several historical buildings and more than 9,000 casualties throughout the country. In subsequent months, Nepal suffered numerous strikes and conflict relating to approval of its constitution, followed by a blockade of the border with India, causing major disruptions in the availability of fuel and other essential imports.

Although these events caused some delays in project start up and a contract amendment postponing some deliverables, the MEL project was able to operationalize and initiate tasks and subtasks under all three Components during the final two quarters of fiscal year (FY) 2015. Following the earthquake, CAMRIS International immediately signaled to the mission that the MEL project stood ready to assist in whatever was required to plan for earthquake recovery. By the end of the first quarter, the project was responding to the mission's needs for realignment of its PMP to accomplish this, utilizing a resilience lens.

Progress toward completion of outputs and deliverables

Despite the challenges posed by these natural disasters and political and economic disruptions, the MEL project was initiated successfully. Within the first quarter, the project hired all senior staff, opened its permanent office, and established administrative and financial procedures. The MEL project's first annual work plan and its corresponding M&E plan were completed and delivered on schedule, and MEL technical work proceeded within all three Components as planned.

Highlights of MEL project activities performed during the period under review, by component, are as follows:

Component 1. The MEL technical team completed a comprehensive review of the mission's PMP and discussed its findings, conclusions, and recommendations with both the Program Office and DO teams. In addition, under the guidance of the responsible AOR/CORs, MEL project staff conducted reviews of the M&E plans of five of the mission's IPs.

The MEL project also implemented online self-assessments of the professional M&E competencies of mission staff (**Annex A**) as well as of points of contact from among its IPs (**Annex B**) as part of the first MEL annual survey.

Component 2: The MEL technical team initiated the Early Grade Reading Program (EGRP) impact evaluation with a comprehensive draft evaluation design. The project

also initiated a mid-term performance evaluation of the Knowledge-based Integrated Sustainable Agriculture and Nutrition (KISAN) activity and provided peer reviews of statements of work for a mid-term evaluation of the Health for Life (H4L) activity and other studies and evaluations planned by the DO teams.

Component 3. The MEL project initiated a comprehensive assessment of the existing KM capacity of mission staff, including a preliminary assessment of the tools and practices, both in use and needed by the mission. In addition, the project hosted a series of workshops for mission and IP staff designed to review and make recommendations for potential adjustments to the mission’s PMP from the perspective of promoting absorptive, adaptive, and transformative resilience to natural, political, and economic shocks and stresses.

Progress of indicators against targets

The MEL project’s M&E plan was submitted as a project deliverable within 60 days of project initiation. The following table illustrates the progress made against achievement of targets in the project M&E plan during the first five months of project implementation.

It is expected that the MEL project M&E plan will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 to reflect the MEL annual survey conducted in September 2015 and other planned adjustments as reflected in the table under the heading “Status Report.”

Annex C presents a proposed revision to the MEL project’s Summary Performance Indicator Tracking Table (PITT), incorporating the results of the first MEL annual survey and other proposed adjustments to indicators and targets, for review and approval by the COR.

Result	Indicator Type	Verification / Data Source	Year 1 Targets (4/15 – 3/16)	Achievements to Date (9/15)	Status Report
Objective: Knowledge dissemination and learning support strong planning, designing, and implementation					
Extent to which USAID/Nepal program exhibits strong planning, designing, and implementation based on MEL project interventions	Outcome	Mid-term and end-of-project evaluations	-	-	The project intends to carry out both mid-term and end-of-project performance evaluations to address the extent to which this objective has been met.

Result	Indicator Type	Verification / Data Source	Year 1 Targets (4/15 – 3/16)	Achievements to Date (9/15)	Status Report
Intermediate Result (IR) 1: USAID achieves rigorous and coherent performance monitoring					
IR 1.1: Percent of USAID/Nepal program staff using data for programmatic improvements	Outcome	MEL Annual Survey	Baseline	-	The project will revise the baseline for this indicator in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect MEL annual survey results.
IR 1.2: Number of ADS-compliant project M&E plans reviewed and updated (annual)	Outcome	Project Monitoring System	0	-	The definition of this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to include PMP reviews and updates.
Sub-IR 1.1.1: Number of ADS-compliant, mission-approved activity M&E plans (annual)	Output	Project Monitoring System	20	5	The number of activity M&E plan reviews depends on the number submitted by the mission for the project to review.
Sub-IR 1.1.2: Number of USAID staff who know how to select quality performance indicators and establish realistic performance targets (cumulative)	Output	Capacity-building pre- and post-tests	35	-	The definition, source, and baseline for this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect the results of the MEL annual survey.
Sub-IR 1.2.1: Number of USAID staff who complete experiential training as per	Output	Project Monitoring System	25	-	The definition, source, and baseline for this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect the results of the M&E Capacity Building Assessment and Training Plan.

Result	Indicator Type	Verification / Data Source	Year 1 Targets (4/15 – 3/16)	Achievements to Date (9/15)	Status Report
capacity building plans (annually)					
Sub-IR 1.2.2: Number of IP staff who complete experiential training as per capacity building plans (annually)	Output	Project Monitoring System	0	-	The definition, source, and baseline for this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect the results of the M&E Capacity Building Assessment and Training Plan.
Sub-IR 1.3.1: Number of regularly scheduled DQAs completed	Output	Project Monitoring System	11	-	DQAs planned to be conducted in August/September of 2015 were postponed due to security concerns.
IR 2: USAID has rigorous evaluations, studies and assessments					
IR 2.1: Percent of evaluations with recommendations that have been applied (measured 6 months after completion)	Outcome	Data use plan tracking	0 percent	-	The definition, source and baseline for this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect the results of the MEL annual survey.
IR 2.2: Percent of studies with recommendations that have been applied (measured 6 months after completion)	Outcome	Data use plan tracking	0 percent	-	The definition, source and baseline for this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect the results of the MEL survey.
Sub-IR 2.1.1: Number of impact evaluations designed /	Output	Data use plan tracking	3	-	The EGRP impact evaluation has been initiated and the baseline survey is scheduled for February 2016; discussions continue on design of two other impact

