

OIE-SRR
STANDZ
M&E
Framework

2012-2016

5th April, 2012

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose of the document	3
1.2	Basis of the M&E framework	3
1.3	Overview of the M&E system	3
2.	Reporting Progress Toward the Goal	6
3.	Reporting Progress Toward the Purpose	7
4.	Reporting Progress Toward Component One Outcomes (Regional Alignment with Evidence-Based Policy)	8
5.	Reporting Progress Toward Component Two Outcomes (Performance of Veterinary Services through the PVS Pathway)	13
6.	Reporting Progress Toward Component Three Outcomes (Effective Management of FMD and Rabies)	17
7.	Reporting Progress Toward Component Four Outcomes (OIE-SRR as an Effective Catalyst for Change)	23
8.	Next Steps	26
Annex 1	Terms of Reference for M&E Specialist	25

Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to provide sufficient detailed guidance to allow the OIE SRR-SEA team to complete the development of their M&E plan. To do this they will also require the support of an M&E Specialist for some of the M&E activities that require methodological expertise. Typically, a framework to guide the development of M&E would not be required, rather an M&E Specialist would be recruited to both design and implement the M&E system. However, after a significant investment in the design of this program, the author captures much of the intent that was discussed in design and planning workshops to ensure that the most important aspects of the program will be monitored and evaluated.

The in-coming M&E Specialist will be required to design and conduct a series of monitoring and evaluation tasks identified in this framework. Suggested terms of reference for this position can be found in Annex 1.

All M&E tasks should be allocated to specific individuals to ensure that responsibilities are clear. These individuals include:

- The OIE Coordinator Communications and M&E
- The OIE technical team
- M&E Specialist
- A small number of appraisers to conduct set document or peer reviews
- Researcher groups contracted to design and implement FMD and Rabies trials

This document will also provide detailed guidance on how to use the M&E system to support high quality reporting. As such, guidance is provided on how to address each contributing outcome of the program in an annual progress report.

1.2 Basis of the M&E framework

This framework was developed in tandem with finalisation of the design (program logic focusing on interventions and output levels) from the first annual program of work. As each outcome and output was reviewed, options for M&E were explored. The framework was developed in recognition of the organisational capacity to design and conduct M&E activities. A full evaluability assessment was carried out during these workshops and does not need to be repeated by the incoming M&E Specialist.

1.3 Overview of the M&E System

This system is designed to be simple, and to allow all OIE team members to make modest contributions to data collection and reporting. The following key M&E activities are proposed for output reporting (table 1) and outcome reporting (table 2)

Table 1: Overview of Key Methods in the M&E System – Output Reporting

Purpose	Methods	Persons Responsible
Output Reporting		
Describe exposure to the program (coverage/dose)	Attendance recording	OIE team
Describe quality of research (relevance of annual research plan; and quality of individual designs and outputs) Describe relevance and quality of policies/strategies and guidance	Quality peer reviews	Peer reviewers
Describe quality of activities (including TA) to achieve alignment	Document review, interviews and observations (sample)	M&E Specialist
Quality of OIE-SRR management system and development products - monitoring and evaluation - policy engagement strategy	Document reviews	Contracted reviewer

Table 2: Overview of Key Methods in the M&E System – Outcome Reporting

Outcome Reporting		
Describe Member Country progress against 46 competencies	PVS Evaluation and follow-up assessments	OIE-Paris
Describe Member Country Expenditure on Veterinary Services	Budget review	OIE-SRR
Describe progress on alignment - PVS pathway - FMD strategy - Rabies strategy - OIE core curricula - OIE code	Alignment reviews (baseline and follow up)	Contracted Reviewers Or OIE team
Identifying factors that explain: - progress on alignment - engagement in implementation of OIE policies and strategies	Exploratory evaluations	M&E Specialist
Identification of SGF (outcomes) - Performance outcome (improved VS, FMD or Rabies) - Alignment/Policy outcome - Attracting additional resources to support VS	SGF Case studies (sample) Aggregation of professional judgement reporting from partners activity completion reports	M&E Specialist OIE team and M&E Specialist
Describe the influence of the FMD and Rabies trials on: - OIE-SRR policies and advice - Member country FMD and Rabies strategies - Regional organisation FMD and Rabies plans	Descriptive and exploratory evaluation study	M&E Specialist
Satisfaction of donors with OIE-SRR progress and financial reporting	Descriptive and exploratory evaluation study (baseline and follow-up)	M&E Specialist
Gender sensitivity of OIE-SRR programming	Document review	Contracted reviewer
Describe budget allocated to OIE-SRR core funding	Budget review	OIE-SRR

Section 2: Reporting Progress Toward the Goal

Goal: Reduce the impact of EIDs, TADs and Zoonoses on food security, human health and livelihoods in SEA.

Indicators, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Although the M&E system will not be providing evidence that the program directly caused an impact on food security, human health and livelihoods, it will need to track regional trends in a selection of key indicators. This suggested list must be finalised by the STANDZ team, and data sources confirmed. Information needs to be collected annually from the 11 participating countries.

