



Dairy Interventions for Mitigation and Adaptation (DaIMA)

Funding Proposal

Annex 11: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Table of Contents

A. MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLANS	3
---	----------

B.	PLANNING, BUDGETING, MONITORING AND REPORTING	7
A)	PLANNING AND BUDGETING SYSTEM	7
B)	MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING	8
C)	SUPERVISION AND IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT	9
D)	EVALUATIONS AND RELATED STUDIES	11
C.	M&E REPORTING SYSTEM(S)	12
D.	SETTING UP THE M&E SYSTEM	13
E.	M&E SYSTEM AND TOOLS	14
E)	PROGRAMME INDICATORS	14
F)	INDICATOR DEFINITION	15
G)	RESULT/LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	15
H)	PROGRAMME OUTPUTS RESULTS MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK	16
F.	IMPLEMENTATION PLANS	16
G.	MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (MIS)	16
H.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, COMMUNICATION AND LEARNING (KMC)	17
	<i>Table 1: Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Consolidated)</i>	<i>19</i>
	<i>Table 2: Monitoring Plan for Rwanda</i>	<i>22</i>
	<i>Table 3: Evaluation Plan for Rwanda</i>	<i>24</i>
	<i>Table 4: Monitoring Plan for Tanzania</i>	<i>26</i>
	<i>Table 5: Evaluation Plan for Tanzania</i>	<i>28</i>
	<i>Table 6: Monitoring Plan for Uganda</i>	<i>29</i>
	<i>Table 7: Evaluation Plan for Uganda</i>	<i>31</i>
	<i>Table 8: Monitoring Plan for Kenya</i>	<i>32</i>
	<i>Table 9: Evaluation Plan for Kenya</i>	<i>33</i>

A. Monitoring and evaluation plans

This section provides the main ingredients for further elaboration and fine-tuning of planning, monitoring, evaluation, knowledge management and learning (M&E –ML) systems and functions expected of the DalMA Programme. An integrated and participatory system for planning, monitoring, evaluation, knowledge management, and learning will be developed and operationalized in alignment with the planning processes of the participating governments (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Rwanda). This system will be fully harmonized with existing frameworks within the PMUs of related IFAD-financed projects to enhance the efficiency of data collection, monitoring, and reporting, and to ensure compliance with IFAD and GCF guidelines and policies. The M&E –ML system will be implemented alongside planned Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) Systems to ensure visibility and enhance awareness of the interventions, specifically targeting the dairy sector and the broader DalMA Programme stakeholders in East Africa.

The DalMA M&E–ML system will be detailed in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM). A comprehensive M&E plan and strategy will be developed to guide the implementation, embedded within the broader institutional strengthening efforts coordinated by the Regional Steering Committee (RSC). It will involve collaboration with National Programme Steering Committees (PSCs), National PMUs, County/Regional Programme Implementation Teams (CPITs), Multi-sectoral County/Regional Programme Steering Teams (CPSTs), and District/Subcounty Programme Implementation Teams (SCPITs), cascading down to the lowest administrative levels in each participating country..

The M&E plan/strategy will provide clear operational guidelines for a robust monitoring and evaluation function across the programme, supporting planning, performance tracking, evaluations, and reporting. Technical support for the execution of these functions may be provided by recruited service providers and knowledge partners.

The M&E plan will include, but not be limited to:

- (i) a description of the overall M&E approach;
- (ii) detailed implementation processes and activities;
- (iii) tools and methodologies for data collection, monitoring, and reporting;
- (iv) key deliverables and expected outputs;
- (v) key performance indicators (KPIs);
- (vi) practical tools such as data collection forms, reporting templates, terms of reference for surveys, and associated instruments including questionnaires; and
- (vii) roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved.

The DalMA Programme will leverage existing human resources within the Executing Entities (EEs) and IFAD-financed projects to support the development and roll-out of the M&E system. This will require strong collaboration among Project Coordinators, M&E Specialists, Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) Specialists, MIS Specialists, GIS Experts, Component Leads, and all implementing entities. Together, they will coordinate the development of the M&E system, including the drafting of the M&E plan/strategy, which will be validated during the start-up workshop(s) to ensure readiness for early implementation.

Given the regional diversity and unique implementation contexts across Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Rwanda, adaptations and enhancements of M&E–ML systems and tools for the DalMA Programme are justified. Implementation responsibilities will lie with the national PMUs of each Executing Entity, each leading efforts in partnership with Service Providers and beneficiaries to ensure inclusive participation. IFAD and its partners will offer technical assistance for the design, coordination, and operationalization of the M&E system under the formal oversight of the RSC, which will also ensure timely and consolidated reporting to the GCF.

A participatory approach will be employed throughout the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation phases. Continuous engagement with stakeholders at all levels will help build ownership, facilitate understanding, and promote adoption of the M&E system, ensuring its alignment with the objectives, strategies, and expected results outlined in the Funding Proposal (FP).

The M&E system will serve the following broad objectives: i) continuous monitoring of the implementation of planned activities and reporting ii) enhanced sharing of experiences and knowledge for learning purposes iii) enhanced accountability and transparency by ensuring key stakeholder's participation in all levels, and (vi) internal and external evaluations. The latter shall consider baseline surveys carried out at the beginning of the program and outcome assessments at program end to determine as precisely as possible, the benefits generated by the programme's activities.

Further, in terms of KM, the DaIMA Programme will explore the likelihood of South-South cooperation and opportunities for enhanced knowledge sharing, communication, dissemination of M&E results and findings to project stakeholders for informed decision making.

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system will play a central role in driving continuous improvement across the DaIMA Programme by informing adaptive management and evidence-based decision-making. It will be designed to refine intervention strategies over time, based on data and lessons learned.

At the national level, the M&E Specialists—under the supervision of the respective Project Coordinators—will be fully responsible for the implementation of all M&E activities. They will be supported by KMC Specialists, who will lead all KMC-related work financed under the DaIMA Programme, as well as by Component Leads and other technical specialists.

Importantly, the responsibility for M&E will not rest solely with the M&E staff. All PMU team members, including Component Leads, will be expected to actively contribute to M&E processes, including the collection and reporting of indicators.

Technical support for the M&E function—particularly during project start-up and initial system development—will be provided by ILRI and IFAD to help design and visualize the M&E system effectively.

DaIMA Programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and learning approaches will build on the experiences of ongoing and past IFAD supported Programmes in the respective participating countries of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Uganda. Overall, the M&E system will use and improve on tools and templates already developed for data collection, tracking, and reporting results (outputs and outcomes), packaging, and dissemination of project knowledge products for sharing with the intention for replication and scale up. The system is intended to be robust and developed in compliance with IFAD – GCF policies, and the participating governments requirements for planning, M&E and reporting.

The Planning and M&E information will feed into the respective existing M&E systems of IFAD supported projects and EEs. The M&E system is intended to help generate timely and accurate information to support decision-making. In particular, it will help: (i) collect, analyze and update information on Project outputs, outcomes and impact level of results; (ii) support Programme Coordination Units (PMUs), EEs, National Project Steering Committees (PSC), Regional Steering Committees (RSC), and decentralized project implementation structures in planning, reporting and making informed decisions on DaIMA Programme strategies and action plans based on the information generated from the system; (iii) maintain and strengthen strategic partnerships with key stakeholders and targeted beneficiaries; and (iv) create opportunities for sharing of Programme results for enhanced learning and continuous improvements on the implementation status. Further, the M&E system is intended to be an iterative process used for identifying issues and problems while ensuring Programme focus is maintained and expected outcomes are achieved and reported in a timely manner.