Result	Indicator Type	Verification / Data Source	Year 1 Targets (4/15 – 3/16)	Achievements to Date (9/15)	Status Report
initiated with baseline surveys					evaluations planned for initiation in the first project year.
Sub-IR 2.1.2: Number of impact evaluations completed	Output	Data use plan tracking		-	No impact evaluations are scheduled for completion during the project year.
Sub-IR 2.1.3: Number of performance evaluations completed	Output	Project Monitoring System	1	-	The KISAN mid-term performance evaluation was initiated during September 2015.
Sub-IR 2.2.1: Number of surveys, assessments and studies completed	Output	Project Monitoring System	1	-	The COR has informed the project that the Government of Nepal capacity development analysis will not be performed as scheduled during the first project year.
IR 3: USAID has knowledge that supports planning, execution and learning					
IR 3.1: Percent of USAID staff who report using the M&E/KM system for decision making	Outcome	MEL annual survey	Baseline	-	The project carried out the annual survey in September 2015 and will revise the baseline for this indicator in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect survey results.
Sub-IR 3.1.1: Percent of registered users who use the M&E/KM system	Output	KM application logs	Baseline	-	The baseline will be calculated after the online M&E/KM system applications are designed to accompany AIDTracker Plus.
Sub-IR 3.2.1: Proportion of approved KM assessment recommendation	Output	Project Monitoring System	0	-	The definition, source, and baseline for this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to

Result	Indicator Type	Verification / Data Source	Year 1 Targets (4/15 – 3/16)	Achievements to Date (9/15)	Status Report
s fully implemented					reflect the results of the MEL annual survey.
Sub-IR 3.3.1: Percent of portfolio reviews including analysis beyond indicator frequencies (i.e. analyzing how indicators relate)	Outcome	Portfolio reviews	33.4 percent	-	The definition, source and baseline for this indicator will be revised in Q1 FY 2016 in consultation with the COR to reflect the results of the MEL annual survey.

MAJOR ACTIVITIES

List of deliverables and outputs

The following table illustrates the MEL project's reports and deliverables due and completed during the period April – September 2015, along with explanatory notes as appropriate.

Work Plan Component/Task Number	Description	Date Due	Completed (Y/N)	Status/ Date Completed	Notes
N/A	First annual work plan	6/15	Y		Amendment 1 postponed several deliverables, and the MEL work plan was revised on August 11 to reflect those changes.
N/A	Finalized M&E plan	6/15	Y		
N/A	Emergency preparedness and response plan	7/15	Y		
1.1.1	PMP review	8/15	Y		
2.1.1	Initiation of EGRP impact evaluation	5/15	Y		The impact evaluation was initiated through submission of a draft evaluation design for implementation in collaboration with the EGRP IP.
N/A	Quarterly report	8/15	Y		

Results achieved by the MEL project within each Component, by task and subtask, during FY 2015, are presented in detail below. Project activities planned for implementation in the first quarter of FY 2016 are presented in a subsequent section.

Component 1: Support greater rigor and coherence in USAID/Nepal's M&E efforts

- **Subtask 1.1.1: Conduct PMP review.** As part of the MEL project mandate to support greater rigor and coherence in USAID/Nepal's M&E efforts, the MEL team reviewed the mission's 2014 – 2019 PMP (revised April 2015). The team employed a number of tools and techniques that included assessing related documents, developing and using a review checklist, and meeting with each DO team along with Program Office staff and members of the Integrated M&E Team (IMET) to cross-check preliminary findings and conclusions.

The review examined the appropriateness and feasibility of indicators at the Goal, DO and IR levels. The concept of appropriateness was assessed according to the mission's development hypothesis at each level and the concept of feasibility was assessed according to a review of the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) for each indicator. The team also reviewed the status of baseline data collection for all PMP indicators.

- **Subtask 1.1.2: Conduct review of project- and activity-level M&E Plans.** The COR identified five activity-level M&E plans for review. Under the leadership of the responsible AOR/CORs, the MEL team reviewed M&E plans of the EGRP, Sajhedari Bikas, KISAN, H4L and Suaahara projects during the reporting period. To standardize the process across all reviews, the team developed and standardized an M&E plan review checklist, which guided an examination of the types of indicators put forward within the M&E plans, and made suggestions for adjustments or clarifications, as needed. As part of this process, MEL staff also reviewed USAID guidance (ADS 205) on gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) indicators and assessed GESI integration into the activity-level M&E plans reviewed.
- **Subtask 1.1.3: Conduct assessment of IP M&E processes and capacity.** The MEL technical team designed a tool for the assessment of IP M&E processes and capacity and implemented this with two of the mission's selected IPs—Hariyo Ban project and Suaahara project—during the reporting period. Although the plan was to make field visits to several IPs to conduct the assessment, led by the responsible AOR/CORs, these were postponed by the mission due to security concerns. Later field visits were restricted by nationwide fuel shortages. Nonetheless, an online self-assessment tool was useful in determining strengths and gaps in IP M&E processes and capacity from the perspective of IP staff members. (See **Annex B**.)
- **Subtask 1.1.4: Provide ongoing support to review of M&E plans.** Intended as a follow-on to subtask 1.1.2, no actions were scheduled to occur under this subtask in FY 2015.
- **Subtask 1.2.1: Assess USAID and IP M&E competencies.** The MEL technical team developed self-assessment M&E competency questionnaires (**Annexes A and B**) to assess the M&E knowledge and skills of mission and IP staff. The online self-assessment tool was forwarded to 45 mission staff and 47 IP staff to identify strengths that can be built on as well as gaps that need to be addressed through capacity building. The response rates from mission and IP staff were 49 and 66

percent, respectively. The results of the online survey were tabulated and analyzed under the guidance of a senior M&E advisor, who also discussed the results with DO teams and Program Office representatives to cross-check and verify the preliminary findings and conclusions derived from the online self-assessment.

