



Sahel Regional Fund (SRF)

MEAL Framework

September 2022

Table of Contents

List Of Acronyms	3
1. Objectives and scope of the MEAL Framework	4
2. FMU MEAL Approach	4
2.1. MEAL processes	4
2.1.1. Monitoring	4
2.1.2. Evaluation	6
2.1.3. Accountability	7
2.1.4. Learning	9
2.1.5. Value for Money	10
2.1.6. Reporting	11
2.1.7. Capacity strengthening	12
2.2. FMU MEAL team and roles	12
2.3. FMU MEAL Work Plan and budget	13
3. Partners MEAL Guidance	13
3.1. Introduction	13
3.2. MEAL Framework	13
3.2.1. Monitoring approach	13
3.2.2. Evaluation Approach	14
3.2.3. Accountability to affected populations (AAP)	15
3.2.4. Learning	15
3.2.5. MEAL Staffing and Budget	16
3.3. Indicators and Progress Tracking Matrix (PTM)	16
3.3.1. Indicators	16
3.3.2. Progress Tracking Matrix	16
3.4. Reporting	16
4. Annexes	17
4.1. FMU specific MEAL Annexes	17
4.2. Partner MEAL Annexes	17

List Of Acronyms

DRC: Danish Refugee Council

FCDO: Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office

FCRM: Feedback and Complaint Response Mechanisms

FMU: Fund Management Unit

MEAL: Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning

SRF: Sahel Regional Fund

ToC: Theory of Change

VfM: Value for Money

PTM: Progress Tracking Matrix

1. Objectives and scope of the MEAL Framework

The SRF will implement a result-based management approach based on a high-level theory of change (TOC) including key dimensions of change (e.g. capacity change, change in level of partnership, policy change) to map results from different regions, sectors and dimensions onto this. This TOC, along with a strong MEAL plan, will form the road map for the SRF to be built upon, showing where results have been achieved. This is the basis of SRF Strategy Testing. The aim of this result-based management approach is to monitor the management of an intervention while trying to ensure the latter's relevance, efficiency, and impact.

The SRF's goal is to achieve monitoring of expected results as well as systemic evolution and change in compliance with its ToC. The MEAL Framework will include key learning questions to support an adaptive management strategy for the collective management of the SRF. It would also allow SRF partners to demonstrate their aggregated efforts, alongside illustrations of some of the wider results, in a coherent and inclusive way.

The primary purpose of this Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) framework is to:

- Describe how the Fund Management Team (FMU) will:
 - Monitor and evaluate the fund activities
 - Ensure accountability to all relevant stakeholders and
 - Document and capitalize learning from the fund operations
- Provide potential partners of the Sahel Regional Fund (SRF) with guidance and minimum standards for their MEAL plan

The MEAL Framework will detail the MEAL activities, the processes, the tools and the roles and responsibilities of FMU MEAL team members

Moreover, it will give orientation to partners on how to ensure high quality programming through a robust MEAL system that will promote innovation, accountability to affected population and learning.

This Framework consists of two parts, the:

- FMU MEAL approach
- Partners MEAL Guidance

2. FMU MEAL Approach

2.1. MEAL processes

2.1.1. Monitoring

Monitoring is the ongoing and systematic tracking of data or information relevant to the SRF projects, and monitoring activities will be done by the FMU (MEAL Staff and Fund Director). The analysis of monitoring data will inform progress towards anticipated results, efforts to manage strategic adaptation and promote accountability between fund partners.

The FMU monitoring will aim to:

- (1) Review partners' progress in delivering project activities and expected results (as per agreed Result Framework and work plan), beneficiary targeting process, resource use (as per budget),

- (2) Triangulate information gathered by other means (context analysis, documentation review, etc.), identify trends in humanitarian response, and reflect on best practices and lessons learned through insights and recommendations for results-based management, risk mitigation, and public information.
- (3) Internal monitoring of the fund, and monitoring partners intervention to ensure that implementation remains aligned with the SRF strategy and contributes to the achievement of the expected outcome; then ensure that all progress is capture in an adequate reporting system.
- (4) Identify gaps and/or training needs during monitoring visit and provide those trainings or identify external or internal resources to provide training.

