# FbF M&E Plan Example

Please refer to the [FbF M&E Guide](https://docs.google.com/document/d/196BKsdtdFfWwdDWhlbXTNLmYSi9NPCShSnOMadQSpVc/edit), and the resources referenced therein, for general instructions on using an M&E plan.

An M&E Plan is a table that builds upon a project/programme's [logframe](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RikS4y9WQk42o7cgl_ucKZJcz2MuI29XmhsMNhz6zKk/edit) to describe M&E requirements for each indicator and assumption. It allows implementers to track progress towards achieving specific results.

An empty [template version of this M&E Plan](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qVPQsdOzzh_KtqDNtJqApmu_pOBA6myqXV2W9rnBx7A/edit) is available [here](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qVPQsdOzzh_KtqDNtJqApmu_pOBA6myqXV2W9rnBx7A/edit). See also the [IFRC M&E plan template](http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/monitoring/IFRC-ME-Plan-template-example-instructions-6Apr11.doc) which contains many useful examples.

**Hypothetical example:** FbF project in a country where the main climate-related hazards are floods and cyclones. All information contained in this plan is provided as an example only; indicators, their definitions and related methodologies must be tailored to the country context.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **M&E Plan: [Country Name] [FbF Programme/Project Name] [Start date - end date]** | | | | | |
| **INDICATOR** | **INDICATOR DEFINITION**  **(& unit of measurement)** | **DATA COLLECTION METHODS / SOURCES** | **FREQUENCY & SCHEDULE** | **RESPONSIBILITIES** | **INFORMATION USE / AUDIENCE** |
| **IMPACT (GOAL):** Reduce the negative impacts of extreme flooding on the health, nutrition and livelihoods of vulnerable communities in flood-prone areas | | | | | |
| **I.1:** % (percentage) reduction in the after-disaster-onset incidence of diarrheal diseases among the target population (compared to comparison population without FbF assistance; or compared to previous similar disasters) Target: 20% | **Numerator:** Number (#) of individuals among the target population who suffered from a diarrheal disease during the two weeks following the onset of the disaster.  **Denominator:** # of individuals in the target population  **Reduction:** Difference in disease incidence between FbF-assisted target population and population in comparison community meeting the eligibility criteria for FbF assistance  **Target population:** As defined in the EAP  **Possible disaggregation:** age, age group, sex, wealth, family size, educational attainment | Post-disaster household sample survey in FbF-assisted and comparison communities (based on pre-developed survey questionnaire)  Community health center records (in case survey cannot be carried out) | For every FbF activation, once after the disaster impact (as soon as it is safe to implement the survey and response activities are not being interfered with) | M&E focal point to establish partnership agreement with university research institute.  Research partner organization to implement data collection field work & analysis according to agreement | Impact evaluation to assess differential benefit of FbF  Accountability to funders and beneficiaries  Organizational learning, to improve the design of the EAP or FbF system |
| **I.2:** % reduction in target population households who experienced livestock losses due to disaster impact (compared to comparison population without FbF assistance; or compared to previous similar disasters) Target: 20% | **Numerator:** # of households among the target population who report having lost at least one animal as a result of the disaster (meaning the animal died or is not available anymore for productive livelihoods purposes).  **Denominator:** # of target population households who keep livestock as a livelihood  **Reduction:** Difference % of target pop. households who experienced livestock losses between FbF-assisted target population and population in comparison community meeting the eligibility criteria for FbF assistance  **Target population:** As defined in the EAP  **Possible disaggregation:** age, age group, sex, wealth, family size, educational attainment | Post-disaster household sample survey  Department of Agriculture, Livestock Division assessment data (in case survey not possible) | For every FbF activation, once after the disaster impact (as soon as it is safe to implement the survey and response activities are not being interfered with) | M&E focal point to establish partnership agreement with university research institute.  Research partner organization to implement data collection field work & analysis according to agreement | Impact evaluation to assess differential benefit of FbF  Accountability to funders and beneficiaries  Organizational learning, to improve the design of the EAP or FbF system |
| **Outcome 1 (FbF system):** A functional, country-wide FbF system is in place with clear financial protocols and roles and responsibilities to enable early warning early action; the management of the FbF system is adaptive and incorporates learning from the M&E system into decision making | | | | | |