- **Subtask 1.2.2: Develop M&E training plan for mission and IP staff.** Under the leadership of the senior M&E advisor, the MEL technical team analyzed the results of the M&E competency self-assessments and prepared a multi-tiered M&E training plan to build the M&E capacity of mission and IP staff over the MEL life-of-project.
- **Subtask 1.2.3: Develop M&E training syllabus and course modules.** With the COR's concurrence, it was decided to delay forwarding the M&E training syllabus and training materials for the two course modules to be offered in the first project year until after the M&E training plan was reviewed and approved by USAID.
- **Subtask 1.2.4: Conduct M&E training for USAID and IP staff.** No actions were planned under this subtask during the reporting period.
- **Subtask 1.2.5: Develop and maintain online M&E experiential learning portal.** No actions were planned under this subtask during the reporting period.
- **Subtask 1.3.1: Assess mission Geographic Information System (GIS) use.** The COR requested that the GIS assessment should be postponed to coincide with finalization of the KM assessment in the first quarter of FY 2016. The MEL project recruited a senior GIS specialist to perform the GIS assessment under the supervision of the KM advisor implementing Component 3 activities in order for the GIS assessment's findings, recommendations, and conclusions to better inform the KM assessment.
- **Subtask 1.3.2: Support USAID staff in the conduct of Data Quality Assessments (DQAs).** The MEL technical team adapted standardized USAID checklists for the conduct of DQAs. Although the plan was to conduct several field visits to conduct DQAs under the leadership of the responsible AOR/CORs during the reporting period, these were postponed due to security concerns, followed by fuel shortages.
- **Subtask 1.3.3: Support mission's migration to AIDTracker Plus.** This subtask was postponed at USAID's request until the second quarter of FY 2016.
- **Subtask 1.3.4: Assist USAID in preparation of annual performance report.** In consultation with the COR, the MEL technical team modified the PITT templates used by the mission to collect data/information from its IPs. The modified PITTs were sent by the mission to the respective IPs for reporting the progress they have made during FY 2015. The data collected through the modified PITTs will be analyzed to examine trends, results, progress made against various indicators, and the overall performance of IPs in meeting program objectives. The MEL technical

team will submit the analysis/report to the mission for use in the preparation of annual performance reports by the respective DOs and program units, as relevant.

Component 2: Design and conduct analyses, evaluations, surveys, studies, and assessments

- **Task 2.1: Performance and impact evaluations.** MEL technical staff held a series of meetings with each of the three DO teams to discuss their performance and impact evaluation needs during the project year. On the request of the COR, the project initiated a mid-term performance evaluation of the KISAN project. CAMRIS International recruited the team leader, while New ERA, a national organization, was selected to provide the other evaluation team members, including deputy team leader/agriculture specialist, GESI specialist, research coordinator, and field researchers. Evaluation kickoff meetings were held in late September 2015.
- **Subtask 2.1.1: Initiate EGRP impact evaluation.** The MEL team met with the DO 3 education team and EGRP leadership to define the EGRP impact evaluation. USAID determined that impact evaluation data collection would be integrated into the baseline, midline, and endline surveys to be conducted by the EGRP, utilizing the services of its subcontractor New ERA, with appropriate controls exerted by the MEL project over selection of control and treatment groups. The MEL team will also oversee the impact evaluation survey team and take the lead in data analysis. Accordingly, subsequent meetings were conducted with the DO 3 education team and EGRP to articulate the evaluation questions, methods to address them and data limitations pertaining to each.

Under the leadership of the EGRP impact evaluation team leader, the MEL technical team finalized an impact evaluation design including methodology, evaluation questions, sample size and other factors. A report outlining the IE design was submitted to the mission for comment. As an outcome of the series of interactions held among the respective organizations, a working group consisting of representatives of EGRP, the MEL evaluation team and USAID was formed to coordinate operationalization of the impact evaluation. The first meeting of the working group was held at the MEL project office to discuss the impact evaluation design report prepared by the MEL evaluation team and identify issues that needed to be resolved for the smooth operationalization of the EGRP baseline survey scheduled in February 2016.

- **Subtask 2.1.2: Initiate Community Resilience Program (CRP) impact evaluation.** Many meetings and interactions were held with the DO 2 team regarding the planned CRP impact evaluation. The outcome of the numerous discussions was that the DO 2 team informed the MEL project that it has decided not to go forward with an impact evaluation of the CRP.
- **Subtask 2.1.3: Initiate Integrated Governance Project (IGP) impact evaluation.** As a result of several meetings with the DO 1 team, it was determined that an impact

evaluation may not be feasible for the IGP, and instead a mixed-methods approach may be more appropriate. It was determined that a desk study should be conducted to identify research options to tackle the question of how governance affects economic development in Nepal. The desk study, followed by research definition and design, will be undertaken in the first quarter of FY 2016.

- **Subtask 2.1.4: Conduct H4L mid-term evaluation.** The MEL technical team met with the representatives of the DO 3 team devoted to the health sector and were informed that a mid-term performance evaluation would be needed as soon as possible. As a follow-up to the meeting, the COR forwarded a draft of the scope of work to the MEL team for peer review. Upon receipt of the scope of work, the MEL project began recruitment for the evaluation team. The evaluation is expected to begin in the first quarter of FY 2016.
- **Task 2.2: Surveys, studies and sector assessments.** At the request of the DO 1 team, the MEL team provided a technical review of the questionnaire of the planned Inclusive Democracy and Governance survey scheduled to be implemented by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago in September 2015. Also, the Chief of Party (COP) and Deputy COP met with the COR and the mission's Communications Officer to offer a peer review of the scope of work for the Private Sector Landscape analysis in the context of anticipated earthquake recovery assistance.