Indicator	Data Source	Reporting
Food Security		
Availability of livestock product	Insert here	Annually (January)
Rice crop yield	Insert here	Annually (January)
Incidence of Rabies	Insert here	Annually (January)
Incidence of Avian Influenza	Insert here	Annually (January)
Nutritional status of women	National Demographic and Health Survey	Annually (January)
Nutritional status of children under 5	National Demographic and Health Survey	Annually (January)
Livelihoods		
Household income from the sale of livestock	Insert here	Annually (January)
International trade from livestock	Insert here	Annually (January)

How to Prepare the Progress Report

The progress report will simply note trends in the key indicators. Where possible, for priority countries, the report may go on to suggest reasons that underpin the trends described, and give brief consideration to the ongoing role of veterinary service performance in effecting the indicators. The report will not need to establish a cause and effect relationship between STANZ interventions and the trends described. All data collected will be available from Member Countries with no expectation for the collection of primary data. The OIE-SRR technical team is responsible for collecting this information.

Section 3: Reporting Progress Toward the Purpose

Purpose: Improved performance of veterinary services in SEA in the prevention, control and eradication of EIDs, TADs and Zoonoses

As STANDZ is working across 11 countries, the magnitude of improvement of veterinary services will be different for each country. This poses challenges for creating meaningful whole-of-program indicators. Therefore improvements in performance will need to be described for each of the 11 countries against a baseline and follow-up assessment of the 46 competencies described in the PVS tool.

It is also important to recognise that STANDZ does not aim to improve all 46 capacities in all countries. The intention is to engage countries in the diagnoses of capacity needs, and to attract resources to support continuous improvement into the future, beyond the life of the program. What we expect to see by the end of the program is that countries have completed the PVS pathway and begun the process of improving veterinary service performance. So long as countries complete the PVS pathway and there are signs of performance improvement for each country, the program would have met its purpose.

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting
The situation against each of the 46 OIE competencies	PVS Evaluation/Follow-up for each of the 11 countries (where available)***	Annually (January) (where available)
Achievement of specific activity outcomes when implementing the Strategic Plan (competencies identified in gap analysis)	PVS Evaluation/Follow-up for each of the 11 countries (where available) Partner “professional judgement” reporting for achievement of all specific SGF activity Case studies of selected SGF activities** OIE informal interviews for non-SGF-supported activities*	Annually (January)

* Conducted by OIE team **Designed and conducted by M&E Specialist; *** OIE-Paris

How to Prepare the Progress Report

Each year you will describe performance changes for each of the Member Countries against the 46 competencies. This will only be possible for countries that have completed and released a follow-up assessment, or have completed a specific intervention included in the PVS Strategic Plan. Although you will discuss the progress through the PVS pathway under Contributing Outcome 2.1, you may chose to provide an overview of factors that account for the current situation in terms of progress. You will make a judgement on whether or not you consider the progress adequate given the time since program inception, and the resources expended.

Section 4: Reporting Progress Toward Component One Outcomes

Component One Outcome: Regional Organisations and Member Countries coordinate and align Animal Health Sectors with OIE evidence-based policy, international standards and good development practice.

The Component One outcome is an aggregated statement of the four contributing outcomes. Therefore indicators and evaluation questions will be discussed at the level of the contributing outcomes.

CO 1.1: OIE commissions relevant, quality research and effectively utilises information to inform OIE –SRR policies, standards and general advice.

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent to which completed research pieces meet quality standards	Peer review of selected pieces against OIE standards/TORs* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevance - Quality of the research product - Gender sensitivity 	Annually (January)
Extent to which quality research findings are reflected in OIE policies, standards and advice	Evaluation Study** (Describing the extent, and exploring explanatory factors)	Annually (January)
Output Indicators		
Relevance of the annual research plan to inform OIE-SRR policies, standards and advice	Review of research questions**	Annually (January)

*Quality criteria to be developed by OIE team; **To be designed by M&E Specialist

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this outcome you simply state which research pieces were considered eligible for peer review, and why. You would then provide a brief summary statement to show how many research pieces met the quality standards developed by OIE-SRR. If there are pieces that did not meet the standards, you need to state why this was the case, what are the implications in terms of other pieces not meeting the standards, and what you propose to do about it.

Next, as a result of the work of the M&E Specialist evaluation study, you would describe how each study has been integrated into OIE-SRR guidance. If they were found not to be useful, you would need to explain how this happened, and what this means for future commissioned work. You would then describe what you plan to do about it.

Finally you may want to describe the relevance of your annual research plan for the coming year, and how this is expected to contribute to policy development.

CO 1.2: OIE progressively develops and updates peer reviewed, relevant evidence-based policy, strategies and guidelines for regional FMD and rabies disease management

Monitoring will include all policies developed from 2012.