| **1.1:** Endorsement of the FbF system by all relevant stakeholders: agency A, organization B, meteorological agency C, ... | **All relevant stakeholders:**   * Agency A * Organization B * Met agency C * ...   **Endorsement:** acceptable evidence   * Signature under MoU * Official meeting minutes recording endorsement by decision maker * Public statement by relevant stakeholder * ... | Copies of evidence documents collected from all relevant stakeholders | Monthly collection of endorsement evidence, until all stakeholders are on board | M&E focal point  FbF advocacy officer | Inform programme planning and, if necessary, increased advocacy efforts to secure endorsements  Strengthen reputation of FbF in country  Accountability to funders |
| **1.2:** FbF EAPs integrated into National Society’s (or other implementing agency’s) disaster risk management strategy / contingency plans | **Integrated:**  (a) The DRM strategy/contingency plan explicitly refers to the FbF EAP, and (b) the strategy/plan describes the type of response actions that could complement after the disaster if the forecast-based actions were already completed.  **Measuring progress** (towards integration): suggested indicators levels   1. Non-existent or not started 2. Consultations & advocacy with NS on EAP integration underway 3. EAP integration process has started 4. Modified draft DRM strategy or contingency plan available 5. EAP integration fully completed. | Revised DRM strategy / contingency planning document | Periodic (at least monthly) until integration is completed | M&E focal point or designated desk officer | Inform programme design to ensure sustainability of FbF |
| **1.3:** Availability of functioning funding mechanism ready to finance forecast-based actions upon triggering | **Functioning and sustainable:** Any formal agreement or process by which financial resources are reliably released when early actions are triggered based on pre-determined trigger levels, and the future of the funding mechanism is secured in the agreement. | Evidence of functioning funding mechanism | Periodic (at least annual) confirmation that funding mechanism is functional and secured for following years | Programme manager | Programme management, to ensure sustainability  Accountability to funders and beneficiaries |
| **1.4** FbF activation rate: % of cases in which EAP were implemented following a forecast-based warning that pre-defined danger levels will be exceeded Target: 100% | **Numerator**: # of EAP activations following a forecast-based warning that the predefined danger level will be exceeded  **Denominator:** # of forecast-based warnings that the predefined danger level will be exceeded  **Danger level:** as defined in EAP | EAP monitoring form (to be adapted from template provided in FbF M&E Guide), to be completed by M&E focal point or implementing staff during and after implementation | Continuous | M&E focal point | Inform EAP design  Inform design of impact-based forecast methodology  Accountability |
| **1.5** EAP implementation rate: % of cases in which EAP was activated based on forecast (indicating the predefined danger level to be exceeded) and early actions were implemented as planned Target: 100% | **Numerator**: # of forecast-based actions implemented upon EAP activation as defined in EAP  **Denominator:** # of all forecast-based actions to be implemented upon EAP activation as defined in EAP  **As planned:** as defined in EAP regarding the timing, targeting and implementation of activities | EAP monitoring form (to be adapted from template provided in FbF M&E Guide), to be completed by M&E focal point or implementing staff during and after implementation | Begins as soon as danger level is reached and EAP is activated; continues for the whole duration of EAP implementation | M&E focal point  Implementing staff / volunteers | Inform improvement of EAP  Operational planning and management |
| **1.6** Coverage: Proportion of targeted beneficiaries reached with FbF EAP actions Target: 100% | **Numerator**: # of targeted beneficiaries reached with FbF EAP actions  **Denominator:** # of all targeted beneficiaries  **Targeted:** Meeting the eligibility criteria for FbF support as defined in the EAP  **Reached with FbF EAP actions:** Received services, items or resources that are usable for the purposes intended in the EAP | EAP monitoring form (to be adapted from template provided in FbF M&E Guide), to be completed by M&E focal point or implementing staff during and after implementation (e.g. counting beneficiaries during distributions)  May have to be complemented with sample survey data in case of non-targeted actions (for example, radio information campaigns or air-dropped supplies) | As soon as danger level is reached and EAP is activated, continues throughout action implementation | M&E focal point  Implementing staff / volunteers | Inform improvement of EAP  Operational planning and management  Assessment of effectiveness and efficiency of EAP implementation  Accountability |
| **1.7** Targeting: Extent to which the people targeted by FbF EAP are the ones most affected by the disaster Target: 100% | **Numerator**: # of targeted beneficiaries fully affected by the disaster  **Denominator:** # of all targeted beneficiaries  **Targeted:** Meeting the eligibility criteria for FbF support as defined in the EAP  **Fully affected by the disaster:** Affected in an equally severe way compared to the most severely affected population in the country during the disaster | EAP monitoring data  Vulnerability and impact data analysis | As soon as danger level is reached an EAP is activated  As soon as disaster impacts materialize  Ongoing until the completion of the EAP implementation | M&E focal point  Implementing staff / volunteers | Inform EAP design |
| **Output 1.1:** National FbF feasibility study | | | | | |