Component 3: Support improved knowledge management within the Mission

- **Subtask 3.1.1: Assess mission's KM tools and practices.** The KM advisor was recruited and mobilized to lead Component 3 activities, beginning with the KM assessment, delivery of which was re-scheduled to occur in the first quarter of FY 2016. The MEL work plan has integrated some relevant tasks from other components into the KM assessment, including subtask 1.3.1—an assessment of the mission's use of GIS—and subtask 1.3.3—integration of AIDTracker Plus into the mission's programming systems. The KM advisor performed a first-round assessment of existing KM practices, the use and relevance of KM, and the strengths and gaps in KM capacity of the mission staff.

The MEL team also met with USAID/Nepal's earthquake recovery team, which requested support in reviewing and realigning the mission's PMP to incorporate planning for earthquake recovery funding under the rubric of "resilience."

Subsequently, the MEL technical team, led by a senior M&E advisor, organized a roundtable discussion with selected IPs to discuss their success stories in coping with the effects of the recent earthquake and aftershocks. Following this roundtable discussion, two resilience workshops were facilitated by the MEL team, under the leadership of a senior resilience expert, for both mission and IP staff. Outcomes of these events included resilience success stories collected from IPs and integrated resilience workshop notes that the KM advisor presented to the mission's resilience

team, along with findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and an action plan for the recalibration of the PMP indicators utilizing a resilience lens.

- **Subtask 3.1.2: Prepare and submit for approval draft work plan to implement assessment recommendations.** No actions were planned under this subtask during the reporting period. It is scheduled for completion after the KM assessment is submitted for approval.
- **Subtask 3.1.3: Prepare and submit for approval training plan, syllabus, trainer's manual, and course references for training needed to carry out work plan.** No actions were planned under this subtask during the reporting period. It is scheduled for completion after the KM assessment and work plan are both submitted for approval.
- **Subtask 3.1.4: Implement KM work plan and training plan.** No actions were planned under this subtask during the reporting period. Implementation of the KM work plan and training plan will commence following their approval by the COR.
- **Subtask 3.1.5: Prepare annual KM report.** No actions were planned under this subtask during the reporting period.
- **Subtask 3.1.6: Facilitate learning summits.** Although no learning summits were planned under this subtask during the reporting period, two brown bag sessions were hosted by the MEL project during the period under review. The first was facilitated by the KM advisor on her KM and M&E experience in Afghanistan. The session was attended by 17 professionals representing the mission, IPs, and the MEL project. The second brownbag event was facilitated by the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, a partner of the MEL project, on the use and relevance of GIS in project management.
- **Subtask 3.1.7: Conduct annual KM survey.** During the reporting period, MEL project staff refined the KM indicators in the project's M&E plan, designed related MEL annual survey questions, and analysed survey responses to document baseline conditions for the project's M&E plan.

COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION

The MEL technical team regularly scheduled and conducted ad hoc meetings with USAID/Nepal staff, including the COR, DO team leaders, and the Program Office. The MEL technical team worked in close coordination with the mission to seek inputs on the review of the mission's PMP; host workshops for recalibration of the PMP to reflect resilience measures; and conduct activity M&E plan reviews, DQAs, peer reviews of evaluation scopes of work, and other ongoing technical support to the mission and its IPs.

MEL project staff have also been actively coordinating and collaborating with mission and IP staff to assess the professional M&E capacity of both USAID and IP staff, the M&E processes of IPs, and the mission's KM practices. The MEL project has also collaborated effectively with USAID and IP personnel on the design of the EGRP impact evaluation and in planning and initiating the KISAN project mid-term performance evaluation, as well as in organizing roundtable discussions for collection of success stories on resilience and hosting brown bag sessions on topics of interest to the USAID community.

CHALLENGES AND LOOKING AHEAD

As a result of the earthquakes beginning in April 2015 and subsequent aftershocks, there were some delays in employing MEL core staff as well as in entering a lease agreement for and equipping the MEL project office. Several project deliverables were postponed under Amendment 1 to the MEL contract.

After the release of the country's constitution in late September, the country has been experiencing political disturbances, including strikes due to conflicts among the political parties. The Terai region of Nepal has been under rolling strikes for more than two months, followed by a blockade on imports at the Indian border that has affected the availability of essential products such as fuels, food supplies, and medicines.

During the period under review, mobility inside the country has been seriously curtailed due to both security concerns and fuel shortages, resulting in the inability to make planned field visits to do some of the project activities such as assessment of M&E processes and capacity of IP staff and the conduct of scheduled DQAs. The prices of commodities, including those needed for basic consumption, have also skyrocketed. These restrictions, if not relieved, may seriously curtail in coming weeks and months the project's ability to conduct field work for performance and impact evaluations and even to carry on normal business in the nation's capital.

The MEL project recognizes that, in response to changes in circumstances and programming, project activities, tasks, and subtasks must be responsive to changes in the mission's needs and requirements for technical support. This has been reflected, for example, in the responsiveness of the project to the mission's request to conduct a series of tasks relating to recalibration of the PMP to incorporate resilience in response to natural, political, or economic shocks and stresses. It is also reflected in the responsiveness of the project to continuously evolving plans for the conduct of impact and performance evaluations and studies for the mission, and to the need for adjustments in the scheduling of tasks and subtasks requiring field work in response to security concerns and fuel shortages.

MEL project staff will continue to work with the COR to ensure that, while remaining responsive to evolving circumstances, the project is able to conduct sufficient forward planning to continue to provide high-quality products to the mission, on time and on budget.