The FMU MEAL team will lead the monitoring effort of the FMU.

During the implementation of projects by consortia, the main tools used by the FMU to monitor projects will be the Progress Tracking Matrix (PTM), which is a harmonized tool (**Annex 1**) designed to collect at the project level all SRF core and project-specific indicators. PTM is used to articulate and monitor progress on expected results and explain their integrated logic.

The PTM will be updated and shared by the consortia on a quarterly basis. The FMU MEAL Manager will be in charge of the overall trend analysis and data compilation of consortia PTM for the reporting to the donor(s).

During the first year of implementation, the FMU will conduct quarterly meetings with the consortia to review the information provided through the PTM and the narrative and financial reports.

During these meetings, topics like access challenges, risks, programmatic changes/adaptations need, progression against sets targets (milestones), financial burn rates, coordination within consortia and with other actors, advocacy needs, and any other challenges will be discussed.

During the second year of implementation, these meetings with consortia will be conducted on a semi-annual basis.

The FMU will be conducting quarterly monitoring visits to the consortia, combining programmatic and financial reviews, to support corrective actions/programme adaptations and to reduce the number of red flags and potential conflicts of interest.

Monitoring visits will include field visits from the FMU MEAL team, DRC's technical experts (on ad hoc basis), the DRC Accountability Specialist, technical experts commissioned by FCDO and external consultant to monitor and assess the quality and progress of project's implementation and standard processes in place. For each field visit, the composition of the team will depend on the aim of the visit, the project/activities to monitor.

The technical and MEAL team field visits will aim at assessing the partner's progress in the delivery of project activities and expected results (as per Result Framework and work plan), the beneficiary targeting process, the use of resources (as per budget) and internal MEAL and reporting systems dedicated to the project.

Field visits from the DRC Accountability Specialist will focus on monitoring the adherence to and the implementation of standards related to Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) in line with CHS standards. This visit will focus on monitoring the implication of the community in program design, implementation and review, information sharing with community, establishment and functioning of feedback mechanisms as well as PSEAH approaches in place at the level of consortia and the SRF.

At least one visit per year will be forecasted for each consortium and further monitoring may occur according to the identified needs. The MEAL team will provide support to DRC Accountability Specialist with the follow up and implementation of recommendations.

The FMU MEAL team have developed a field Monitoring visit template and Terms of reference (**Annex 2**) for the field monitoring mission to ensure common approaches, standards, tools and check lists to assess the performance of SRF partners.

The MEAL team will triangulate information collected through reports, identify gaps, assess grantee performance against the key performance indicators provided in the MEAL plan and identify trends in humanitarian operations.

Overall, the MEAL team will monitor the management of interventions while trying to ensure the latter's relevance, efficiency, and impact.

At the beginning of the project, a kick-off meeting will be organized, to review the strategy proposed by partners, clarify approaches and expectations of the SRF. Areas of support from the SRF to partner organisations will also be identified along with associated support plans.

2.1.2. Evaluation

Evaluation activities will be done at separate levels and by different actors.

Consortia evaluations: Each consortium is requested to budget and organise **one mid-term evaluation** through an independent third party (selected through a bidding process) in compliance with SRF log frame and MEAL Framework. This evaluation will be organised during the second year (not later than the 18th month) of project implementation and the scope will be the consortia (activities and governance) as a whole.

The evaluation should aim to address the main following questions:

- To which extent is the program is achieving its objectives, including the timely delivery to the most in need persons?
- Have the SRF financial mechanism and technical support enabled the partners to provide better response?
- How efficiently are resources being used?
- To what extend the coordination between consortia members helps achieve better performances.

This will be a requirement to be presented in the proposals.

To ensure alignment with the SRF ToC and MEAL framework, the scope of the evaluation will be shared with the FMU prior to its implementation in the field. The FMU will define the scope of the work of the different consortia evaluation to ensure common methodology and analytical framework. This is necessary for the SRF to have evaluation report that could be summative and allow synthesis of findings.