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent to which key OIE regional guidance for FMD is relevant to need and meets international standards of good practice	Peer review by internationally recognised expert* - Relevance means demand driven - Good practice includes gender sensitivity	Annually (January)
Extent to which key OIE regional guidance for rabies is relevant to need and meets international standards of good practice	Peer review by internationally recognised expert* - Relevance means demand driven - Good practice includes gender sensitivity	Annually (January)
Output Indicators		
Nil		

*Expert develops own criteria of quality as part of the methodology submitted to OIE before the review

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this outcome you would state what guidance has been developed in the reporting period, the rationale for selecting all or only some for peer review, who was appointed to conduct the peer review (and their qualifications for being selected) and how each piece of guidance performed on peer review.

CO 1.3: Member Countries progressively increase or maintain adequate resources, and align national policies with OIE regional policies, strategies and guidelines for veterinary services development and FMD and rabies disease management

This is a central stream of work for the program and requires an adequate investment of the monitoring and evaluation resources.

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Proportion of GDP allocated to veterinary services (check if this can be broken down into more detail) (Context indicator)	National Accounts* (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014;2016)	Every two years (January)
Extent to which key national documents (define which documents) are aligned with OIE guidance	Document review against criteria*/*** (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016) (sample of legislations only)	Annually (January)
Evaluation question: What are the factors (positive or negative) that account for alignment progress?	Evaluation Study** Opportunistic and informal interviews with selected workshop participants*	Once only reported (January)
Output Indicators		
Extent to which policy engagement messages reflect the outcomes of the program	Document review comparing messages with program design framework**	Six monthly report (once only)
Quality of policy briefs as a mechanism for policy engagement	Document review**	Annually (January)
Coverage and reach of each regional meeting	Attendance record (include job title and institution)*	Six monthly report
Extent of each member country exposure to the program	Review of attendance and meeting records (to show all individuals exposed to the program across a MC in the reporting year)* Website visits by country*	Annually (January)
Quality of regional meetings as a mechanism for policy engagement	Observation of a sample of regional meetings (documentation and conduct)**	Six monthly report
Quality of the planning for senior officials face to face meetings	Review of a sample of preparation plan and minutes of meetings**	Six monthly report

*OIE team to collect attendance, budget information and develop criteria of alignment to guide contracted reviewer; **designed and conducted by M&E Specialist ***Contracted reviewers to carry out

How to Prepare Progress Report

Effective and complete reporting against this outcome is required in all progress reports. For this example you can start with the reporting against the output indicators in the reporting period. The output indicators are, for the most part, providing information about the reach and effectiveness of your policy engagement strategy. First you need to describe the coverage or reach of the program, both in terms of what kind of reach the regional meetings had, but then providing information about what total exposure to the program a single country has had. Then you need to describe the quality of these contacts with member countries in terms of the effectiveness as a policy engagement mechanism. Taking coverage and reach, exposure to the program, and quality of the delivery of the policy engagement strategy, we can go some way to explaining why the program did (or did not) achieve the expected outcomes.

You would then report (every two years) on the extent to which MCs are allocating more budget to veterinary services, and how much progress is being made on the alignment with OIE guidance. You must take a position on whether or not you think this progress has been adequate or not. If not, you may want to reflect on any issues that came up under the output discussion, or consider other explanations.

At least once after half-way through the program you will need to conduct a small exploratory evaluation study to find out what factors may be accounting for lack of/adequate progress. This information will be very valuable for OIE as an institution whose main mandate is obtaining regional commitment to agreed policies and standards. You require a good understanding of your organisational performance in this area. Once this evaluation is completed, the summary findings will be presented in the annual report.

CO 1.4: Regional organisations and development partners progressively align programming with OIE regional policies and standards in veterinary systems performance and FMD and rabies disease management.

This is another important stream of work for the program for without other regional organisations supporting an agreed direction, it will be difficult for member countries to harmonise their strategic plans across different donors. Therefore, this requires an adequate investment of the monitoring and evaluation resources.

How to Prepare Progress Report

Reporting for this outcome should follow the same format as the previous outcome relating to member countries.

The table of indicators is on the following page.

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Budget allocation to FMD programming	[define key relevant organisations] accounts (if accessible to OIE)* (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016)	Every two years (January)
Budget allocation to rabies programming	[define key relevant organisations] accounts (if accessible to OIE)* (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016)	Every two years (January)
Extent to which FAO has aligned with OIE FMD strategy Extent to which ASEAN has aligned with OIE FMD strategy Extent to which WHO has aligned with OIE rabies strategy Extent to which SEAVSA has aligned educational curricula with OIE critical competencies Extent to which FAVA has aligned educational curricula with OIE critical competencies Evaluation question: What are the factors (positive or negative) that account for alignment progress?	Document review against criteria*/*** (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016) Evaluation Study** (sample only) Opportunistic and informal interviews with selected workshop participants*	Annually (January)
Output Indicators		
Coverage and reach of each regional meeting	Attendance record (include job title and institution)	Six monthly report (August)
Extent of each regional organisation exposure to the program	Review of attendance and meeting records (to show all individuals exposed to the program across a regional organisation in the reporting year)	Annually (March)
Quality of regional meetings as a mechanism for policy engagement	Observation of a sample of regional meetings (documentation and conduct)**	Six monthly report (August)
Quality of the planning for regional organisation representatives for face to face meetings	Review of a sample of preparation plan and minutes of meetings**	Six monthly report (August)

*OIE team to collect budget information and develop criteria of alignment to guide reviewer; OIE to conduct informal interviews **designed and conducted by M&E Specialist; *** contracted reviewer

Section 5: Reporting Progress Toward Component Two Outcomes

Component Two Outcome: Member Country Veterinary Services progressively improve performance consistent with OIE policies and standards

The Component Two outcome is an aggregated statement of the four contributing outcomes. Therefore indicators and evaluation questions will be discussed at the level of the contributing outcomes.