PLAN FOR THE NEXT QUARTER

The plan for each MEL project component for the upcoming quarter is as follows:

Component 1: Support greater rigor and coherence in USAID/Nepal's M&E efforts

- **Subtask 1.1.1: Conduct PMP review.** This subtask was completed during FY 2015.
- **Subtask 1.1.2: Conduct review of project- and activity-level M&E plans.** This subtask was completed during FY 2015; ongoing MEL project support to the review of M&E plans will be provided under subtask 1.1.4.
- **Subtask 1.1.3: Conduct assessment of IP M&E processes and capacity.** The MEL technical team members will participate in field visits led by the respective AOR/CORs to assess the M&E processes and capacity of IPs. The MEL project will work with the AOR/CORs and the Program Office's M&E team to review the data collection methodologies, approaches, and other related documentation of selected IPs to ensure that results and indicators are aligned with those of the mission, definitions are clear, and data reporting formats are standardized to streamline data collection and entry. Taking into account security and fuel shortage restrictions on field travel, as discussed with the COR, these visits will focus on IPs with headquarters in Kathmandu.
- **Subtask 1.1.4: Provide ongoing support to review of M&E plans.** MEL technical staff will continue to support AOR/CORs in the review of the M&E plans of USAID's IPs on an as-needed basis, utilizing the checklists and procedures developed under subtask 1.1.2. The project will also review project (DO)-level M&E plans or Project Appraisal Documents forwarded by the COR.
- **Subtask 1.2.1: Assess USAID and IP M&E competencies.** The MEL project will forward to the COR for review a draft assessment of USAID and IP M&E competencies, taking into account both the MEL annual survey (**Annexes A and B**) and discussions with cognizant USAID staff, with recommendations for a multi-tiered M&E training plan.
- **Subtask 1.2.2: Develop M&E training plan for mission and IP staff.** The project will forward a draft M&E Capacity Building Assessment and Training Plan covering life-of-project for review by the mission and finalize the training plan in response to comments received.
- **Subtask 1.2.3: Develop M&E training syllabus and course modules.** Based on the mission's review and approval of the M&E Capacity Building Assessment and Training Plan, the MEL project will assemble and adapt course materials for the two course modules in M&E topics to be delivered in the final quarters of the project year. These materials will be customized and adapted for the Nepal context, emphasizing experiential learning, or learning by doing, and will be reinforced with

online training materials. The course materials will include a syllabus, a participants' manual, and course references.

- **Subtask 1.3.1: Assess mission GIS Use.** A senior GIS specialist will be hired to meet with DO team leaders, AOR/CORs and the Program Office staff, including the GIS specialist, to assess both the use and relevance of GIS within the mission and the potential for developing GIS as a tool to enhance KM and learning. This subtask will be fully integrated with subtask 3.1.1—an assessment of the mission's KM tools and practices—which will include forward planning for an integrated information system to improve KM and learning.
- **Subtask 1.3.2: Support USAID staff in the conduct of DQAs.** MEL technical team members will continue to support responsible AOR/CORs in the conduct of scheduled DQAs, utilizing a standardized DQA checklist, and will conduct on-the-job DQA training of the staff of IPs and their sub-awardees as the opportunity arises.
- **Subtask 1.3.3: Support mission's migration to AIDTracker Plus.** On the understanding that AIDTracker Plus will be integrated into mission programming during the second quarter of FY 2016, the MEL technical team will develop a draft scope of work for support of that integration that will involve the following deliverables:
 - Desk review of USAID's experiences with AIDTracker Plus in the six countries in which it has been implemented;
 - Participation in AIDTracker Plus training;
 - AIDTracker Plus online training sessions for M&E officers from the mission's 30 IPs; and
 - Assistance to USAID in migration to AIDTracker Plus, taking into account findings from assessment of IP information systems (subtask 1.1.3), the GIS assessment (subtask 1.3.1), and the KM assessment (subtask 3.1.1).
- **Subtask 1.3.4: Assist USAID in preparation of annual performance report.** Working closely with the mission M&E Team, MEL staff will prepare an annual performance monitoring and data quality report for FY 2015 that analyzes and presents data on selected performance indicators included in the mission's PMP.

The report will note trends in the data reported and determine whether targets have been met and if project outputs and outcomes are consistent with changes identified in the mission's CDCS. The report will include analysis of changes in Nepal's development context and of cross-cutting indicators and assumptions, aggregate data, and trends. It is anticipated that the recent earthquakes and aftershocks in Nepal will have a huge impact on the country's development context.

The annual Performance Monitoring and Data Quality report will help the mission prepare for portfolio reviews, the Performance Plan and Report, and annual PMP updates. Until AIDTracker Plus is established, the report will be based on the

quarterly and annual reports from IPs and modified PITTs forwarded to the Program Office by the MEL project for circulation to IPs to report on standard indicators.

Component 2: Design and conduct analyses, evaluations, surveys, studies, and Assessments

- **Task 2.1: Performance and impact evaluations.** In addition to the evaluations already planned for the project year, the MEL project was asked by the COR to carry out a mid-term performance evaluation of the KISAN activity, a task that was begun in the final quarter of FY 2015 and that will continue during the first quarter of FY 2016. Responding to another special request from the COR, the MEL project will help the DO 3 education team to define a baseline study and mixed-methods approach for evaluation of the Zero Tolerance pilot program to address gender-based violence in Nepali schools.
- **Subtask 2.1.1: Initiate EGRP impact evaluation.** MEL project staff will continue to coordinate with the EGRP IP on preparation for the planned roll out in February 2016 of the baseline survey which will underpin the EGRP impact evaluation. The evaluation team leader will respond to any comments received from the mission on the draft impact evaluation design forwarded during the final quarter of FY 2015.
- **Subtask 2.1.2: Initiate CRP impact evaluation.** The MEL project will request that the COR provide written notification of the termination of this contract project deliverable. MEL project staff will continue to discuss with the DO 2 team concerning their projected evaluation and study needs, including those relating to the incorporation of resilience into mission programming.
- **Sub-task 2.1.3: Initiate IGP impact evaluation.** The MEL project will continue to work with the DO 1 team to design evaluation studies of the contribution of governance to economic development in Nepal, beginning with a desk study to be completed during the first quarter of FY 2016 that will be led by Vanderbilt University.
- **Subtask 2.1.4: Conduct H4L mid-term Evaluation.** Subject to the ability to travel to field destinations, the MEL project will initiate a mid-term evaluation of the H4L project during the first quarter of FY 2016.
- **Task 2.2: Surveys, studies, and sector assessments.** The MEL project will request formal notification from the COR that the contracted project deliverable to conduct an analysis of Government of Nepal capacity development in the first project year has been cancelled.