The DaIMA M&E system will help keep track of the day-to-day activities implementation to help identify or give early indication of any possible shortcomings regarding input deliveries, execution of different activities or production of outputs for corrective measures. Therefore, the system will primarily be an instrument for aiding improvements and provide overall Programme management. The improvements on the system will be an on-going process focused on the expected results described in the logical framework. It will be used to assist understand how the Programme resources are being used within the framework of an approved Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB), and the outputs being realized and reported from these processes. The application of the results-based management approach will make it possible to link human, material and financial resources allocated for the implementation of activities and to better plan for results during the next planning cycle, the medium-term effects, and the impacts the Program is expected to have on the living conditions and standard of the community benefiting from the Programme. This exercise will be carried throughout the DaiMA implementation cycle to aid in assessing performance against a set of pre-set milestones/targets regarding inputs, activities, outputs and how outputs would progressively contribute to outcomes, and eventually the intended impact(s).

The M&E system and information generated from it should help establish whether resources are being used according to the plan(s), if the Programme objectives are being achieved or whether they need to be adjusted as a corrective measure. The M&E Information which would have indicated inadequate operations, shortfall in performance and discrepancy between planned target and objectives or expected impact to those being achieved, should then be used as the basis for decision-making by Programme management in addressing identified deficiencies, and help bring the Programme back on track. The M&E system will define what needs to be measured—including the GCF Fund-level indicators, core indicators (COIs), supplementary indicators and project-level indicators—and what outputs must be produced and reported to IFAD and the GCF. It will also outline the data to be collected and processed, the information required for key decision-making, and the corresponding levels at which decisions should be made.

In addition, the M&E system will provide data, feedback, and answers to the following evaluation questions: **(i) effectiveness** – how are the inputs (activities) being converted to higher level results (output and outcomes? And is the Project being implemented according to the Funding Proposal and are the indicators in the objectives being met? - **(ii) relevance** - is the Project consistent with beneficiaries' needs and priorities of the participating governments in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Rwanda? **(iii) effectiveness** – is project implementation and operations cost effective? **(iv) Coherence** – how well the intervention fits in with national and regional and national plans and strategies? **(v) Impacts** – what difference or changes the intervention will make on the life of the intended beneficiaries; **(vi) sustainability** – are the project implementation sustainable and what mechanisms are being put in place to ensure its sustainability in the long run. The M&E system should generate relevant information for key stakeholders who shall include the Government, IFAD, partners, implementing agencies, and the Programme management eg PMUs, PSC.

The development and implementation of the DaIMA M&E system will be guided by the following four key M&E tools:

- **The Theory of change (ToC)** – will provide a comprehensive description and illustration of how, what and why the desired changes are expected to happen in the context of Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda.
- **The Logical Framework (LF)** – will offer an overview of the Programme's goal, outcomes, and outputs, and allow tracking progress against expected results on a selection of key indicators.
- **The Results Framework (RF)** - lays out all the indicators to be collected by the Programme's M&E system, including those not presented in the LF; and
- **The AWPB** - will set out management priorities, planned activities and budgets for each financial year. It is a tool used to control costs, review performance, and assess the achievement of yearly targets.

The M&E system support will focus on strengthening the capacities of PMUs and all implementing entities and partners in tracking results (outputs and outcomes) including but not limited to the following activities: a) M&E start-up workshops to familiarize Programme implementing entities with the Programme, define

roles and responsibilities of implementing entities in data collection, measurement and reporting of outputs and outcomes; b) the Programme will finance at least two outcome surveys per country, particularly prior to Mid-Team Review (MTR) and End of Programme. Outcome surveys will be harmonized and integrated to the extent possible with those undertaken by the related IFAD-projects; c) at start-up and during the first year, the programme will conduct a baseline survey on Core Outcome indicators as well as key performance indicators to benchmark on the existing situation in the target areas, and be the measurement against which outcomes and impacts will be assessed. At regional level, a Community of Practice will be established for discussion of regional M&E requirements, for example definitions of indicators, development of reporting formats etc.

Given the existing gaps in M&E skills and capacity across the region (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Rwanda), the respective PMUs will explore the provision of M&E Technical Assistance (TA) to support the development of the Project Implementation Manual (PIM) and the overall M&E system, particularly during the Programme start-up phase. This support may include, but is not limited to, drafting Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the start-up workshop, designing the baseline study, and reviewing other related M&E tasks as agreed.

As a management tool, the DaIMA M&E system will be an integral part of planning, implementation and reporting structures established along those existing in the respective governments of the implementing countries. The M&E processes will be coordinated by the PMUs, but fed into by all implementing agencies and partners at national levels, regional level, district levels according to administrative structures in each country supported by additional professional staff from the government who will work closely with subject-matter specialists to strengthen planning, monitoring, and reporting approaches and systems aligned to the government's policies.

Overall, the M&E system will be used as the basis to monitor Programme performance and for assessing the impact of the interventions. Monitoring will focus mainly on inputs/ activities for performance of outputs, outcomes, risks mitigation and corrective measures, while evaluation will assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability, partnership, lessons learned, and knowledge up-take brought about by the Programme and their replicability. Output monitoring will comprise monitoring of physical and financial inputs and activities, both planned and actuals i.e M&E system will cover both operational and financial aspects of the Programme. Outcome monitoring will assess the use of outputs and their benefits at beneficiary level, while Impact evaluation will measure the changes in selected variables from the beginning (baselines) to the end of the Project or at a later selected date.

The objectives of the monitoring and evaluation system will be achieved based on the following key principles:

- a) **Programme Performance Management**– Programme performance monitoring will provide insight in the lower-level indicators (activities and outputs) in the LF providing early-stage indication on performance, programme implementation and progress towards the achievement of targeted results. Performance monitoring will focus on annual implementation, comparing actual achievements against the targets specified in the AWPB. The data to be collected will: a) facilitate the preparation of bi-annual, annual and APRs to be shared with the PSCs, RPSCs, IFAD; and GCF b) enable learning from experience and amplify lessons learnt; and c) measure outcomes and impact for comparison “with Programme” and “without Programme” scenarios.
- b) **Relevance and efficiency monitoring (Input/Activity/Output)** - will be concerned primarily with the monitoring of input delivery, activity implementation in the achievements of the outputs.
- c) **Annual Reviews** – The involvement of beneficiaries in internal evaluations to reflect on the services they received or will receive, is not only an empowerment tool, but also a means of promoting ownership and participation of the development processes. It will eventually contribute to the realization of the sustainability of DaIMA. Therefore, beneficiary participatory Annual Performance Reviews workshops will be organised at various levels as an essential part of M&E activities. Resources will be provided for review workshops at sub national and national levels as per the Programme governing structures including one Joint Regional Review workshop bringing

stakeholders from all countries to reflect on the performance and review activities and plan for the next implementation cycle

- d) **Programme Impact and Outcome Evaluation** – Specific studies will be undertaken to assess the situation with respect to the outcomes and impact of Programme interventions. Evaluation will provide insight into the higher-level indicators of the LF (Outcome and Impact).

B. Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Planning and Budgeting System

The planning cycle will be guided by the programme's M&E strategy/plan, Logframe and the broader DaIMA results framework which will inform the development of annual work and budget (AWPB) drawn by PMUs, but in consultation with all implementing partners. The approved AWPB will be the tool to direct implementation and facilitate monitoring and progress reporting. It will help provide PMUs with a timetable for implementing a set of carefully scheduled activities, with specific annual targets, budgets, and input requirements in the coming years. However, during any given Programme implementation year, the approved AWPB can be revised upon request by respective implementing government, but this must be with the approval from IFAD and GCF.