Details and orientation on these evaluations will be provided in section 3

SRF evaluation: The FMU will organize and conduct **one evaluation** during the second year (Not later than the 22nd month) of funding to assess:

- The project design
- The progress on outputs, outcomes and potential impact

- The implementation of activities
- The relevance of project submitted (alignment with SRF ToC), internal and external relationships and coordination
- The relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency in the management of funds (e.g., Value for Money [VfM] and its governance mechanism.

The evaluation will contribute to evaluate if the SRF is progressing toward its goal by identifying changes which can be attributed to the SRF, identify areas of improvement, suggest recommendations, and capitalize learning. The following questions will be used to guide the evaluation:

- Does the SRF contribute on improving the quality and effectiveness of the humanitarian action in Sahel hot spots,
- Do the supported partners have gained more financial stability and programmatic/preparedness capacity to scale and adapt in cost effective way to respond to the most acute humanitarian and protection needs and emerging crisis in a sustainable manner in Sahel hot spots;
- Is the SRF collectively influencing policy and humanitarian system reform in Sahel

The evaluation will be conducted by an external consultant using approved research method such as process tracing, contribution analysis and/or documentation review.

The FMU MEAL team will support the development of TOR for the recruitment of the consultant and the validation of his/her scope of work. They will also provide support in reviewing the final reports of the evaluation.

This evaluation will contribute to the revision of the SRF strategy and operational frameworks.

2.1.3. Accountability

The SRF is committed to have a high level of Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), donor(s) and relevant stakeholders in all undertaken activities.

This commitment means that the SRF will place the principles of integrity and transparency at the heart of its mandate and thus in all aspects of how it manages its finances and how funds are used by partners during project implementation.

The SRF is committed to upholding the principles, standards and values of accountability and transparency contained in the Sphere Humanitarian Charter and the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS). To that end, the SRF will make sure that partners comply with:

International Standards	
CHS	Respect core values conveyed by CHS
IASC	Abide by IASC's Six Core Principles related to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
SRF Charter	
SRF Charter	Sign and uphold the SRF Charter as a moral commitment to inscribing Accountability to Affected Populations at the forefront of all SRF's actions.
Organizational mechanisms and policies	
Reporting mechanism	Ensure that all grant recipient organisations possess a solid internal complaint reporting mechanism in line with DRC standards.
Feedback mechanisms	Ensure that a functioning community-based feedback mechanisms are set across all areas of projects' interventions, that response mechanisms are set up and that community feedback are used for learning and adaption leading to a better programming. Furthermore, the SRF will ensure that partners incorporate to a "do no harm" as a core approach as well as considering specific vulnerabilities in project intervention.

Code of Conduct	Commit that certain minimum standard of behaviour regarding fraud, corruption, sexual exploitation and other abuse of persons, are to be observed by all FMU and SRF partners. And they should possess procedures and resources for the internal investigation of cases of breaches of the code of conduct. SRF maintains a right to externalise full administrative investigations when deemed necessary
Aid Diversion	Commit to a zero-tolerance approach towards Aid Diversion, including any associated inappropriate behaviour. All parties will fully co-operate with investigations into such events, whether called by the Board, FMU, the donor or any other third party.

Concretely, the SRF will respect its commitments to the donor through the:

Leadership: The SRF will use its expertise to set all documents, strategies and processes that will allow the fund to select and implement project consortia that will help achieve the SRF mission. The FMU will also ensure that all consortia produce progress and financial reports that will be compiled by the FMU and shared with the donor.

The commitments to partners and other stakeholders will rely on:

Transparency and equity: Through its internal functioning, the SRF promotes transparency and equity through different means. The SRF is managed by a board constituted of donor(s), observer(s) and Internationals and Nationals NGO. This allows a transparent management of the fund.

The SRF has a website to keep the humanitarian community informed of calls for proposals, implemented activities and the SRF global functioning. A list of organizations operating in the Sahel region has also been gathered to spread updated information.