CO 2.1: Member Countries demonstrate wide and active participation in the PVS pathway.

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
No. Member Countries that have fully costed strategic plans that meet quality standards	Assessment of plan against quality criteria*	Annually (January) as each country completes
Extent of ownership over the process and Strategic plan	Evaluation: single case study (includes output indicators below)**	Annually (January)
Extent of application of PVS in decision-making		
Output Indicators		
Coverage and reach of participants in all PVS preparation workshops	Attendance records (include job title and institution)*	6 monthly
Coverage and reach of participants in all strategic planning workshops	Attendance records (include job title and institution)*	6 monthly
Quality of PVS preparation workshop as a mechanism to increase ownership	Evaluation single case study (document review and observation)**	Annually (January)
Quality of strategic planning workshop as a mechanism to increase ownership		
Quality of the planning for senior officials face to face meetings		

*To be collected and processed by OIE team; ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist

How to Prepare Progress Report

For regular annual progress reports you will simply state the number of costed strategic plans that have met your quality criteria that were completed in the reporting period. If there were delays, this would be explained and suggestions for preventing further delays would be discussed. You will also describe the coverage and reach of participants in both the preparation and strategic planning workshops and draw conclusions about whether or not your coverage or reach was adequate to ensure that you have wide participation. Again, any reasons for poor coverage or reach should be described and solutions to prevent this occurring again proposed.

Once during the program you will report on the case study that examines issues around ownership, participation, use of the PVS pathway in decision making, and the quality of interventions the program employs to bring these outcomes about. This case study should be done early to guide the further development of the approach.

CO 2.2: Member Countries demonstrate progressive engagement in veterinary systems strengthening

Indicators, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent to which Member Countries are implementing their PVS strategic plans - attract additional national funding to activities in the strategic plan - attract additional donor funding to activities in the strategic plan - generate evidence to use for policy engagement in-country or regionally	Member Country report during national coordinators meeting* (content of the report would include: - what activity has been implemented - what was the source of the funding - any barriers/successes to implementing the PVS strategic plan - any donor resources off the strategic plan)	Annually (January)
Extent to which SGF facility activities are progressing implementation of the PVS strategic plan	Partner professional judgement reporting in completion reports for achievement of all specific SGF activities* Annual case studies of selected SGF activities**	Annually (January)
Output Indicators		
Nil		

*OIE prepare and send format (against three points in indicator) for reporting during meeting; OIE aggregates findings from SGF completion reports; ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this outcome you would provide a brief summary of findings from: a) the reports from the Member Countries during the annual coordinators meeting; b) the SGF annual case studies by the M&E Specialist; c) an aggregation of the findings from Member Country completion reports from the SGF. Consider the barriers and success factors and what this is telling you about a) the usefulness of the PVS pathway; b) the way you are selecting and managing activities under the SGF. Special attention needs to be given to donor harmonisation with the strategic plans, and cross reference these findings to Contributing Outcome 1.4.

CO 2.3: At least four Member Countries basic and continuing education organisations develop curricula that addresses the minimal competencies identified by the Global Working Group

Indicators, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Four member country veterinary curricula reflects OIE Day 1 core curricula	Document review against OIE guidelines*** (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016)	Every two years (January)
Evaluation question: what factors account for progress on alignment of curricula?	Evaluation Study** (after follow-up alignment assessment in 2014;2016)	Every two years (January)
Output Indicators		
Nil		

** designed and conducted by M&E Specialist; *** conducted by contracted reviewer

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this outcome you will be reporting once every two years (in terms of outcome reporting). In 2012 you will report the findings of the baseline, and make an estimate of the magnitude of change you are working toward. In response to the baseline you will also provide additional information on whether your current two outputs (the regional dean workshop and the provision of a TA mission to support curricula development) will be sufficient.

For 2014 and 2016 you will report on any changes in terms of progress on alignment of curricula. You will use the findings from the evaluation study to explain the factors that have either impeded progress, or allowed you to progress. You can cross reference here to any policy engagement activities under Component One that may have been directed at this outcome, and judge the extent to which that has contributed or hindered progress.

With this information you will propose ways of improving your program interventions to achieve faster progress, and identify the positive factors that should be shared across Member Countries and OIE more broadly.