Each PMU will prepare and consolidate an Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) at national level for consideration. An 18-month AWPB drafted at inception will have to be validated by the Programme staff and key stakeholders of each PMUs at national level during the start-up phase before its actual implementation. The validation process will also be undertaken at regional level through regional start up workshops to further build consensus on regional requirements. The Programme will adopt a bottom-up community-driven planning process aligned with the decentralised participatory planning system, tailored to local needs and community priorities. Therefore, AWPBs will be prepared for each level of Programme participants, starting with the primary stakeholders at the community or lower planning level who will identify activities according to needs and priorities. The community plans will then be consolidated into decentralized AWPBs and then national AWPB for each participating country. This shall be according to existing planning and budgeting preparation structure in each participating country within the existing government structures and policies for that country.

The preparation of AWPBs will be based on the activities needed by beneficiaries in each participating country and implementing partners to achieve the Theory of Change (ToC) and the indicator targets in the LF. Therefore, joint AWPB review meetings will be conducted during the planning cycle in all planning levels to allow common understanding on the requirements of the annual priorities, expected targets and budget adequacies. PMUs will be the responsible institution for all planning processes at national and regional level and for inclusion of key stakeholders to guarantee transparency and sufficiency of information and timely planning decisions. Therefore, PMUs will receive, review, harmonize and consolidate AWPBs from all other required lower planning levels in collaboration with the relevant lead Ministry, departments, and planning actors for seamless flow of information while ensuring consensus building among all key stakeholders, and for endorsement before submission to IFAD for approval. The consolidated AWPBs will be submitted to the National Programme Steering Committee (PSC) in each country for review and endorsement before submitting to for approval. The consolidated regional AWPB will also be reviewed by Regional Steering Committee (RSC) before its finally submitted to IFAD at national level. This will be based on the proposals from participating Member States from Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Rwanda involved in the implementation for consideration.

The revised AWPBs will then be submitted to IFAD for review and a '**No Objection**' incorporating all the comments from Programme's Technical Committees shall be considered. This should happen at least 60 days before the commencement of the following Programme year/cycle. The consolidated AWPBs will specify the following: (i) key activities for the period; (ii) units of measurement and targets; (iii) expected outputs the activity is contributing to them; (iv) timeline required to complete each activity; and (v) the entities responsible for reporting on each activity. It will be also important for the PMUs and FM to have tabular summary information on the AWPBs of the overall project to be able to understand how they're faring in the overall planning and implementation picture (financial/physical summary), for easy review by the RSC.

These participatory approaches will help facilitate the preparation of programme reports in a way that meets the needs of PMUs and the lead agency's Management Information System, dairy sector key stakeholders, and in compatibility with IFAD - GCF M&E policies and tools. Annual planning and implementation cycle will be aligned with the government planning cycle and fiscal year in each respective countries (by June in most Eastern Africa countries) and will be the key instrument for implementation and operational controls. Coordination of AWPBs with various actors and partnerships will be pursued as one of the important strategies and tasks for PMUs, and where feasible, proactively exploring opportunities for linkages, synergies and added value in planning and budgeting processes. This coordination will contribute to efficiency in management and pooled resources in support for the dairy sector, where DalMA programme works very closely with other existing IFAD funded projects, Government, and other development partners' financed Projects. The aim is to maximise on the intended benefits and impacts. Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) will be signed as and when necessary to help guide implementation of AWPB, especially where partnership and collaboration exists or are required. This will be within the spirit of dairy sector ecosystem as well as for increased investment support.

The National Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist based in each of the PMUs besides being responsible for leading and coordinating the planning and AWPB preparation, will lead all other M&E processes for effective and timely implementation. Besides, the Officers will work in close liaison with National Project Coordinators, Programme Financial Officers, Procurement Officers, and all other component leads to ensure adequacy of budgeting across all components at any given planning cycle. Once the AWPB has been approved, the implementing departments and agencies will be expected to carry out short-term activity planning, during which detailed activity plans to facilitate close supervision and coordination of field activities and progress review will be prepared. This would be done during regular planning meetings undertaken monthly where it will be decided exactly what activities need to take place during the coming months, when, where and by whom. Individual work plans shall be considered as part of this process to ensure individual time input on the Programme implementation is considered. An annual stakeholder review and planning workshops in which annual performance report findings and management implications is discussed will help support and inform preparation processes for the next AWPB. These shall be considered for all planning level including regional review.

Therefore, to facilitate preparation of the AWPB, a standard draft of a AWPB template/tool will be provided to maintain coherence in planning, ensure standardization in consolidation and reporting of AWPB at all levels. Guidelines for AWPB preparation, planning and budgeting shall be provided by the M&E Specialist in each country and consolidated under the purview of the RSC. Training and awareness will be provided to all programme staff and stakeholders as part of the Programme start-up activities during the first year of the initial start-up. Training on M&E will continue throughout the implementation cycle for enhanced capacities of stakeholders' and the targeted beneficiaries in alignment of roles required. Each PMU will provide and coordinate its own training workshops on Programme strategy and approaches, gender awareness, AWPB, and procurement targeting key implementing agencies and stakeholders. This will be according to unique needs existing in country to ensure accuracy and shared understanding of the Programme implementation strategy and information needs for accountability and for continued support.

b) Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

The Regional Steering Committee (RSC) will oversee the progress realized on regional aspects of the Programme and that regional added value is achieved. As a first level, all the PMUs need to ensure that their M&E systems baseline, mid-term and final impact surveys capture data on all indicators from the DalMA Results Framework. Specifically, the PMU teams will monitor progress with respect to **Output 1.1** (regional policy harmonization and dairy market integration, harmonization of dairy market protection) and **Output 1.3** (*measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of greenhouse gas (GHG) capacity building*). For instance, to report on the indicator "*natural resource areas brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practices*", a Geographic Information System (GIS) must be established. This will involve the use of satellite imagery and data interpretation, supported by ILRI and other service providers.

Each PMU will be responsible for collecting georeferenced, area-based data on its rangeland interventions. This data will be used to verify whether, and to what extent, improvements are evident—through methods such as random sampling. With support from ILRI and relevant service providers, GIS data from each PMU will be compiled and integrated into a consolidated Regional GIS database.

ILRI will also lead capacity-building efforts to ensure that PMUs and Executing Entities (EEs) can effectively use GIS software, promoting sustainability and continued use of geospatial data beyond the life of the project. These efforts will contribute to Output 1.4, which focuses on establishing a regional exchange platform for knowledge sharing and learning.

At national level, the PMUs will be responsible for monitoring and evaluation, undertaking knowledge management of all activities related to the Programme in the Logical Framework that includes GCF core indicators (*outcomes and outputs*), in line with the GCF requirements. Respective executing lead agencies from each country as the key implementer of the Programme will play key role in data collection, analysis and reporting to PMUs. They will collect and report on baseline data, portfolio information, as well as output and selected outcome indicators; participate in Annual Supervision and Implementation Support Missions, Midterm and Final Evaluations; as well learning and adaptive management events organized by the Programme. When relevant, indicators will be disaggregated by (i) type of recipient, (ii) gender, (iii) age (youth vs non-youth), and (iv) country.