The SRF also wishes to remain attentive to its partners and external organizations and thus encourages the sharing of feedback, complaints or any comments related to the SRF. A grievance committee has been set up to deal with complaints regarding the fund's institutional functioning or the FMU. A specific email address (grievance@sahelregionalfund.org) has been created and is available on the SRF website. Additional details on the Grievance committee can be found in the operations manual

To respect the commitment to Accountability to Affected Population, the SRF will rely on:

Policies and Procedures:

Partners should ensure that policies, procedures, and tools are in place to establish and maintain effective community feedback mechanisms. This includes time-bound and effective mechanisms to address critical complaints such as Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH), fraud, workplace harassment, bribery etc.... The evaluation of the partners' code of conduct and internal complaint mechanisms will be part of the vetting process, while the evaluation of the community complaint mechanisms will be done during the concept note and proposal evaluation process. More details on this topic are available in the operational manual.

Community Participation, Information Feedback and Action:

The SRF will make sure that the selected consortia programming approach is needs-based and people centred. The proposed interventions should place affected populations and communities at the centre of assistance. They should participate and be consulted throughout the project cycle, be informed, and offered the possibility to share feedback and raise complaints. The consortia will be responsible to provide response to complaints and make sure that feedback and complaint are used for learning and adaptive programming. *(More details will be provided in the Accountability requirement of the Partners MEAL guidance chapter).*

The FMU will ensure that minimum requirements on accountability are included in Concept notes (CN) and full proposal as it will be part of evaluation criteria. The DRC Accountability Officer will be part of the evaluation committee.

During the proposal review, the accountability framework proposed by partners will be evaluated.

During the implementation of project, the DRC accountability Specialist will conduct field visits to each consortium to:

- Support organisation in building strong accountability systems
- Ensure that affected populations needs and opinions are taken in account
- Ensure that consortia are accountable towards communities in terms of information sharing related to activities but also to staff misconducts, complaints investigation, disciplinary actions....

This support will rely on:

- Established procedure and processes to ensure community participation and functioning of community-level feedback mechanisms
- Information sharing with community
- Established community feedback mechanisms pathways (from complaint registration to relevant response)
- Support the documentation of complaints upon request
- Support the learning approach stemming from communities' feedback for the improvement program quality.

In case of identified needs, the Accountability Specialist could organise training sessions. Key performance indicators are developed in the Global Indicators Reference Sheet (GIRS) to provide a clear basis for this monitoring and recommendations. These performance indicators will incorporate expectations on safe, accessible, child/gender sensitive and inclusive community feedback mechanisms.

DRC Accountability Specialist will be supported in this task by the FMU MEAL Manager.

2.1.4. Learning

To demonstrate that the SRF programmatic approach can be an asset in improving the humanitarian response in Sahel, a strong Learning system will be put in place. The system will document innovation, learning, adaptation, anticipation, and policy dialogue based on evidence generated throughout the project. Learning will also support the revision of the SRF frameworks, tools, and strategy.

The SRF will rely on the following key learning questions to support an adaptive management strategy:

- Has the project achieved its objectives or showed progress toward achieving it?
- Is there any change in the context of interventions areas which may affect the SRF strategic framework?
- Do the National/Local NGO consortia members have increased?
- Does the SRF need to change its strategy?
- Is the SRF support to partners valuable?
- Does implementation generate evidence-based results?
- What are the best practices developed by SRF partners?
- Does the affected population participate in project implementation?