Component 3: Support improved knowledge management within the mission

The MEL project expects to receive mission comments on findings, conclusions, and recommendations, including an action plan for potential adjustments to the mission's

PMP from the perspective of promoting absorptive, adaptive, and transformative resilience to natural, political, and economic shocks and stresses. Once these are received, the MEL technical team will finalize a draft report with recommendations for follow-up actions to realign the PMP and incorporate resilience into mission programming.

- **Subtask 3.1.1: Assess mission's KM tools and practices.** The KM advisor will finalize an assessment of the mission's KM tools and practices, including institutional and informational challenges to effective KM within the mission. This will integrate the assessment of the mission's GIS use (subtask 1.3.1) and planning for integration of USAID/Nepal's reporting systems into AIDTracker Plus (sub-task 1.3.3). The full KM assessment will be delivered to USAID during the first quarter of FY 2016.
- **Subtask 3.1.2: Prepare and submit for approval draft work plan to implement assessment recommendations.** Within one month of submission of the KM assessment, the MEL project will prepare and submit for approval a draft work plan to implement assessment recommendations. This will:
 - Present the MEL project's KM team composition, level of effort, roles and responsibilities, and qualifications;
 - Identify any subcontractors, the level of effort of each, and the roles, responsibilities, and qualifications of each team member;
 - Present an implementation schedule/action plan;
 - Describe proposed mechanism(s) for mission input and feedback;
 - Present information on the logistics of work plan implementation;
 - Propose a deliverables schedule; and
 - Present an estimated budget for KM activities.
- **Subtask 3.1.3: Prepare and submit for approval training plan, syllabus, trainer's manual, and course references for training needed to carry out work plan.** No actions are planned under this subtask during the upcoming quarter. It is scheduled for completion after the KM assessment and work plan are both submitted for approval.
- **Subtask 3.1.4: Implement KM work plan and training plan.** There are no activities planned for implementation in the next quarter under this subtask.
- **Subtask 3.1.5: Prepare annual KM report.** There are no activities planned for implementation in the next quarter under this sub-task.
- **Subtask 3.1.6: Facilitate Learning Summits.** There are no activities planned for implementation in the next quarter under this subtask.
- **Subtask 3.1.7: Conduct annual KM survey.** There are no activities planned for implementation in the next quarter under this subtask.

ANNEX A: SELF-ASSESSMENT OF M&E COMPETENCIES AND KM PRACTICES OF USAID/NEPAL PROGRAM STAFF



This assessment is carried out by USAID/Nepal's Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Project. The purpose of the assessment is to understand the M&E competencies and KM practices of Mission staff. It is not intended to identify weaknesses of any particular staff member; instead, the findings of this assessment will be the basis for developing tools to strengthen the M&E and KM practices of Mission Staff.

The response to this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

1. What percentage of your time during the past year would you estimate was spent on M&E activities (*Monitoring, Evaluation, Data Analysis and Reporting, and Knowledge Management*)?
 - 75% - 100%
 - 50% - 75%
 - 25% - 50%
 - ≤ 25%
 - Don't KNOW

2. In which of these following M&E areas did you spend most of that time (**Please rank in order of time spent from 1 to 4, 1 being the most and 4 being the least**)
 - Monitoring
 - Evaluation
 - Data Analysis and Reporting
 - Knowledge Management

3. In which of these following M&E areas do you feel that you are competent? (**Please check those applicable**)
 - Monitoring
 - Evaluation
 - Data Analysis and Reporting
 - Knowledge Management

4. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to the following M&E foundation skills?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
-------	------	--------	-----

Active Listening	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process Facilitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participatory Practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ethics-guided M&E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Group Facilitation & Negotiation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Design and Implementation of Activity M&E Plan?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Designing an Activity M&E Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementing an Activity M&E Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Data Quality Assessment (DQA)?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Completing a DQA checklist	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conducting a DQA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Evaluation Planning and Management?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Evaluation Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drafting Evaluation Scope of Work and Evaluation Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation and Management of an Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Project Learning and Knowledge Management?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Using Data for Decision Making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Selecting Data for Planning and Design of Activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing an Action Plan for Knowledge Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilitating Data and Knowledge Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Please rank the following training approaches in terms of what works best for you?

Training approach	High	Med	Low
Formal Class Room Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
On the Job Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online Virtual Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. In which of the following areas would you be most interested in attending in formal class room training sessions?

Areas	Yes	No
1. Logical Framework Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Data Management and Reporting Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Research / Evaluation Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Others (please specify)		

11. Please rank your competency in the following areas:

Parameters	High	Med	Low
Definition of Quality Performance Indicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Setting Realistic Performance Targets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preparation of Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRSs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Have you used M&E data/results extracted from USAID/Nepal's M&E system for programmatic improvement during past year?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

13. If yes, please provide some examples below.

14. Have you used USAID/Nepal's M&E/KM system for decision making during the past year?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

15. If yes, please provide some examples below.

16. In your opinion, what percent of the recommendations from all the evaluations that have been implemented by USAID/Nepal during the past year, have been implemented within six months of completion of those evaluations?

- 75% - 100%
- 50% - 75%
- 25% - 50%
- ≤ 25%
- Don't Know

17. In your opinion, what percent of the recommendations from all the studies that have been implemented by USAID/Nepal during the past year have been implemented within six months of completion of those studies?