Overall, the responsibilities for M&E data collection, utilization and reporting will be divided between key stakeholders: (i) PMUs will be responsible for national coordination, integration and data quality control as well as tracking Core Outcome Indicators (COI) at the outcome and PDO level and GCF priorities, decision making and policy engagement; (ii) Executing and lead implementing agencies will provide data on activity related to output level indicators to PMUs, provide programme progress on quarterly basis on their respective focus areas / components; (iii) Lower implementing institutions / units, facilitation teams and Service Providers (SPs) will ensure activities are implemented according to plans, collect and report data on output level indicators and report them to PMUs from time to time, and in a timely manner and as when required for consolidation and decision.

c) Supervision and Implementation Support

Supervision and implementation support missions will be organized by IFAD and the implementing Governments of Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda, with the aim to jointly support supervisions and implementation missions, and assist implementing partners and the PMUs in improving Programme implementation. The supervision and implementation support missions will assess the overall physical and financial performance, identifying implementation challenges, and propose measures to address them, in compliance with all the fiduciary aspects in the financing agreement and FP. Supervision and implementation support missions will be conducted at least twice per year or more frequently, and be coordinated with the supervision of the related IFAD-financed projects. The outputs of all supervision and implementation support missions will be the Aide Memoire and supervision mission reports, findings, and recommendations, focusing on the achievements and constraints for discussion with the RSC, PSC and PMUs, lead ministry and the respective governments for concurrence best strategies for implementation improvements.

To facilitate the work of the mission teams, each National PMUs and the implementing agencies will prepare implementation progress report in advance describing the achievements and constraints prior to the start of all missions. The support missions will identify and address emerging issues from mission support, build technical capacities, and to the extent possible, build on experiences and best practices from past and ongoing IFAD and GCF funded projects. The composition of the mission team will be determined in the light of actual requirements, and in accordance with FP, IFAD - GCF policies and the respective government needs. However, there will be need to ensure continuity in the composition of the supervision and implementation support missions' team(s) to increase mission's effectiveness. A Key feature likely to require the attention by the mission's team will include but not limited to: a) planning, financial management, and the provision of Technical Assistance as may be required by the implementing institutions, setting up of a functional M&E and Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC), MIS and GIS systems; etc

b) procedures and systems causing implementation and reporting delays; and c) the procurement function and helping address related challenges.

During early years of Programme implementation, attention should be given to ensure active participation of the target beneficiaries in all M&E processes. And care must also be taken to ensure that the Programme does not coerce people into cooperatives / enterprise groups, and instead, play a facilitative role, leaving the key decision to be made by the beneficiaries themselves.

- **ESMF monitoring** – The implementation of environmental and social safeguards (ESS), as well as climate resilience aspects of the Programme will be monitored in two ways: assessing physical progress against targets within programme components where climate adaptation/mitigation and Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM) measures are proposed and, b) monitoring and ensuring the implementation of ESMPs and Monitoring Plans developed and embedded in AWPB. DalMA's M&E Specialist and the component lead (Environment and Social Safeguard (ESS) Specialist will be responsible for monitoring and reporting SECAP and ensuring implementation of environmental safeguards. The Ministry of Environment in each country will periodically provide support in mainstreaming environment and social safeguards issues. DalMA, ESS and M&E staff will be trained on IFAD -GCF SECAP procedures, implementation monitoring and reporting of safeguards to ensure efficiency in the implementation.
- **Monitoring of Gender, Youth and Social Inclusion** – All people-centred data under DalMA will be monitored and reported, disaggregated by sex, age, location of the dairy entrepreneurs, input, and service providers. Qualitative analysis of such data will be part and parcel of Programme reporting. Studies envisaged under DalMA will apply a gender-and social inclusion lens to ensure challenges and differentiated needs can be identified and adequately addressed. The progress on Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) will be assessed through use of the IFAD empowerment Indicators such as the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) addressing any negative impact. Partnerships with Ministries and organisations dealing with women, youth, and social inclusion will help guide on accurate data collection and disaggregated to help track economic and social empowerment pathways. Similarly, the gender and social inclusion strategy and action plan (targeting women, youth, persons living with disabilities (PWDs), indigenous people) to be developed will outline clear economic and social empowerment pathways to be monitored and evaluated over the course of project implementation.
- **Monitoring of Nutrition-Related Outcomes** – The Dairy sector, through the Ministry of livestock or other relevant ministry in the implementing country will be one of the institutions with key responsibilities working towards the achievement of nutrition outcomes under DalMA. Nutrition lead ministry(s) will provide logistical support and the nutrition focal points to support in monitoring, collection, and analyses of routine nutrition outcome related data. To contribute to the strengthening of the dietary diversity and other national nutrition outcomes indicators, the Programme will engage with other partners with demonstrated capacity and analysis of nutrition outcomes from the dairy value chains, working specifically on food and nutrition evaluation assessment and related surveys.

Considering that DalMA is building upon Nutrition strategy existing in each country, nutrition M&E system under Programme will further adopt a programmatic approach endline results for nutrition outcome indicators that will be used to define its baseline values. Hence, subsequent monitoring of nutrition indicators will be done during midline and endline through planned COI surveys. Nutrition output indicator will be monitored annually through progress reports. The M&E and inclusion specialists will be trained on nutrition monitoring and reporting requirements to adequately support quality assurance during Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) surveys while ensuring accuracy during annual progress monitoring. Therefore, monitoring and reporting of nutrition Indicator and related output indicators will be part of the overall M&E considered in the AWPB for sustainability of nutrition-related interventions.

- **For monitoring rangeland restoration interventions**, M&E activities will involve both on-site ground-truthing and remote sensing analysis. Ground-truthing will entail data collection at restoration sites, including GPS coordinates of targeted rangelands, surveys on species composition and biomass yield,

identification of improved grazing practices (e.g. rotational grazing, agroforestry, pasture management), and details on legume seed types, quantities, and planting dates. These activities will be led by M&E experts at the county/district level. Complementing this, remote sensing analysis using high-resolution satellite imagery (e.g. NDVI) will be conducted by PCU M&E/GIS experts to monitor vegetation changes across restored areas. All data will be collected through the M&E system via baseline (start), mid-term (year 3), and impact (year 6) surveys and stored in the MIS. To monitor soil carbon sequestration in rehabilitated areas, M&E efforts will include process-based modeling (e.g. RothC) using baseline data on soil carbon stocks, texture, vegetation inputs, manure, and climate. Alternative Tier 2 methodologies, such as FAO's Ex-ACT tool, may also be used. Modeling activities will be led by Environment and Climate Change Experts in each PCU, who will also leverage data from the MRV systems strengthened under Output 1.3. Country-level sequestration estimates will be based on Tier 2 data and factors derived under Sub-Activity 1.3.1.1 (e.g. Eddy Covariance Towers), with data collection also led by the Environment and Climate Change Experts.

d) Evaluations and Related Studies

Evaluation system and studies will integrate and triangulate the following sources of data:

- Primary project level data.
- Secondary data from national statistical surveys and evidence from other agencies and partners at national and in the region.
- Data generated by studies and surveys to measure the changes brought about by the programme at the project target level.

Evaluation and related studies /activities will be carried out by IFAD and depending on the stages of implementation of the Programme, the types of evaluation and studies to be carried out are as follows:

- Initial assessment (baseline survey)
- Outcomes/ thematic studies
- Mid-term review
- Final evaluation
- Impact assessment /studies

Baseline Survey - Baseline studies are specialised studies that will be used to evaluate the extent to which programme will be making progress towards achieving a set of planned targets. At the start of Programme implementation, it will be important to obtain a set of benchmark measures on DaIMA Programme interventions. Therefore, baseline surveys will be conducted to provide information about verifiable indicators for assessing the impact of the interventions in line with the Programme's goal, objectives and activities contained in the logical framework. This will be contracted to an external service provider and shall be conducted at regional level to ensure harmony in data collection, and indicator refinement and reporting in all the four countries.