| **1.1.1:** Availability of national feasibility study | Final feasibility study report available  **Measuring progress** (towards feasibility study completion): suggested indicator levels   1. Non-existent or not started 2. Feasibility study underway 3. Draft feasibility study available 4. Final draft feasibility study under review 5. Feasibility study completed | National feasibility study document (final) | Periodic (at least monthly) from the inception of the FbF programme / project | M&E focal point  Feasibility study lead | Inform FbF system design  Inform programme / project management |
| **Output 1.2:** Series of FbF sensitization and advocacy events/coordination roundtables for key stakeholders | | | | | |
| **1.2.1:** # (number) of breakfast briefings organized with at least 80% of targeted attendance Target: 3 | **Briefings organized:** Information sharing event with external stakeholders took place  **Targeted attendance:**  Numerator: # of targeted stakeholders present at the meeting  Denominator: # of targeted stakeholders  Targeted stakeholders: list…   * Organization A * B * C | Breakfast briefing sign-in sheets, collected after every meeting | Each meeting | M&E focal point | Inform programme management |
| **1.2.2:** # of monthly FbF steering group meetings with at least 80% of targeted attendance Target: 12/year | **Targeted attendance:**  Numerator: # of steering group members present at the meeting  Denominator: # of steering group members  Steering group members: list…   * Organization A * B * C | FbF steering group sign-in sheets | Each group meeting | M&E focal point | Inform programme management |
| **Output 1.3:** FbF EAP integrated into implementing organization’s operational strategy and plans (e.g. Red Cross Red Crescent National Society disaster risk management strategy or contingency plan) | | | | | |
| **1.3.1:** Availability of revised operational plans showing integration of FbF EAP | **Operational plan:** Any plan or strategy document that describes the processes an organization will activate and follow in specifically defined scenarios or situations  **Integrated:** The operational plan or document refers to FbF and EAP and details how forecast-based actions will be carried out by the organization, and how these early actions will be complemented with response activities. | Operational plans of the implementing organization | During the inception phase of the FbF project, to ensure EAPs are well institutionalized  Follow up periodically to ensure sustainable integration | M&E focal point | Inform programme management  Ensure sustainability of FbF in country |
| **Output 1.4:** Functional M&E mechanisms in place to monitor EAP implementation and evaluate community-level outcomes and impacts | | | | | |
| **1.4.1:** Availability of EAP monitoring form, adapted to the respective EAP | EAP monitoring form: adapted to the country context, following the example provided in the FbF M&E Guide, suitable to record   * The types of actions being implemented * Location * Timing * Targeted beneficiaries / reached beneficiaries * Observations about what went well & what needs to be improved * etc. | EAP monitoring form | Form to be designed immediately upon completion of the EAP formulation | M&E focal point | Monitor EAP implementation upon activation / triggering  Inform learning and improvement of EAP |
| **1.4.2:** Availability of community-level impact evaluation mechanism | **Impact evaluation mechanism:** a complete, quantitative and qualitative research design suitable to assess community-level effects of FbF assistance vs. non-assistance and make evaluative judgements about its effectiveness, efficiency and impact.  **Community-level:** The unit of analysis for effects of FbF are recommended to be:   * Individuals * Households * Communities (in cases where entire communities were assisted) | FbF lograme and M&E plan include clear definitions of outcome and impact indicators  M&E plan shows how data on relevant indicators will be collected  Plans are in place for data collection and analysis, for example: Signed agreement with external survey service provider, or (internal) enumerator training plan; in-house statistician or agreement with external analyst ready to support sample design & analyze impact survey data; draft qualitative data collection instruments developed | FbF outcome and impact indicators to be defined at the start (after EAPs are finalized)  Plans for qualitative and quantitative data collection should be set up in line with logframe, M&E plan and recommendations in FbF M&E Guide | M&E focal point to lead the planning for impact evaluation and to ensure adequate analytical & data collection capacity is in place | Understand impact of FbF, “whether it makes a difference”  Inform design of EAP and overall programme/project  Accountability |
| **Output 1.5:** EAPs developed based on impact-based forecast methodology | | | | | |
| **1.5.1.** Availability of (at least one) fully developed EAP | **Fully developed EAP** must include:   * Detailed description of actions to be implemented and description of scenario in which they are to be implemented * Evidence of prioritization of forecast-based actions * Theory of change for each set of actions showing why the action is thought to have the most impact, based on evidence * Description of impact-based forecast methodology, including any constraints   **Measuring progress towards EAP finalization**, suggested indicator levels:   1. EAP non-existent / not started 2. EAP drafting underway 3. EAP draft available including theory of change (TOC) 4. EAP + TOC submitted for quality peer review 5. EAP completed   **Quality peer review:** Document to be critically reviewed by knowledgeable peers with experience in EAP design and theory of change development | EAP document (based on EAP template) | Tracking EAP development progress usually starts at the beginning of the FbF programme/project | M&E focal point  FbF programme lead | Inform FbF programme management  Inform EAP design |