The Learning will rely on qualitative approach using participatory methods, document review and process based on:

- i. Capitalization of **Monitoring reports**: observations made during monitoring visits will be consigned in reports and recommendations or corrective actions taken will be followed up. Gaps observed in one consortium will be used for learning and adaptation in other consortia so that preventive corrective measures can be taken;
- ii. **Project review meeting**: during these meeting, progress toward targets will be discussed and tips, best practices and lessons learned will be shared for all consortia to implement;
- iii. **Project evaluation**: evaluation conducted by SRF partners and the FMU will be used for the learning. Reports with findings and recommendations will be used to improve performance and process. The mid-term evaluation will help evaluate the funding mechanism by responding to questions on Evaluation section above mentioned. This will help revise the SRF strategic framework;
- iv. **Accountability to affected populations**: this is a great learning tool to understand how communities perceive and influence the intervention. Partners will be asked to share and use the results of community consultations and complaint/feedback shared by the community to revise/adapt the intervention;
- v. **Project report**: to share project update or realization. Partners will include in this report a lesson learn session and most significant change stories;
- vi. **Operational research**: The SRF will finance two (02) operational research. The thematic of the research will be suggested by the FMU team and validated by SRF board members. Research topics may not be directly linked to the intervention but will focus on topics that are likely to lead to a step change in the quality of the humanitarian response and the reform agenda. These research will be funded to provide information on priority strategic investments and disseminate key evidence to contribute to a more effective and principled response thus enriching NGO's regional advocacy agenda. The FMU will resort on universities, private organizations or research firms to conduct the research, and result will be published and shared within the humanitarian community. Partners are encouraged to suggest research topics during the proposal submission stage.

The Fund Management Unit will facilitate a formal annual review with the SRF board and another one with consortia.

With the SRF board, the annual review will be the opportunity to assess where the SRF lies in terms of different areas, including atmosphere and relations; strategy acceptance; decision making;

With consortia the review will focus more programmatic aspect related to: targeting of most in need areas, information sharing; reaction to leadership; and attention to the way the group is working.

This will also be the venue to share annual learning, discuss and share best practices and check if there is any need to update of the SRF strategic framework.

The FMU will share learning materials such as: reports, infographics and diagrams, newsletters, and stories.

2.1.5. Value for Money

Value for money (VfM) is a framework that supports organisations to *Maximise the impact of every pound/krone/euro spent in a programme to improve the lives of the affected communities we work for and with*. To ensure the optimal use of resources can achieve a programme's intended outcomes, Value for Money analysis is guided by four pillars known as the 4 E's:

- **Economy:** Are we buying inputs of the appropriate quality at the right price? (*Inputs*)
- **Efficiency:** How well are we converting inputs into outputs? (*Outputs*)
- **Effectiveness:** How well are the outputs achieving the intended outcome (*Outcome*)
- **Equity:** How fairly are the benefits distributed? To what extent will we reach marginalized groups? (*Age, Gender, Disability*)

The SRF will assess the value for money at various stages of the selected projects:

At the **beginning** of the project, the SRF will review the partners' Result Framework to ensure that a clear approach to Value for Money has been included in the indicators. In ensuring that the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness pillars of VfM can be monitored in a systematic way, the SRF will also review the budget template to ensure that the cost categories are correctly filled in.

During the **implementation** phase of the programme, there will be routine monitoring of the indicators to ensure that they are being achieved, with a Value for Money checklist utilised to assess the progress against the indicators.

For the **evaluation** phase, the FMU will consolidate the results of the VfM analysis into a report highlighting the lessons learned and develop proposed action plan to further improve programme implementation for the programme duration.

Throughout the project cycle, there will be several resources used to assess progress made towards Value for Money including:

- Dioptra, a software tool to support cost efficiency analysis (Efficiency)
- DRC VfM assessment tool, used at the evaluation phase to synthesize the progress made towards VfM monitoring that partners have made towards the E's (Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Equity).
- Value for Money checklist, developed within DRC to support on quality assurance of programmes under (Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Equity)

2.1.6. Reporting

To report the implemented activities to the donor(s), the SRF will use the '8+3 Template'. This template is in line with the Grand Bargain donor's commitment to harmonize and simplify reporting requirements. But this reporting template has been customised to reflect the reporting requirements of the SRF.

The frequency and deadlines of these reports are detailed here below

Report	Period covered	Due to donor	Content
Intermediate Report (IR)	Each 3 months	2 months after the period covered end	See in the Reporting template
Annual Report (AR)	12 months	2 months after the period covered	
Final Report (FR)	35 months	6 months after the period covered	

The report will be shared alongside with a) risk register; b) Performance Tracking Matrix c) Financial Report; d) list of downstream partners (in case of changes) and e) asset register (exclude in the IR).