Baseline will provide the benchmark against which to measure future progress, as well as provide important information on changes taking place in the target communities, as well as provide additional information to further help refine the logframe/result framework, consider new and emerging indicators and provide a platform for validating the outreach targets. Baseline study should help address information needs of the Programme and aid implementation and planning. The survey will include context-specific needs on the concrete barriers to smallholder dairy sector in the different target areas. It will be designed in a way that it captures the following data separately: (i) sampled existing beneficiaries; and (ii) sampled new beneficiaries. The specific IFAD - GCF Core indicators will be included in the survey and will be updated based on the milestones from outcome surveys/ studies. The baseline data and system for tracking Programme outcome indicators and reporting format will be improved, building on the work done in a context similar to IFAD - GCF past or ongoing initiatives in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda, and in the region or elsewhere. Similar surveys/ studies will be repeated at mid-term and programme endline using large sampling frames and panel studies that includes non-beneficiary households, but with similar characteristics to those receiving support, either in the same districts/regions or in neighbouring ones. This

will be used as the basis for assessing change taking place or the likely causes of these changes in the implementation districts.

Thematic studies – Specialized studies to assess the extent to which DalMA Programme is making progress towards the achievement of set targets will be contracted out by the respective PMUs for Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Rwanda and in collaboration with the RSC to identify need for regional consideration. These will be short surveys/studies that can be implemented by the Project Team as a quick way to obtain information on progress towards outcome realization. They will help deepen the understanding of quantitative data and will be conducted jointly by the project implementation teams led by PMUs. This shall be undertaken much earlier prior to MTR for informed review.

Interim Evaluation. A joint interim evaluation will be planned for Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda and undertaken Regionally focused on the programme components. The aim is to take stock of the results achieved and critically review all aspects of the GCF funding proposal and recommend amendments as required to help adapt to evolving circumstances and improve Programme performance and effectiveness. The interim evaluation will be planned and managed by IFAD according to the requirements of the GCF's evaluation criteria and as per the GCF and IFAD Evaluation Policy. It will be carried out during between year 3-4 of project implementation to provide key information on what is working in realizing the PDO and what is not for early corrective action. During interim evaluation, any prevailing constraints will be identified and recommendation to re-orient the project may be required to address them and help get the Programme back on course to achieving set targets. A management response will also be prepared and submitted to the GCF in response to the interim evaluation recommendations.

IFAD will lead all evaluation processes following IFAD's procurement guidelines, supported by IFAD's Research and Impact Assessment (RIA) unit. The interim evaluation and final evaluation will embed an assessment of the Programme's contributions to a paradigm shift and enabling environment.

Impact monitoring assessment - IFAD will provide the methodological guidelines for conducting impact Surveys. Impact assessment will strive to measure the long-term effects of programme interventions on beneficiaries' livelihoods and on the environment.

Data on impact assessments will be collected through a set of three surveys (baseline, mid- line, endline studies) conducted in the first, third - fourth, and last year of project implementation cycle, respectively. These surveys will be conducted in alignment with the GCF guidelines for the measurement of Core Indicators at outcome levels and in according with guidelines provided by IFAD, who will offer support in ensuring that the surveys are carried out respecting the quality standards set out in the guidelines. The three surveys use a panel structure, meaning that where possible, the same sample should be used for all the three surveys. The questionnaire for these surveys will be developed by the respective PMUs.

The Programme M&E plan/strategy need to clearly the articulate strategies, methods, and instruments to assess DalMA outcomes and impacts. IFAD's impact assessment envisages the employment of a rigorous "attribution" approach for the assessment of outcomes and impact in a subset of projects. However, the programme will have the flexibility to choose among quantitative or mixed method approaches for the assessment, as long as they ensure credible and reliable measurement of performance.

C. M&E Reporting System(s)

Progress reports are the most tangible products for accountability, monitoring and reporting for M&E result. Usually, a distinction is made between quarterly, bi-annual, and annual reports. Monthly reports are not recommended, although some implementing agencies may require for use monthly reports as part of their internal systems and operational management. For IFAD -GCF Programme/Projects, however, a month is generally too short to record significant change and allow adequate time for preparing a consolidated report. Thus, annual reports will be produced by each PMUs and these will be consolidated into a single annual regional report highlighting achieved successes, constraints and, lessons learnt during the implementation, recommendations, and action plans to address the identified constraints. The annual report will take the form of the GCF's Annual Performance Report (APR), submitted annually on the 28th

February through the GCF's reporting portal, PPMS. The primary importance of progress reports is that it enables implementing agencies and Programme management to record data, review progress and report successes that can be scaled up, reflect on outputs, evaluate performance, and discover weaknesses that still needs to be worked on for improvements. It is this process of reflection and analysis that matters, and if done properly, the process would lead to better plans and implementation strategies in the future. The consolidated reports will have to be approved by the PSCs and RSC before submission to IFAD not later than 60 days after the close of each reporting period. The guidelines on progress report writing will be prepared and shared by the M&E Specialists in each national PMUs in collaboration with the ILRI or Regional M&E service provider as appropriate to help guide the reporting processes.

Progress reports outline will include, but not limited to:

- a) A summary of implementation progress of the AWPB with achievements compared to annual targets.
- b) A summary of overall implementation progress with cumulative achievements compared to appraisal report targets together with a summary of related impact studies, where applicable.
- c) Detailed implementation progress by component.
- d) An analysis of strength and weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
- e) A summary of expenditures relative to Programme disbursement targets.
- f) A summary of successful approaches and lessons learned.
- g) Identification of constraints and challenges encountered during the reporting period and any remedial actions taken to resolve the problems.
- h) Provision of strategic direction for the next planning cycle; and
- i) The way forward.

Reporting on activities and outputs - Activities and output monitoring and reporting will concentrate on the financial and physical outputs of activities. Data on activities and outputs will be collected on a regular basis, either directly by the respective PMUs (for activities directly implemented) or by implementing partners. All contracts and MoUs signed by the PMU will include details on implementing partners' data collection and reporting responsibilities and how these data will be shared with the M&E specialist in each PCU. At lower levels, extension officers will collect data with tablets provided by the Project and upload it into national M&E system, and the data collection and reporting system hosted at PCU of each country. Once validated by PMUs and lead ministry staff, data will be shared with the National M&E Specialist, who will insert it into the Project's own Management Information System (MIS).

Regular Programme Implementation review workshops and reporting – The primary importance of implementation review is that it enables implementing agencies and Programme management to record data, review progress to reflects outputs, internally evaluate performance, and discover successes that can be scaled up and weaknesses that needs to be reviewed and improved. It will be undertaken at national level every quarter, six months and annually and this will be followed with one regional review to enhance understanding on the implementation at regional level. The review workshops will serve as a platform for internal assessment of the implementation and performance as well as share experiences and lessons learnt from the implementation. Participation will be by all those involved in activity implementation as well as selected dairy chain actors and stakeholders at national levels.

Impact reporting - The information to be included in these reports will largely follow the programme reporting formats required by IFAD supported Projects/ Programmes. It will relate to the targets contained in the funding proposal and those in the AWPBs.

Interim Evaluation Report- This report will be prepared and consolidated by PMUs in collaboration with IFAD and will comprise assessment of the efficiency as well as achievements to-date, and an analysis of the Programme approach and activity implementation status.

D. Setting up the M&E system

Before start-up – DalIMA will be responsible for:

- Ensuring that monitoring of the first AWPB gets underway.
- Procuring a firm to carry out the baseline survey (*ToRs are to be developed and advertised following existing procurement processes*)
- Procuring a firm to develop the MIS and GIS applications for the Programme.