CO 2.4: Veterinary Statutory Bodies harmonise accreditation systems with OIE minimal competencies

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Four country government orders reflect OIE core curricula	Document review against OIE guidelines*** (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016)	Every two years (January)
Evaluation question: what factors account for progress on alignment of curricula?	Evaluation Study conducted by sub-contractor (FAVA)	Every two years (January)
Output Indicators		
Nil		

** designed and conducted by M&E Specialist; *** conducted by contracted reviewer

How to Prepare Progress Report

You will be reporting once every two years (in terms of outcome reporting). In 2012 you will report the findings of the baseline, and make an estimate of the magnitude of change you are working toward. In response to the baseline you will sub-contract a design and implementation activity.

For 2014 and 2016 you will report on any changes in terms of progress on alignment of the curricula. The proposed evaluation question (and all other related monitoring and evaluation) will be carried out by the sub-contractor. You should provide clear guidance on your requirements.

Section 6: Reporting Progress Toward Component Three Outcomes

Component Three Outcome: Member Countries Effectively Manage FMD and Rabies and Other Priority Emergent Diseases

The Component Two outcome is an aggregated statement of the four contributing outcomes. Therefore indicators and evaluation questions will be discussed at the level of the contributing outcomes. It is beyond the scope of the program for all countries to be managing FMD and rabies effectively, rather the intent is that there is alignment and then progressive performance improvements

CO 3.1 CMLV Countries Complete Alignment of Previous National FMD Plans with OIE SEACFMD 2020 Roadmap

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
The extent to which CMLV national FMD Plans are aligned, costed and show priority actions and potential sources of support	Document review against criteria*/*** (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016) (sample of legislations only)	Every two years (January)
Evaluation question: What are the factors (positive or negative) that account for progress to complete alignment?	Evaluation Study**	Once only (January)
Output Indicators		
Days of participation with TA by country representatives	Interview with consultant and focal points*	6 monthly

*Criteria to be developed by OIE team; OIE to interview TA/FP ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist ***Contracted reviewers to carry out

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this CO you can start with the reporting against the output indicators in the reporting period. The output indicator provides information about the exposure of the CMVL countries to the technical assistance that is provided. You would then report every two years on the extent to which CMLV countries are progressing on their alignment – this is beyond the alignment assessment carried out under CO1.3, and includes whether the plans have been costed, whether priority actions are identified and whether or not potential sources of support have been identified. You must take a position on whether or not you think this progress has been adequate or not. If progress is not sufficient, you may want to reflect on any issues that relate the output measure of exposure to the program, or any other considerations that could explain progress.

OIE-SRR STANDZ Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (April, 2012)

At least once after half-way through the program you will need to conduct a small exploratory evaluation study to find out what factors may be accounting for lack of/adequate progress. This information will be very valuable for OIE as an institution whose main mandate is obtaining regional commitment to agreed policies and standards. You require a good understanding of your organisational performance in this area. Once this evaluation is completed, the summary findings will be presented in the next annual report.

CO 3.2 Credible evidence of the effectiveness of a comprehensive approach to FMD Hotspots is used to inform regional programming

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Incidence of FMD in trial hotspots	Trial data (define after trial designed)*/**** (baseline and follow-up year 3)	End of trial (January)
Extent to which the evidence of the trial is reflected in OIR-SRR and regional organisation's policies and general advice	Evaluation Study** (Describing the extent, and exploring explanatory factors)	Once 2016 (January)
Extent to which the evidence of the trial has resulted in integration of the approach in Member Country plans	Evaluation Study** (Describing the extent, and exploring explanatory factors)	Once 2016 (January)
Output Indicators		
Quality of the trial design	Peer review of quality against criteria***	Once (in next report)
Quality of the trial final report	Peer review of quality against criteria*** Published in peer review journal */****	Once (in next report)

* OIE team involvement ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist; *** Contracted consultants; **** Contracted researchers (FMD trial)

How to Prepare the Progress Report

This trial will be designed and conducted as a discrete activity. Reporting will mainly be done by those responsible for the trial. For 6 monthly program progress reports it will be important to discuss the activities and issues encountered, and as the trial design and final report come in, report on the quality of these products. In the annual progress reports you will first describe any baseline data generated, then at the end of the trial discuss all the outcomes achieved – both in terms of the effectiveness of the approach and the feasibility of integrating the approach into Member Country FMD policies and plans.

It will be important in the last year of the program to report to what extent the information generated from the trial was used to a) inform OIE-SRR policies and general advice; b) inform other regional organisations policies and general advice; and c) inform Member Country policies and FMD plans.