2.1.7. Capacity strengthening

The SRF will organize training sessions based on the needs of capacity building identified or requested by the partners. These training needs will be identified during the kick-off meeting, field visits, and project review workshops (quarterly or annual).

Training needs will be discussed within the FMU who will identify internal and external technical staff and resources to deliver the required training.

2.2. FMU MEAL team and roles

The table here below presents the roles and responsibilities of the team responsible for implementing the FMU MEAL activities. This table should not be read as an exhaustive list of responsibilities but rather as an overview.

Staff Position	Role	Location
Fund Director	The fund director will ensure oversee the grant management cycle of the project and the strategic planning process. S/He will establish grant management systems in coordination with the SRF MEAL and the finance department. During field visit s/he will review with partners consortium grant management, coordination between consortium organization, effectiveness of project, alignment of project with SRF strategy and discuss with consortium adjustment or revision of the grant.	Dakar
MEAL Manager	The MEAL Manager during the start-up phase will lead the development of the MEAL framework documents and all the related annexes. During the implementation, s/he will endorse a leading role in implementing SRF MEAL Strategy and Procedure; work to ensure strong linkage between M&E and SRF strategy and program adaptation/development with a view to improving the quality and effectiveness of programmes and projects; provide technical support to SRF Grantees MEAL and Programme teams with a view to ensure coherence and improve quality in data collection, analysis and reporting; and supports learning and knowledge management toward the project duration.	Dakar
MEAL Coordinator (02)	Working in support to the MEAL Manager, the MEAL coordinator will oversee partners project quality management by conducting regular field visits, review Result Framework, MEAL plans and cost-effectiveness of program strategies and activities. They will support the MEAL Manager and the accountability specialist in all efforts towards accountability, specifically to beneficiaries. They will provide timely and high-quality advice to consortia managers and MEAL staff as required; and act as focal point for all MEAL issues with SRF Consortia.	In Country
DRC Accountability Specialist (Part Time)	S/He will act as technical advisor on ad hoc basis with a propositional role. Ensure the FCRM two-way communications channels feedback mechanisms (including PSEAH approaches) are in place at the level of consortia and the SRF. Following field visits, he will share report requiring a management response to the propositions/comments/recommendations from the Consortium lead.	Dakar

2.3. FMU MEAL Work Plan and budget

The FMU MEAL team will follow a work plan (**Annex 3**), to make sure that forecasted MEAL activities are implemented on time and are properly monitored.

The work plan is drafted for 3 years and will be highly detailed years after years. At the end of each year, the workplan will be evaluated and based on the outcome the detailed of the next year will be elaborated.

3. Partners MEAL Guidance

3.1. Introduction

Notice: This guide is intended to assist all those who are fully or partially involved in the monitoring, evaluation, learning and accountability of consortia fund by the SRF. It is designed to support MEAL staff, project managers, program officers and technical coordinators to know what is expected from the SRF in terms of MEAL standards.

The guide does not intend to replace the SRF partners' internal MEAL guidelines but will aim to support high-quality MEAL actions to improve performance of SRF funded projects.

Accurate and timely monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning is essential to demonstrate that SRF funds have been used effectively, efficiently, and transparently. MEAL should be commensurate with the scale and risk profile of the intervention, and the approach used should be tailored to the project's approach, innovation, complexity, and accountability. Learning should be captured throughout responses and utilised to inform real-time adaptations.

Thus, this document aims to describe key monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning responsibilities of SRF partners and provide guidance in response to the requests from implementing partners to elaborate the M&E requirements articulated in the Proposal template.

Partners should develop in their proposal a Result Framework and a MEAL plan to demonstrate a strong and robust quality control of the implemented project

The MEAL Framework should also include a description of MEAL staffing and resources, including a summary of the MEAL budget and a MEAL workplan (to be presented as an Annex). SRF encourages partners to budget at least 1 to 3% of the total budget to MEAL activities and staffing. Digitalisation of processes and tools is highly encouraged.