After start-up - The M&E unit, with the support of ILRI and other service provider will undergo 5 key steps below or as may be appropriate to set up a robust M&E system.

Step 1: Prepare the M&E manual - prepare an M&E manual which will define – indicator by indicator - when, where how and who will be responsible for data collection. In particular, the M&E manual will provide further details on:

- The objectives of M&E
- Roles and responsibilities of different actors
- Data collection methods
- Data flow and how the data will be stored.
- Frequency of reporting and by who
- MIS establishments and Geo-referencing approaches to be applied.

Step 2: Prepare an M&E plan - Based on the M&E manual, prepare an M&E plan/strategy that covers the whole lifetime of the Project, listing all M&E components and activities with timelines and the corresponding budgets.

Step 3: Strengthen DalMA M&E system.

- Hire a TA to work in collaboration with the National M&E Specialists to digitize and revise the M&E system, plans and where necessary, the data reporting formats used by Extension Officers.
- Ensure that the planning, monitoring, and reporting tools include all necessary data and are harmonized for consolidated national and regional reporting.
- In collaboration with the PMUs, lead Ministry and SPCU, prepare ToRs for the development of baseline studies, MIS and GIS, outcome studies, midline and evaluation studies and required related consultancies in the future.
- Purchase tablets for Extension Officers among others M&E requirements.

Step 4: Prepare data collection tools - Develop standard reporting formats/tools for all Project activities and outputs that includes requirements on data collection in the contracts of service providers and use it as a measure of performance.

Step 5: Validation and Training - Share and validate the M&E manual, plan, and reporting formats with all relevant Project stakeholders, agree on key timelines for reporting. Train all implementing partners with data collection responsibilities on standard reporting formats and the use of tablets, and well as use of the MIS.

E. M&E System and tools

e) Programme indicators

The Programme will collect data on the following types of indicators:

All the indicators noted below will take into consideration different country contexts:

- **Impact potential** - Separate indicators are proposed for the impact potential of mitigation and adaptation projects.
 - Mitigation impact indicator - project lifetime emission reductions (in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent)** - Project proposals should describe the expected reductions in emissions resulting from the GCF intervention.
 - Adaptation impact indicator**- Project proposals should describe the expected change in loss of lives, value of physical assets, livelihoods, and/or environmental or social losses due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters and climate change in the geographical area of the GCF

intervention. The FP should also refer to the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project, taking into account the needs of Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Tanzania.

- **Paradigm shift potential**

- a) **Necessary conditions indicator** – The FP should identify a vision for paradigm shift as it relates to the subject of the project. The vision for paradigm shift should outline how the proposed project can catalyse impact beyond a one-off investment. This vision for longer-term change should be accompanied by a robust and convincing theory of change for replication and/or scaling up of the project results, including the long-term sustainability of the results, or by a description of the most binding constraint(s) to change and how it/they will be addressed through the project.
- **Outcome Result level Core Indicator** - These result level aims to assess/measure observable outcomes of GCF-funded projects/ programmes across the two interdependent layers of **climate impact (IRMF core indicators 1-4, quantitative indicators)** and **enabling environment (IRMF core indicators 5-8)**, both of which interact to underpin pathways to the paradigm shift. The GCF outcome results level “reduced emissions and increased resilience” will be measured through these CIs to quantitatively track major climate-focused outcomes aligned with those of other climate finance mechanisms, national statistical authorities and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Contributions to GCF outcome, “**enabling environment**”, will be informed through four core indicators (**IRMF core indicators 5-8**). These indicators, are categorized together to help assess how and to what extent GCF through its mitigation and adaptation projects/programmes will contribute to creating an enabling environment, derived from mitigation and adaptation performance measurement frameworks as well as the coverage area and activity-specific sub-criteria of paradigm shift potential. The indicators are placed at the outcome level to recognize that they could be building blocks towards promoting paradigm shift.
- **Project Level indicators** - To maintain focus on the GCF mandate, the IRMF aims to balance the number of core and supplementary indicators available for measurement. These are indicators that appear in the LF, and are only specific to DaIMA, and thus not aggregated at GCF project level (e.g. Number of plans developed). These indicators can either be defined at output or at outcome levels. In line with the current practice under the initial RMF, AEs are encouraged to add and monitor co-benefit indicators such as those related to biodiversity, social and gender inclusion and/or poverty alleviation under respective project/programme-level logframes, if not captured by the core and supplementary indicators.
- **Operational indicators** - These are indicators that do not appear in the LF but which the PMUst will still collect and store in the MIS because they are useful for monitoring and managing the. Operational indicators are presented in the RF.

f) **Indicator definition**

Logframe indicators with their exact definitions, clearly explaining what they mean in the context of DaIMA, and what should be reported (and what not), should be defined in the indicator reference sheet. Logframe indicators and targets can be slightly modified at start-up upon good justification and can be changed at Midterm Review (MTR) or following project restructuring, partial cancellation, or the approval of additional finance. In all other moment, Logframe indicators should only be updated with results, but not modified. The indicators at Goal and Development Objective level can never be changed once the Project is approved, because otherwise the Project would need to go back to the GCF Executive Board for approval. The naming of Core Indicators is fixed, as these are standard indicators that are used across GCF-supported projects in the world and should not be always modified.

g) **Result/Logical Framework**

The principal guide for the implementation and monitoring of the Programme will be the result/logical framework to be refined during the first year of implementation as part of the Programme initiation activities. The review should assist in alignment with the strategic priorities in the funding proposal, and in accordance with national policies, strategies, and plans of the respective government and GCF guidelines.

h) Programme Outputs Results Management Framework

In addition to the logframe, DalMA will develop a broader Project level outputs results management framework to measure output indicators that will be digitized. The rationale to develop such an output results management framework stems from lessons in previous project missions where there have been challenges in reporting specifics and requested output indicator data on time. This additional framework will support and capture the following: (i) improve standardization and reporting of the broad Project output indicators; (ii) allow additional important country and Programme level output indicators to be captured in the MIS; and (iii) provide DalMA the opportunity to add GCF COIs. This will be the responsibility of M&E Specialists, and the M&E TA hired in the respective implementing countries for the M&E support. At start-up, they will coordinate and work with the entire PCU teams to add relevant Programme and country level output indicators in the results management framework. In addition, they will decide on the yearly targets of all the identified indicators in the output results management framework.

It should be highlighted that the Programme should add important country level output indicators that are only relevant to DalMA interventions and will contribute to the achievement of country level outcome indicators. Furthermore, the outputs results management framework will be, firstly designed in Excel and then migrated to the advanced MIS after finalization and having consensus with key implementing agencies. It will be of key importance for DalMA to conduct the following tasks at start-up: (i) improve on the results management framework by adding additional output indicators; (ii) set the yearly targets for the indicators; (iii) define the responsible parties; and (iv) validate the output results management framework.

F. Implementation plans

Implementation Readiness and Start-up Plans - An early implementation support mission will be mobilized within the first three months of Programme effectiveness to cover any gaps in the Programme design and Funding Proposal. IFAD will undertake periodic monitoring, evaluation, and supervision and implementation support missions to assess the status of Programme implementation, and evaluate the direction with respect to its objectives, outputs, and outcomes. A draft AWPB, 18 months Procurement Plan and Programme Implementation Manual (PIM) will be prepared. The other steps to be taken to minimize the start-up delays/long gestation periods that hinder effective Programme inception include a) build on the existing structures and mechanisms of past IFAD and GCF funded projects in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and across East Africa. This will contribute to seamless adaptation, bringing in the lessons, experiences, and achievements of IFAD past projects; and b) sustaining the experience of the staff from past projects.