CO 3.3 CMLV Member Countries with FMD Hotspots Effectively Implement Priority Actions Identified in their National FMD Plan

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent to which Member Countries are implementing their National FMD Plan - attract additional national funding to activities in the FMD plan - attract additional donor funding to activities in the FMD plan - generate evidence to use for policy engagement in-country or regionally	Member Country report during national coordinators meeting* (content of the report would include: - what activity has been implemented - what was the source of the funding - any barriers/successes to implementing the National FMD Plan - any donor resources off the strategic plan)	Annually (January)
Extent to which SGF facility activities are progressing implementation of the National FMD Plans (and improving performance)	Aggregated partner professional judgement reporting for achievement of all specific SGF activities* Annual case studies of selected SGF activities and performance outcomes**	Annually (January) Annually (January)
Output Indicators		
Nil		

*OIE prepare and send format (against three points in indicator) for reporting during meeting; OIE aggregates findings from SGF completion reports; ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this outcome you would provide a brief summary of findings from: a) the reports from the Member Countries during the annual coordinators meeting; b) the SGF annual case studies by the M&E Specialist; c) an aggregation of the findings from Member Country completion reports from the SGF. You will only be highlighting particular examples of achievements from the aggregated reporting and the case studies. Consider the barriers and success factors and what this is telling you about a) the way you are selecting and managing activities under the SGF; and b) how Member Countries are able to implement their FMD plans. Special attention needs to be given to donor harmonisation with the National FMD plans, and cross reference these findings to Contributing Outcome 1.4.

CO 3.4 CMLV Countries Complete Alignment of National Rabies Plan with OIE-SRR Regional Rabies Strategy

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
The extent to which CMLV national Rabies Plans are aligned, costed and show priority actions and potential sources of support	Document review against criteria*/*** (Baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016) (sample of legislations only)	Every two years (January)
Evaluation question: What are the factors (positive or negative) that account for progress to complete alignment?	Evaluation Study**	Once only (January)
Output Indicators		
Days of participation with TA by country representatives	Interview with consultant and focal points	6 monthly

*Criteria to be developed by OIE team; ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist;

*** Contracted reviewers to carry out

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this CO you can start with the reporting against the output indicators in the reporting period. The output indicator provides information about the exposure of the CMVL countries to the technical assistance that is provided. You would then report every two years on the extent to which CMLV countries are progressing on their alignment – this is beyond the alignment assessment carried out under CO1.3, and includes whether the plans have been costed, whether priority actions are identified and whether or not potential sources of support have been identified. You must take a position on whether or not you think this progress has been adequate or not. If not, you may want to reflect on any issues that relate the output measure of exposure to the program, or any other considerations that could explain progress.

CO 3.5 Credible evidence of the feasibility of implementing national “one health” approach for rabies control through inter-sectoral collaboration at the local level is used to inform regional rabies programming

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Incidence of Rabies in trial small islands (dogs and humans?)	Trial data (define after trial designed)*/**** (baseline and follow-up year 3)	End of trial (January)
Extent to which the evidence of the trial is reflected in OIR-SRR and regional organisations’ policies and general advice	Evaluation Study** (Describing the extent, and exploring explanatory factors)	Once 2016 (January)
Extent to which the evidence of the trial has resulted in integration of the approach in Member Country National Rabies plans	Evaluation Study** (Describing the extent, and exploring explanatory factors)	Once 2016 (January)
Output Indicators		
Quality of the trial design	Peer review of quality against criteria***	Once (in next report)
Quality of the trial final report	Peer review of quality against criteria***	Once (in next report)
	Published in peer review journal */****	Once (in next report)

*To be collected and processed by OIE team; ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist

*** Contracted peer reviewer **** Sub-contracted trial researchers

How to Prepare Progress Report

This trial will be designed and conducted as a discrete activity. Reporting will mainly be done by those responsible for the trial. For 6 monthly program progress reports it will be important to discuss the activities and issues encountered, and as the trial design and final report come in, report on the quality of these products. In the annual progress reports you will first describe any baseline data generated, then at the end of the trial discuss all the outcomes achieved – both in terms of the effectiveness of the approach and the feasibility of integrating the approach into Member Country Rabies policies and plans.

It will be important in the last year of the program to report to what extent the information generated from the trial was used to a) inform OIE-SRR policies and general advice; b) inform other regional organisations policies and general advice; and c) inform Member Country policies and Rabies plans.

CO 3.6 Member Countries Effectively Implement Priority Actions Identified in their National Rabies Plan

Indicators, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent to which Member Countries are implementing their National Rabies Plan - attract additional national funding to activities in the Rabies plan - attract additional donor funding to activities in the Rabies plan - generate evidence to use for policy engagement in-country or regionally	Member Country report during national coordinators meeting* (content of the report would include: - what activity has been implemented - what was the source of the funding - any barriers/successes to implementing the National FMD Plan - any donor resources off the strategic plan)	Annually (January)
Extent to which SGF facility activities are progressing implementation of the National Rabies Plans	Partner professional judgement reporting for achievement of all specific SGF activities* Annual case studies of selected SGF activities**	Annually (January) Annually (January)
Output Indicators		
Nil		

*OIE prepare and send format (against three points in indicator) for reporting during meeting; OIE aggregates findings from SGF completion reports; ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist

How to Prepare Progress Report

For this outcome you would provide a brief summary of findings from: a) the reports from the Member Countries during the annual coordinators meeting; b) the SGF annual case studies by the M&E Specialist; c) an aggregation of the findings from Member Country completion reports from the SGF. Consider the barriers and success factors and what this is telling you about a) the way you are selecting and managing activities under the SGF; and b) how Member Countries are able to implement their Rabies plans. Special attention needs to be given to donor harmonisation with the National FMD plans, and cross reference these findings to Contributing Outcome 1.4.