- 75% - 100%
- 50% - 75%
- 25% - 50%
- ≤ 25%
- Don't Know

18. Please discuss some of the major barriers you face in conducting M&E?

“THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME AND INPUTS”

ANNEX B: SELF-ASSESSMENT OF M&E PROCESSES OF USAID/ NEPAL'S IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS AND M&E COMPETENCIES OF THEIR TECHNICAL STAFF



This assessment is carried out by USAID/Nepal's Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Project. The purpose of this assessment is to understand the M&E processes of USAID/Nepal's Implementing Partners and the M&E competencies of technical staff members. It is not intended to identify strength or weakness of the particular IP in regards to their M&E processes and competencies of any particular staff member; instead, the findings of this assessment will be the basis for developing tools to further strengthen the M&E systems of the IPs as well as competencies of their staff.

The responses to this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

1. Does your project have an M&E plan? How many times has it been reviewed/ revised?
 - No
 - Yes (In the process of revision)
 - Yes (Revised once)
 - Yes (Revised twice)
 - Yes (Revised three or more times)

2. What type of Information Management System exists in your project? (**Please check those applicable**)
 - Portal-based data entry
 - Data entry into personal computer (e.g., Excel/Word/Access)
 - Partially computer based data entry/partially manual data entry/other

3. Has your project carried out Data Quality Assessments (DQAs) of sub-awardee indicators?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Planned for future

4. What reporting periodicity does your project follow? (**Please check those applicable**)
 - Monthly
 - Quarterly
 - Annually
 - Ad-hoc / As needed

5. Does your project M&E plan include some form of evaluation plan, including key questions to be addressed by future performance evaluations, and for carrying out a baseline study/survey?
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
6. In your opinion, what percent of the recommendations from all evaluations of your activity, implemented during the past year, have been implemented within six months of completion of those evaluations?
- 75% - 100%
 - 50% - 75%
 - 25% - 50%
 - ≤ 25%
 - None
 - Not Applicable (e.g., no evaluations performed during the past year)
7. Have you used M&E data/results extracted from your project M&E system for decision making during the past year?
- Yes
 - No
 - Not Applicable
8. If yes, please provide some example below.
9. What percentage of your time during the past year would you estimate was spent on M&E activities (*Monitoring, Evaluation, Data Management and Reporting Systems, and Project Learning*)?
- 75% - 100%
 - 50 to 75 %
 - 25 to 50 %
 - ≤ 25%
 - Don't Know
10. How many years of work experience have you had with M&E?
- None until now
 - Less than one year
 - One to two years
 - Two to five years
 - More than five years
11. In which of the following M&E areas did you spend most of your time (**Please rank in order of time spent from 1 to 4, 1 being the most and 4 being the least**)
- Monitoring
 - Evaluation

- Data Management and Reporting Systems
- Project Learning and Knowledge Management

12. Please rate your competency in the following M&E areas?

S n.	Areas	Competency Level		
		High	Medium	Low
1	Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Data Management and Reporting Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Project Learning and Knowledge Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to the following M&E foundation skills?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Active Listening	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Process Facilitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Participatory Practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ethics-guided M&E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Group Facilitation & Negotiation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Design and Implementation of Activity M&E Plan?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Designing an Activity M&E Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementing an Activity M&E Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Data Quality Assessment (DQA)?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
-------	------	--------	-----

Completing a DQA checklist	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conducting a DQA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Evaluation Planning and Management?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Evaluation Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drafting Evaluation Scope of Work and Evaluation Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation and Management of an Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. What is your level of confidence in carrying out tasks related to Project Learning and Knowledge Management?

Areas	High	Medium	Low
Analyzing and using Data for Decision Making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Selecting relevant Data for Planning and Design of Activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing an Action Plan for Project Learning and Knowledge Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Please rank the following training approaches in terms of what works best for you?

Training approach	High	Med	Low
Formal Class Room Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
On the Job Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online Virtual Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. In which of the following areas would you be most interested in attending in formal class room training sessions?

Areas	Yes	No
5. Logical Framework Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Areas	Yes	No
6. Data Management and Reporting Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Research / Evaluation Methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Strategic Uses of GIS for Project Teams	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Promoting a Project Learning Culture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Others (please specify)		

20. Please discuss some of the major barriers you face in conducting M&E?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME AND INPUTS

ANNEX C: PROPOSED MEL PROJECT SUMMARY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR TRACKING TABLE

MEL Project Summary Performance Indicator Tracking Table

Result	Indicator Type	Data Source	Baseline Data and Date	Minimum Annual and Life of Project (LOP) Targets					
				Yr 1 (4/15-3/16)	Yr 2 (4/16-3/17)	Yr 3 (4/17-3/18)	Yr 4 (4/18-3/19)	Yr 5 (4/19-3/20)	LOP
Objective: Knowledge dissemination and learning support strong planning, designing and implementation									
Extent to which USAID/Nepal program exhibits strong planning, designing and implementation based on MEL Project interventions	Outcome	Mid-term and End-of-Project Evaluations	N/A	-	-	1	-	1	2
IR 1: Rigorous and Coherent Performance Monitoring									
1-1: Percent of USAID/Nepal program staff using data for programmatic improvements (Cumulative)	Outcome	MEL Annual Survey	41 percent (Sep.-2015) N=22	41 (Baseline)	51 (+10)	61 (+10)	71 (+10)	76 (+5)	76
1-2: Percent of USAID technical staff who know how to select quality performance indicators ¹ (Cumulative)	Outcome	MEL Annual Survey	27 percent (Sep.-2015) N=22	27 (Baseline)	35	46	64	88	88

¹ Assumption is 30 percent increment each year from baseline value.