G. Management Information System (MIS)

Reviews and steering of the Programme implementation will be facilitated by systematic measurement of achievements against targets. The basis for that will be provided by the establishment of a MIS for comprehensive data management system providing accurate and reliable information with description of the socio-economic status in the target communities. Beneficiary participation in monitoring will be ensured by involving the target groups, with special effort made to include women, youths and PWD. Monitoring will include data collection in forms of individual interviews, focus group discussion, case studies or applied research. The Programme will use tailor-made tools suitable for baseline, mid-term and end of Programme surveys to track Programme impact on women's empowerment in key domains of milk production, income, cooperatives, low-emission and climate-resilient dairy sector, reviewing and updating existing national and regional regulations, policies, standards and investment, access to finance and technology, business plans for investments, concessional loans for adaptation and renewable energy use among others.

The M&E Unit in collaboration with component leads will design MIS to enhance data collection and reporting, custom to the level of details required in relation to Programme interventions. The MIS system will include templates for quarter, semi-annual and annual reporting among other reports that may be required from time to time. The data collection, monitoring and reporting requirement will form the basis for the design and development of the DalMA M&E System. Each PMUs will develop its own MIS to facilitate

data storage, analysis, and reporting. This should be procured before start-up by each PMUs and transferred to the lead ministry in each country at the end of Programme life. ToRs for the development of the MIS will be drafted and custom to the needs of each PMUs and lead ministry as may be appropriate.

The programme will promote sustainable MIS interventions such as the Integration of GIS with M&E and CKM systems and will work with respective implementing agencies, ministries, and departments to develop a consolidated M&E geo-referencing system with scaled-up outlook. This should have the potential of being replicated in other IFAD or GCF financed project aimed at strengthening the M&E systems at regional and national levels while also enhancing the visibility of the programme. The GIS application will give added geo-referencing support, aiding mapping of physical facilities and outreach densities for gender, youth women, nutrition etc reporting on GIS Atlas maps while building on existing and new initiatives, available tools developed in the lead ministries and other IFAD financed projects in country with possibility for adaptation where inter-operability is feasible. Therefore, a GIS specialists / experts and Technical Assistance (TA) will be hired to support MIS and GIS application development and use in the Programme in each country.

Geo-referenced data will be systematically collected on all the indicators related to relevant countries and locations /areas/ districts/regions. This will allow the M&E and the MIS to produce geo-referencing maps showing DalMA interventions and the outreach level for reporting. For example, women and youth beneficiaries by densities, etc. Field data collection will be done digitally through portable electronic devices to speed up data entry, cleaning, and reporting as well as enhance management decisions and disseminating of the results rapidly.

In first year (1) of implementation, each PMU will develop standard reporting tools in digital formats, ready to be downloaded on tablets. Overall, DalMA will aim to promote digitalization and improvement of the M&E system with portable electronic devices to speed up data entry, cleaning and disseminating of the results on rapidly with enhanced reporting features such key dashboards so as for speedy management decisions. if necessary and based on the standard reporting formats currently used by lead ministry to be done through ILRI or service providers to be hired in the first year of Programme implementation by the respective PMUs. The institutional level results will be collated, consolidated, and digitalized into standardized formats for electronic transmission and into various dashboards for visualization and utilization in informing decision-making processes at the different administrative levels of project and Ministry levels. PMU reporting systems will be linked to the lead ministry database, using custom-made software that allows data to be entered electronically and forwarded through subsequent approvals processes.

H. Knowledge Management, Communication and Learning (KMC)

The Programme will elaborate and implement a KM and Communication Strategy/plan that will: (i) provide Programme beneficiaries with the necessary material to sustain the technical knowledge acquired with the support of the Programme (production of training materials and communication platforms for sensitization) and continuously assess their adoption; (ii) generate shared knowledge acquired from the experience of the Programme in various fields based on the information collected as part of the monitoring of results or thematic studies; (iii) share this knowledge with the Technical Departments of the Ministry, IFAD, GCF , and implementing partners using various dissemination strategies. Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) will play an important role in planning, monitoring, supervision, and evaluations helping to inform activities, replication, and scaling, be an integral part of the Programme to ensure implementation is a continuous learning process. Evidence-based data from innovative technologies will continuously be collected, analysed, packaged, and disseminated as KM Products through appropriate communication channels /media, targeting different audience mainly for policy dialogues and change influence, specifically on behaviour.

KMC will serve as the foundation for replication of successes, provide the analytical basis to resolve challenges, and help to adapt plans and implementation strategies to changing social and economic circumstances in the target areas. The KMC function will be complemented by the M&E system and Management Information System (MIS) on which quantitative and qualitative data will be assessed to primarily develop: (i) policy-level KMC Products (policy, briefs, strategies, working papers), (ii) beneficiary

success stories; (iii) training manuals on technologies; and (iv) lessons learned etc. KMC activities will have the following strategic objectives: i) supporting policy engagement; ii) supporting Programme's successful implementation; iii) raising awareness on mainstreaming themes; iv) disseminating lessons learned and promoting scaling up of innovations and technologies; and v) support Programme communication and visibility strategies.

Overall, DalMA will make use of already proven knowledge management and communication methods, tools and strategies, exchange groups, Communities of Practice (CoPs), exchange visits, learning routes, contributions to thematic networks, and an e-Library. The Programme will explore CoPs that include different thematic groups such as i) The M&E thematic Group; ii) Financial Management Thematic Groups; iii) Procurement Management Thematic Groups; iv) Thematic group for Programme Coordinators from all four countries; Gender and Inclusion groups and other focused technical groups among other groups to discuss technical issues that could enhance and ensure both national and regional approaches and harmony in the implementation and add value to the DalMA Programme. The goal will be to generate by the end of the program, a detailed report on the good practices developed in DalMA Program area of climate change adaptation. Among the M&E CoPs to be explored by the respective country will include, but not limited to the following i) Joint national workshops of M&E and knowledge management groups of experts and specialists in the M&E teams from all administrative levels in each country to discuss M&E technical issues, and ii) Joint Regional workshops of M&E and knowledge management groups of experts and specialist from all the four countries to discuss M&E technical issues; iii) National M&E Specialist support to joint supervision and implementation support mission to enhance learning and experience. The Regional CoP workshops shall also include Regional M&E Specialist and may be supported by IFAD as and when required. However, the composition of Regional CoP could change when required and may involve experts who are not M&E but add value to the M&E eg Financial Management Experts and Gender/ inclusion specialist. The Regional CoP workshops will also include that of Senior Programme Steering committee levels with members from the RSC but will have to be approved by IFAD through **"a No Objection"**. Possible topics may include data management and disaggregation, planning and reporting, Indicator definitions, implementation challenges, best practices, stakeholders' engagement, knowledge management and Programme visibility among other feasible practices. At RSC levels, CoPs could include policy discussions and harmony as may be requires, planning and reporting requirements at regional levels to ensure harmony and timely submissions to IFAD and GCF.