Section 7: Reporting Progress Toward Component Four Outcomes

Component Four Outcome: OIE-SRR sustains effective program management and development practices

The Component Four outcome is an aggregated statement of the four contributing outcomes. Therefore indicators and evaluation questions will be discussed at the level of the contributing outcomes. It is beyond the scope of the program for all countries to be managing FMD and rabies effectively, rather the intent is that there is alignment and then progressive performance improvements

CO 4.1 OIE-SRR effectively manages administrative, M&E, and financial management systems of a coherent program of work

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent of donor satisfaction with financial management reporting	Evaluation Study ** (baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016)	Every two years (January)
Extent of donor satisfaction with progress reporting	Evaluation Study ** (baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016)	Every two years (January)
Output Indicators		
Quality of M&E outputs	Document Review*** (sample against AusAID M&E Standards) (baseline 2012; follow-up 2014; 2016)	Every two years

** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist ***Contracted reviewers (as part of annual program review by SD)

How to Prepare Progress Report

For the most part, this section will be reporting using professional judgement on progress. However, there will be three areas in which a baseline and follow-up assessment will be carried out. You will need to demonstrate the improvements in monitoring and evaluation products in an effort to justify the technical assistance you have received. The baseline can be done any time before the next annual progress report. A final discussion about the extent to which donors are satisfied with program reporting (progress reporting and financial reporting) should also be described. For these three assessments you may want to reflect on factors which may account for the degree of improvement (or lack of improvement) and propose any management actions that ought to be taken in the following year.

CO 4.2 OIE-SRR effectively mainstreams social inclusion into program delivery

Indicators, Evaluation questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent to which OIE-SRR tools, policies, strategies and guidelines are gender sensitive	Document Review*** (baseline 2012; then reporting on each document as it is reviewed and updated)	Annually (January)
Evaluation Question: What are the factors (positive or negative) that account for progress on gender mainstreaming	Evaluation Study***	Once (January)
Output Indicators		
Nil		

** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist ***Contracted gender reviewer (Gender Specialist to the program) to carry out as part of the initial diagnostics; conduct factor analysis

How to Prepare Progress Report

The main point to communicate in the annual progress report (or annual review) is the gender sensitivity of key documents as they are reviewed the first time (baseline). Report on the findings of these reviews including: the extent to which the document is gender sensitive; the proposed solutions (or state why the issue will not be addressed); and then any final improvements as documents are updated.

CO 4.3 OIE-SRR effectively designs and delivers a policy engagement strategy

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Nil		
Output Indicators		
Quality of Policy Engagement Strategy	Document Review against quality criteria***	Once

***Contracted reviewers to carry out

How to Prepare Progress Report

The effectiveness of OIE-SRR policy engagement practices will be assessed under CO 1.3 so they are not duplicated here. It is important to report on the quality assessment of the Policy Engagement Strategy once it is completed.

CO 4.4 OIE-SRR attracts adequate core funding to sustain engagement in the SEA region

Indicators, Evaluation Questions, Confirmed Sources of Data and Reporting Frequency

Indicator	Method/Data Source	Reporting Frequency
Outcome Indicators		
Extent to which OIE has credibility with donors and Member Countries in the region	Informal interviews**	Every two years (January)
Budget allocated to core funding	Budget review	Every two years (January)
Evaluation Question: What are the key factors inhibiting or supporting additional core funding?	Informal interviews*	
Output Indicators		

* OIE-SRR discussions with OIE Paris ** Study to be designed and conducted by M&E Specialist

How to Prepare Progress Report

This CO is difficult to report on as much of the information required is sensitive. Informal interviews are proposed as formal evaluations may not be realistic. Reporting should be anecdotal to some extent, but it is useful to reflect on and communicate every two years on progress and barriers to progress should these become apparent to the team.

Section 8: Next Steps

To complete the development of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan, the following steps should be taken:

1. Sign off on the attached terms of reference for the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and begin recruitment activities immediately (See attachment One)
2. Determine what needs to be included in the 6 monthly reports. It is likely that this will involve information on:
 - Main activities (do not include documentation from workshops or meetings; however this information should be available if requested from donors).
 - An assessment of the adequacy of progress implementing the annual work plan, identification of any factors that may have accounted for delays, what the implications are to the program, and what management responses have been taken or are proposed.
 - Program expenditure in the reporting period, and factors that may have accounted to significant variations from the budget, what the implications are to the program, and what management responses have been taken or are proposed.
 - Any emerging issues that donors need to be made aware of including any relevant reporting on risk management.
3. Agree on the roles and functions of each team member of the OIE-SRR in terms of participating in delivering on the monitoring and evaluation plan, and preparing reports.
4. The M&E Specialist finalises the monitoring and evaluation plan (including the design of all evaluation studies required and full elaboration of the tools for each piece of work) and submits for quality review. AusAID's Indonesia and Pacific Branches Monitoring and Evaluation Standards (provided) will assist in this process, and should be provided to the M&E Specialist on recruitment if not as part of the recruitment process.
5. A detailed schedule for M&E activities and reporting times is agreed by the OIR-SRR team.