Result	Indicator Type	Data Source	Baseline Data and Date	Minimum Annual and Life of Project (LOP) Targets					
				Yr 1 (4/15-3/16)	Yr 2 (4/16-3/17)	Yr 3 (4/17-3/18)	Yr 4 (4/18-3/19)	Yr 5 (4/19-3/20)	LOP
1-3: Percent of USAID technical staff who know how to establish realistic performance targets ² (Cumulative)	Outcome	MEL Annual Survey	9 percent (Sep,-2015) N=22	9 (Baseline)	35	46	64	88	88
Sub IR 1.1: PMP, Project M&E plans and Activity M&E plans updated									
1.1-1: Number of PMP and Project M&E Plans reviewed ³ (Annual)	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	1	1	1	1	1	5
1.1-2: Number of Activity M&E Plans reviewed (Annual)	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	7	7	7	7	7	35
Sub IR 1.2: USAID and partner personnel able to perform M&E responsibilities									
1.2-1: Number of participants from USAID/Nepal program staff who complete 16 hours of M&E Training as per Capacity Building Plan ⁴ (Annually)	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	15	30	20	5	5	75
1.2-2: Number of participants from IP program staff who	Output	Project Monitoring System	0	15	15	30	30	30	120

² This indicator is related with indicator number 1-2 which is why the targets have been set accordingly.

³ MEL project has not received for review any project/portfolio level M&E plans except the Mission PMP. Assumption is that there will be project level M&E plan in future, including Project Appraisal Documents (PADs).

⁴ 16 hours of modular course training (or equivalent). Training on AIDTracker+ not included.

Result	Indicator Type	Data Source	Baseline Data and Date	Minimum Annual and Life of Project (LOP) Targets					
				Yr 1 (4/15-3/16)	Yr 2 (4/16-3/17)	Yr 3 (4/17-3/18)	Yr 4 (4/18-3/19)	Yr 5 (4/19-3/20)	LOP
complete 16 hours of M&E Training as per Capacity Building Plan ⁵ (Annually)		ng System	(June 2015)						
Sub IR 1.3: USAID Implementing Partners meet M&E responsibilities									
1.3-1: Number of regularly scheduled DQAs completed with support of MEL project ⁶ (Annually)	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	11	20	20	20	12	83
IR 2: Production of Rigorous Evaluations, Studies and Assessments									
2-1: Percent of recommendations from evaluations completed within the past year that have been applied (<i>measured 6 months after completion of those evaluations</i>) ⁷ (Cumulative)	Outcome	MEL Annual Survey	18 percent (Sept. 2015) N = 22	18	30 (+12)	50 (+20)	75 (+25)	90 (+15)	90
2-2: Percent of recommendations from Studies within the past year that have been applied (<i>measured 6 months after</i>)	Outcome	MEL Annual Survey	9 percent (Sept. 2015) N = 22	9	20 (+11)	50 (+30)	75 (+25)	90 (+15)	90

⁵ 16 hours of modular course training (or equivalent). Training on AIDTracker+ not included.

⁶ One indicator considered as one DQA. There are 83 PPR indicators noted in PMP.

⁷ Percent of respondents who said that 50 percent or more of the recommendations of all evaluations completed during past year had been applied within six months of completion of those evaluations.

Result	Indicator Type	Data Source	Baseline Data and Date	Minimum Annual and Life of Project (LOP) Targets					
				Yr 1 (4/15-3/16)	Yr 2 (4/16-3/17)	Yr 3 (4/17-3/18)	Yr 4 (4/18-3/19)	Yr 5 (4/19-3/20)	LOP
completion of those studies) ⁸ (Cumulative)									
Sub IR 2.1: Completion of rigorous high quality evaluations, performance and impact									
2.1-1: Number of Impact Evaluations Designed / Initiated with Baseline Surveys	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	1	-	-	-	-	1
2.1-2: Number of Impact Evaluations Completed	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	-	-	-	-	1	1
2.1-3: Number of Performance Evaluations Completed	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	2	2	4	4	3	15
Sub IR 2.2: Completion of Surveys, Analyses, Studies, and Assessments meeting study needs									
2.2-1: Number of Surveys, Assessments and Studies completed	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (June 2015)	-	1	2	2	0	5
IR 3: Knowledge Supports Planning, Execution and Learning									
3-1: Percent of USAID program staff who report using the M&E/KM system for decision-making (Annual)	Outcome	MEL Annual Survey	32 percent (Sep.-2015) N = 22	32	45 (+13)	60 (+15)	75 (+15)	90 (+15)	90

⁸ Percent of respondents who said that 50 percent or more of the recommendations of all studies completed during past year had been applied within six months of completion of those studies.

Result	Indicator Type	Data Source	Baseline Data and Date	Minimum Annual and Life of Project (LOP) Targets					
				Yr 1 (4/15-3/16)	Yr 2 (4/16-3/17)	Yr 3 (4/17-3/18)	Yr 4 (4/18-3/19)	Yr 5 (4/19-3/20)	LOP
3-2: Percent of portfolio reviews including analysis beyond indicator frequencies (i.e. <i>analyzing how indicators relate</i>) ⁹ (Annual)	Outcome	Portfolio review reports	N/A	33.3	66.7	100	100	100	100
Sub IR 3.1: Decision makers access relevant & reliable data									
3.1-1: Percent of registered users who use the M&E/KM system ¹⁰ (Cumulative)	Output	KM application logs	TBD ¹¹	Base line	+5 percent	+10 percent	+10 percent	100 percent	100 percent
Sub IR 3.2: Lessons and knowledge are documented and disseminated									
3.2-1: Proportion of approved KM Assessment Recommendations fully implemented (Cumulative)	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (Sep.-2015)	0	50	100	N/A	N/A	100
3.2-2 Number of IPs who have documented lessons learnt as a result of the support from MEL project (Annually)	Output	Project Monitoring System	0 (Sep-2015)	0	2	7	7	5	21

⁹ There are two Mission portfolio reviews annually, each with DO-level reviews of 8-10 high-level indicators for analysis.

¹⁰ AIDTracker+ will be introduced in February 2016.

¹¹ Baseline to be calculated when Mission Information System software becomes operational.