3.2. MEAL Framework

3.2.1. Monitoring approach

The Monitoring approach section should demonstrate how the monitoring system, indicators, data collection, quality management, and resources put in place by the partner will ensure that projects remain effective, efficient, and financially on track to provide the expected result at the end.

The partner should describe how they will monitor the implementation of the field activities to make sure that activities are conducted as planned, are of good quality and meet minimum standards. This monitoring will enable to identify gaps and then use this information to improve the projects' implementation.

Partner should also demonstrate how performance indicator data and other quantitative or qualitative information/data will be collected, analysed, presented, and reviewed to reveal whether implementation is on track, the quality of implementation is high, and whether expected results are being achieved.

It is expected from the partners to expend on the contextual monitoring, to identify on time conditions and external factors that can affect the implementation and performance of activities. This should be coupled with a section on the remote monitoring. Project data and other monitoring products should also be used project adaptation.

The interventions could be implemented in hard-to-reach areas with/and complex and volatile security situation, which may prevent staff from conducting regular site visits to monitor and verify the effectiveness and quality of activities implemented as well as results. In such circumstances, partners are encouraged to develop a remote monitoring approach that will involve context-appropriate methods and tools to ensure that activities, as well as accountability to affected population, are overseen from a distance without losing quality, effectiveness, and safety.

The SRF recommends that the remote monitoring approach is updated along with the risk analysis register and the contingency plan.

The monitoring approach should also demonstrate how the capacity strengthening of the national NGOs will be monitored. For this purpose, it will be expected from the consortia lead to share within the 5 first months of the project a sub-partner capacity strengthening plan with the FMU. This plan should be based on gaps observed during the vetting process of the sub-partner and during the first months of the activities' implementation.

On an annual basis, the partners should submit an updated MEAL plan after the annual review. The revised version should be based on the review and learning from the closing year.

3.2.2. Evaluation Approach

Evaluations play a significant role in meeting the SRF commitment to ensure the effective and efficient use of resources as a tool for accountability and learning. In the Evaluation Approach section, partners should include a narrative that give details on the thematic areas of evaluations and sample evaluation or learning questions.

The SRF requires consortia to plan, budget and conduct three surveys during the project. A baseline, mid-term, and end line survey.

Baseline survey will collect at the beginning of the project baseline values for all the indicators included in the PTM. Mid-term and endline surveys will focus on outcome indicators or any other indicators requirement survey as measurement method. The baseline survey is recommended to be taken at earliest, depending on the accessibility of the areas, but not later than the first three months after the beginning of the intervention.

Values obtained in baseline will be compared to **mid-term** values collected during the second year, then to endline values collected during the last year of the project. These surveys aim to provide information's to the partners and the SRF to measure changes on project outcome and about targeted population to strengthen the design and targeting of the interventions. The mid-term should be conducted during the second year of the project and the **endline** during the last year.

Partners will share with the FMU the term of reference of the survey describing the scope of work for information and potential recommendation before its implementation.

Each consortium is required to conduct one **mid-term evaluation**. This evaluation could include the management and governance of the consortia, procedure (financial, supply, grant, etc...), value for money, SRF support, sub-partners participation and capacity improvement. Partners can use as reference evaluation questions of the OECD/DAC¹ to select questions that are most relevant.

It is strongly recommended that this evaluation be carried out by an external consultant. The Scope of work should be developed in close collaboration with the FMU.

3.2.3. Accountability to affected populations (AAP)

The SRF strategy of implementing a new response model in Sahel combining needs based and people centred approach needs to rely on a strong accountability to conflict and displaced affected population. SRF partners are required to adhere to the Core Humanitarian Standard and IASC AAP Commitments.