| **After the FbF system (above) has been set up, the logframe can be populated for each EAP:** | | | | | |
| **Outcome 2 (EAP A: floods):** Improved access to and use of safe drinking water in the event of flooding in targeted communities | | | | | |
| **2.1:** % of vulnerable households in the target communities with sufficient quantities of water purification tablets/liquids in their house to purify all of their drinking water for the duration of the flood Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who report not to have run out of water purification tablets/liquids to meet their households’ drinking water needs for the duration of the flood  **Denominator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities  **Vulnerable households in the target communities:** As defined in EAP | Post-disaster household sample survey | For every FbF activation, once after the disaster impact (as soon as it is safe to implement the survey and response activities are not being interfered with) | M&E focal point to establish partnership agreement with university research institute.  Research partner organization to implement data collection field work & analysis according to agreement | Impact evaluation to assess differential benefit of FbF  Accountability to funders and beneficiaries  Organizational learning, to improve the design of the EAP or FbF system |
| **2.2:** % of the vulnerable population in the target communities with potentially contaminated drinking water sources who purified all water meant for their household’s consumption Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of the vulnerable population in the target communities with potentially contaminated drinking water sources who report to have purified all water meant for their household’s consumption  **Denominator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities with potentially contaminated drinking water sources  **Vulnerable households in the target communities:** As defined in EAP  **Potentially contaminated drinking water sources:** Surface water sources (streams, lakes, ponds), unprotected wells, in case of severe flooding even standpipes  **Water for household consumption:** water used for drinking and cooking; washing clothes or bathing does not count. | Post-disaster household sample survey | For every FbF activation, once after the disaster impact (as soon as it is safe to implement the survey and response activities are not being interfered with) | M&E focal point to establish partnership agreement with university research institute.  Research partner organization to implement data collection field work & analysis according to agreement | Impact evaluation to assess differential benefit of FbF  Accountability to funders and beneficiaries  Organizational learning, to improve the design of the EAP or FbF system |
| **Output 2.1:** 30-day supply of water purification tablets/liquids distributed to every household in target communities | | | | | |
| **2.1.1:** % of targeted households to whom water purification supplies were delivered Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of targeted households to whom water purification supplies were delivered  **Denominator:** # of targeted households  **Targeted households:** As defined in EAP | Supply distribution records  EAP monitoring form | To be recorded during distribution | Distribution / EAP implementation staff  M&E focal point | Inform operational management  Inform EAP design  Accountability to beneficiaries |
| **Output 2.2:** Awareness raising campaign implemented in targeted communities about the risks of waterborne diseases and the importance of water purification | | | | | |
| **2.2.1:** % of targeted households reached with campaign messaging Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of targeted households who report to have been reached by campaign messaging  **Denominator:** # of targeted households  **Targeted households:** As defined in EAP  **Reached by campaign messaging:** Recall to have heard the message and understood its content and meaning | Information package recipient list  Records of radio station broadcasting campaign messages  Post-disaster household sample survey | Data about info material distribution can be recorded during distribution  The reach of radio messages or public service announcements is best tested in sample surveys | Distribution / EAP implementation staff  M&E focal point to integrate relevant questions into post-disaster sample survey | Inform operational management  Inform EAP design  Accountability to beneficiaries |
| **Outcome 3 (EAP B: cyclones):** Improved access to and use of materials/techniques to reinforce animal shelters and emergency feed in the event of cyclone landfall in targeted communities (for households owning livestock) | | | | | |