Attachment One: TOR for M&E Specialist OIE-SRR

1. Qualifications

The consultant should hold a post graduate degree that has included a research dissertation component. Alternatively, evidence of training in advanced research or evaluation design, conduct and management. Short professional development courses in M&E are not considered advanced training.

Where a post graduate degree in research or evaluation methods has not been completed, evidence of the quality of research or evaluation activities previously designed and conducted will be sought.

2. Experience

Essential

- 2.1 Experience developing M&E systems for projects in resource constrained settings. This is required to ensure that the proposed M&E systems are feasible in the context.
- 2.2 Demonstrated practical experience in research or evaluation design, conduct, and management. This experience should reflect expertise in developing a fully elaborated design of an M&E system which includes the design approach, articulation of M&E questions, development of sound methods and tools, conduct of data collection activities, analysis of data (or supervision of such), interpretation and dissemination of results and report preparation¹.
- 2.3 Demonstrated ability to breakdown and communicate complex concepts simply with a range of stakeholders in multi-cultural settings.
- 2.4 Demonstrated ability to facilitate learning from M&E findings with implementation teams and other relevant stakeholders.

Desirable

- 2.6 Demonstrated experience in the delivery of development projects. This is required to ensure that the consultant is sensitive to the difficulties of implementing development projects in complex settings, that the M&E plan is feasible and value for money, and that the M&E products meet the needs of all relevant stakeholders.
- 2.7 Demonstrated on-going membership of a domestic or international evaluation society, or other demonstrated commitment to keeping up to date with the theoretical and practice developments in the field of evaluation.

3. Terms of Reference

The M&E Specialist will report to XXXX

- 3.1 Develop a good understanding of the program, its program theory or logic, and the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (5th April, 2012).
- 3.2 Using a participatory approach, design a monitoring and evaluation plan that meets the expectation of OIE-SRR and international standards of practice in M&E. The AusAID Indonesia/East Timor and Pacific Branches Monitoring and Evaluation Standards are available from OIE-SRR to provide clear guidance on the standards expected to be met. Take particular note of the following standards:
 - Standard 2: Initiative M&E Systems (including plans)
 - Standard 3: Initiative Progress Reporting
- 3.3 Identify where the implementation team will require on-going technical support from you, and where they will be expected to implement the M&E plan themselves.
- 3.4 Identify what capacity is required by the implementation team to implement the M&E Framework (Plan), and develop a simple capacity building plan to develop relevant skills, and to ensure that there is an enabling environment in place to implement the M&E plan. Do not plan for extensive training and development. The plan should reflect the general capacity of the team.
- 3.5 Support the OIE-SRR team in the preparation of terms of reference for other contracted technical assistance to deliver the M&E plan.
- 3.6 Provide regular support to the implementation of the M&E Framework (Plan). The focus ought to be on the following:
 - Finalising the design of all document reviews and descriptive and evaluation studies outlined the M&E Framework – this includes all tools required such as interview guides, survey questionnaires, observation checklists or document review criteria
 - Conduct, analyse and report on all reviews and evaluation studies
 - Assist OIE-SRR team to prepare brief six and twelve monthly reports using the guidelines provided in the M&E Framework
- 3.7 Prepare relevant outcome and output data in advance of any review/evaluation team missions.
- 3.8 Contribute to the intellectual development of the initiative during implementation. Working as a facilitator, support the implementation team and other relevant stakeholders to interpret and respond to M&E findings over the life of the initiative.

4. Input Days

The M&E Specialist will require approximately 253 days to deliver the tasks outlined here. The breakdown of these days is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Input Days for M&E Specialist for the Life of Program (five years)

Task		Days Input
1.	Design and Conduct Evaluation Studies	
1.1	Two case studies each year of the SGF activities	100
1.2	Assessment of integration of research and trial findings into OIE policies, strategies and advice	10
1.3	Relevance of annual research plan	3
1.4	Factors accounting for the alignment of MCs and regional organisation with OIE policies, strategies and plans (all topics)	25
1.5	Quality of policy engagement messages	1
1.6	Quality of policy briefs	5
1.7	Quality of Senior Official meetings	5
1.8	Quality of Regional Meetings	25
1.9	Extent of ownership over the PVS Strategic Plan	10
1.10	Quality of PVS workshops	10
1.11	Donor satisfaction with OIE-SRR progress and financial reporting	2
1.12	Credibility of OIE in delivering on its mandate	2
2.	Aggregating reporting from SGF completion reports	10
3.	Assisting in the preparation of progress reports	40
3.	Contingency	15
	Total	263
	Average days per year	52.6