Define as an active commitment to give account to and take account of, and be held to account by the people assisted; partner in the AAP section should clearly describe:

- How the affected population, including marginalized and/or vulnerable groups, will participate and play an active role in decisions related to the activity design and implementation;
- Which specific mechanisms are in place to make information available and accessible to affected population;
- Which mechanisms are in place to receive and respond to beneficiary feedback and/or complaints throughout the duration of the activity;
- How mechanism sets are safe, accessible, and transparent to collect complaints on a confidential basis;
- How feedbacks are collected, considered, and acted upon in a timely and structured fashion;
- How feedbacks will be incorporated into activity implementation, monitoring and evaluation of progress, and designing course corrections as needed;
- How mechanisms will be monitored to ensure that they are appropriate, functioning and trusted by the community.

Some community feedback mechanisms' key performance indicators are developed in the GIRS to support partners to establish safe, accessible, child/gender sensitive, inclusive, and functional Mechanisms.

3.2.4. Learning

Monitoring, evaluation and accountability materials and information generated should be used to generate evidence and learning. Partners are encouraged to promote learning through: (1). Generating evidence from data collection and analysis; (2). Documenting best practices and success stories; (3). Project review; and other learning approaches ensuring that learning takes place to support continuous improvement in organisational learning and change.

The annual review is mandatory for each consortium and should be the opportunity to assess where the SRF lies in terms of different areas, including atmosphere and relations; strategy acceptance; targeting of most in need areas, information sharing; decision making; reaction to leadership; and attention to the way the group is working.

The SRF MEAL team will gather lessons and evidence collected by all SRF funded entities to take stock, disseminate them across the SRF partners and underpin advocacy and policy dialogue.

¹ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

3.2.5. MEAL Staffing and Budget

Partners should present the MEAL structure of the project and a budget + MEAL activities workplan.

3.3. Indicators and Performance Tracking Matrix (PTM)

3.3.1. Indicators

SRF will provide standard outcomes indicators to be selected by partners depending on their relevance to the intervention. Refer to SRF Global Indicator Reference Sheet (GIRS) in annex 5 which provide details on the indicator definition, data collection, indicator calculation and other details.

For the output and performance indicators, the SRF encourages partners to use standardized Global indicators² to allow aggregation and comparison across countries and consortia.

All the indicators should be included in the result framework with annual targets. When designing a framework, it is important to consider the theory of change behind the design. This can greatly improve the logical coherence and reliability of the project design and help to identify assumptions that are critical to the project success.

3.3.2. Performance Tracking Matrix

The PTM serves to articulate and monitor the progress of the intended results of the activity and how it will be monitored. The PTM will be used as data collection tool for the SRF, to track performance of consortia and aggregate consortia data. It should be shared in the first quarterly report using the template in annex 1. Guidance on the information to be provided is in the template.

Targets must be provided for all indicators for each year depending on if it is applicable for the indicator. Baseline value should be provided for each applicable indicators before the end of the first quarter of project implementation. Partners should rely on baseline survey to collect baseline values of all the indicators.

Partners are free to adapt the template based on their monitoring needs. But the template should be shared on a quarterly basis with the FMU. When sharing information with the FMU, the data should respect all the disaggregation criteria mentioned in the GIRS and with one sheet per country covered.

3.4. Reporting

Each partner will be required to submit a quarterly narrative report by the end of the month following the end of the quarter. This narrative template can be found in annex of the operations manual and should be accompanied by the financial report.

Report	Period covered	Due to SRF	Content
Intermediate report (IR)	3 months	1 month after the period reported	See in the Reporting template
Annual Report (AR)*	Each 12 months	1 month after the period reported	
Final Report (FR)	35 months	3 months after the period covered	

* Annual report is the cumulative report of Quarterly reports, means there is no Q4 report, but the annual.

² [Home | Indicator Registry \(hpc.tools\)](#)

4. Annexes

4.1. FMU specific MEAL Annexes

Annex 1. Performance Tracking Matrix (PTM)

Annex 2. Field monitoring visit package

Annex 3. FMU MEAL Workplan

Annex 4. Partner performance index

4.2. Partner MEAL Annexes

Annex 5. Global Indicator Reference Sheet