| **3.1:** % of vulnerable households in the target communities who have the materials and knowledge necessary to build/reinforce their animal shelters against cyclone impacts Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who report to have had all the materials and knowledge necessary to build/reinforce their animal shelters against cyclone impacts  **Denominator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who had existing or wanted to build new animal shelters  **Vulnerable households in the target communities:** As defined in EAP | Post-disaster household sample survey | For every FbF activation, once after the disaster impact (as soon as it is safe to implement the survey and response activities are not being interfered with) | M&E focal point to establish partnership agreement with university research institute.  Research partner organization to implement data collection field work & analysis according to agreement | Impact evaluation to assess differential benefit of FbF  Accountability to funders and beneficiaries  Organizational learning, to improve the design of the EAP or FbF system |
| **3.2:** % of çhouseholds in the target communities who built animal shelters for their livestock before the cyclone Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who report to have built animal shelter(s) before the cyclone to protect their livestock against cyclone impacts  **Denominator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who own livestock  **Vulnerable households in the target communities:** As defined in EAP | Post-disaster household sample survey | See above. | See above. | To assess whether distributed items were used for the intended purposes (or put to alternative uses such as being sold or bartered) |
| **3.3:** % of vulnerable households in the target communities who reinforced existing animal shelters for their livestock before the cyclone Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who report to have reinforced existing animal shelter(s) before the cyclone to protect their livestock against cyclone impacts  **Denominator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who own livestock and who had existing animal shelters  **Vulnerable households in the target communities:** As defined in EAP | Post-disaster household sample survey | See above. | See above. | To assess whether distributed items were used for the intended purposes (or put to alternative uses such as being sold or bartered) |
| **3.4:** % of vulnerable households in the target communities with sufficient supplies of emergency feed for their livestock Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who report to have had sufficient supplies of emergency feed for their livestock for the duration of the cyclone  **Denominator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who own livestock  **Vulnerable households in the target communities:** As defined in EAP | Post-disaster household sample survey | See above. | See above. | See above. |
| **3.5:** % of vulnerable households in the target communities who provided their animals with emergency feed during the disaster period Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who report to have used the animal feed provided through the EAP to feed their livestock during the cyclone  **Denominator:** # of vulnerable households in target communities who own livestock  **Vulnerable households in the target communities:** As defined in EAP | Post-disaster household sample survey | See above. | See above. | To assess whether distributed items were used for the intended purposes (or put to alternative uses such as being sold or bartered) |
| **Output 3.1:** Animal shelter building / reinforcement materials and livestock feed distributed to all animal-rearing households in targeted communities | | | | | |
| **3.1.1:** % of targeted households to whom supplies were delivered Target: 100% | **Numerator**: # of targeted households to whom building materials and feed supplies were delivered  **Denominator**: # of targeted households who own livestock  **Targeted households:** As defined in EAP | Supply distribution records  Post-disaster household sample survey | Data about material distribution can be recorded during distribution and should be verified through community focus group discussions or key informant interviews | Distribution staff  M&E focal point  Focus group facilitators | To inform efficient operational management  Improve EAP design and implementation  Accountability to beneficiaries and funders |
| **Output 3.2:** Information campaign implemented in targeted communities to disseminate shelter reinforcement guidance and animal feed recommendations | | | | | |
| **3.2.1:** % of targeted households reached with informative messaging Target: 100% | **Numerator:** # of targeted households who report to have been reached by information campaign messaging  **Denominator:** # of targeted households  **Targeted households:** As defined in EAP  **Reached by campaign messaging:** Recall to have heard the message and understood its content and meaning | Information package recipient list  Records of radio station broadcasting campaign messages  Post-disaster household sample survey | Data about info material distribution can be recorded during distribution  The reach of radio messages or public service announcements is best tested in sample surveys | Distribution / EAP implementation staff  M&E focal point to integrate relevant questions into post-disaster sample survey | Inform operational management  Inform EAP design  Accountability to beneficiaries |
| *Continue adding results and indicators according to the programme / project logframe.* | | | | | |
| ... |  |  |  |  |  |