Table 1: Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Consolidated)

Monitoring Plan					
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	Budget Comments
Regional inception meetings - with stakeholders to raise awareness on DAIMA approach and projected impact	Focus groups	One-time project inception workshop	Workshop report	70,000	The Regional inception meeting will be one time and will draw participants from all the 4 countries
Regional Start-up activities: Review and update of the first annual work plan and budget and the Programme Manuals	Focus groups	Annual	Reviewed Annual Work Plan(s)	40,000	This will be a one-time Joint review and update of AWPB to ensure harmony
Joint Regional Annual workplan and budget and review workshops	Focus groups	Annual	Annual Work Plan(s)	60,000	This will be annual activity costed per to consolidate and review the work plan to ensure harmony in the implementation
Monitoring and evaluation System development and operationalization eg M&E plan/ strategy development. M&E tools development and operationalization e	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, key informant interviews and focused group discussion	Continuous	Monitoring and evaluation plan/ strategy M&E tools M&E products TA Reports	40,000	The activities aim to support M&E activities at regional level.
Regional Knowledge Management and Communication	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping	Continuous	MIS tools and Systems eg website	60,000	<i>The activity will cover Knowledge Management and Communication Aspects at the Regional Level</i>
M&E and KMC Capacity building of Regional Staff at RSC level	Government data/records	Continuous	# of Training reports produced	20,000	<i>M&E and KMC capacity building will also be targeted</i>

			# of people trained		for RSC Members for enhanced understanding
Total Indicative Monitoring Budget				220,000	The budget to be covered by each project on the corresponding activity budget line
Evaluation Plan					
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget	Comment	
Outcome	Baselines Baseline will be conducted at the initial stage of Programme start up	Independent	200,000	Shall be one baseline covering Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda for harmony of data variables. Baseline studies will include those on emission reduction carried under ILRI as part of the Programme	
Outcome	Thematic / Outcome studies/assessments - Conducted to provide data and for informed view justifying MTR	Independent	250,000	DaIMA shall conduct at least two Outcome /Thematic studies conducted prior to Mid Term Review. This shall ensure harmony on selected outcome study reports and data. The budget to be contributed by each project on the activity budget line	
Outcome	Mid Term Conducted midway to help determined for the Programme is progressing	Independent	200,000	Mid Term shall be conducted jointly for Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Rwanda	
Participatory	Beneficiary feedback survey	Independent	150,000	At least 2 surveys shall be conducted jointly covering Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda ensure harmony of Beneficiary feedback results. The budget to be contributed by each project on the activity budget line	
Impact	Impact Evaluation Conducted after the Programme closure to determine the achievement realized and the impact on the beneficiaries	Independent	400,000	Impact evaluation shall be conducted jointly covering Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda to ensure harmony of impact results. The budget to be contributed by each project on the activity budget line	

Total Indicative Evaluation	1,200,000	This budget shall be covered by each participating programme in the four countries of Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Tanzania
-----------------------------	-----------	--

Table 2: Monitoring Plan for Rwanda

Monitoring					
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	Budget Comments
National inception meetings - with stakeholders to raise awareness on DAIMA approach and projected impact	Focus groups	One-time Programme inception workshop	Workshop report	40,000	
National Start-up activities: Review and update of the first annual work plan and budget and the Programme Manuals	Focus groups	Annual	Reviewed Annual Work Plan(s)	40,000	
National annual workplan and budget and review workshops	Focus groups	Annual	Annual Work Plan(s)	120,000	The activity is also spread for period 6 years @20,000*6 USD
Profiling of Programme activities	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, Field observation,	Once at the inception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TA Reports 	23,376	This is a unique activity for this country.
Monitoring and evaluation System development and operationalization eg M&E plan/ strategy development. M&E tools development and operationalization etc- <i>A detailed M&E plan /strategy and tools for operationalization of the M&E system</i>	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, key informant interviews and focused group discussion	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and evaluation plan/ strategy M&E tools M&E products TA Reports 	100,000	The activity is also spread across the 6-year period
Development, maintenance, and update of MIS system eg GIS, Website and M&E system development, automation, and operationalization	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MIS tools and Systems eg website 	120,000	The activity is spread across the 6-year period USD@ 20,000 annually

M&E TA/ Consultancy support during the initial start up	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, Field observation,	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E Tools, • TA Reports 	50,900	The budget is spread across period 6 years
Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) plan/ strategy development, tools, operationalization, and production of various KMC products	Other (please specify). Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping and key informant interviews	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KMC plan/ strategy • KMC tools • KMC products 	80,000	This activity is critical for consideration USD @20,000 annually
M&E Capacity building of staff and field staff (MIS, and related M&E tools)	Government data/records	Continuous	# of Training reports produced # of people trained	60,000	6 yearly capacity building budget of staff
Total Indicative Monitoring Budget				634,276	

Table 3: Evaluation Plan for Rwanda

Evaluation				
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget	Comment
Outcome	Baselines Baseline will be conducted at the initial stage of Programme start up	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Outcome	Thematic / Outcome studies/assessments -Conducted to provide data and for informed view justifying MTR	Independent	180,000	While Regional studies will be important, National Level Studies may be important due to uniqueness of context. Details shall be harmonized with Regional Outcome studies. At least 2 surveys during the project life @90,000 each
Outcome	Mid Term Conducted midway to help determined for the Programme is progressing	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Participatory	Beneficiary feedback survey	Independent	180,000	National survey may be important due to unique context of implementation. This shall feed the National surveys conducted. At least 2 surveys during the project life @90,000 each
Ex-poste	End of Programme Final Independent and external terminal evaluation at the end of Programme cycle	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Impact	Impact Evaluation Conducted after the Programme closure to determine the achievement realized and the impact on the beneficiaries	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Total Indicative Evaluation			360,000	
Overall Indicative Monitoring & Evaluation Plan			994,276	

Table 4: Monitoring Plan for Tanzania

Monitoring					
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	Budget Comments
National inception meetings - with stakeholders to raise awareness on DAIMA approach and projected impact	Focus groups	One-time Programme inception workshop	Workshop report	40,000	Cost item not captured in the country M&E cost tab
National start-up activities: Review and update of the first annual work plan and budget and the Programme Manuals	Focus groups	Once	Reviewed Annual Work Plan(s)	40,000	Budget scaled down from 306,000
National Annual workplan and budget and review workshops	Focus groups	Annual	Annual Work Plan(s)	120,000	The activity is spread every year for 6 years @20,000*6 USD
National Monitoring and evaluation System development and operationalization eg M&E plan/ strategy development. M&E tools development and operationalization etc- <i>A detailed M&E plan /strategy and tools for operationalization of the M&E system</i>	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, key informant interviews and focused group discussion	Recurrent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and evaluation plan/ strategy M&E tools M&E products 	240,000	The budget is Spread for 6 years @ 40,000 USD annually
National Development, maintenance, and update of MIS system formats	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping	Recurrent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MIS tools and Systems eg website, Automated M&E system, GIS system etc 	120,000	MIS for C-SDT, MoA Zanzibar GIS, Website and M&E system development, automation, and operationalization, C-SDTP, Ministry of Agriculture Zanzibar, digital registry for livestock farmers, and to revise and digitalize ARDS reporting. The budget is spread for 6 years @20,000 USD annually
National M&E TA/ Consultancy support during the initial startup (eg Training on tablets and digitalized reporting formats, new MIS for users and training for M&E officers C-SDTP)	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, Field observation,	Recurrent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E Tools, TA Reports 	60,100	The budget is spread for 6 years lumpsum

National Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) plan/ strategy development, tools, operationalization, and production of various KMC products	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping and key informant interviews	Recurrent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KMC plan/ strategy • KMC tools • KMC products 	120,000	The cost will cover 6 years @20,000 USD annually
National M&E Capacity building of staff and field staff (MIS, and related M&E tools)-	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping and key informant interviews	Recurrent	# of Training reports produced # of people trained	40,000	Spread for 6 years at @ 10,000 annually for capacity building for staff C-SDTP, Zanzibar Ministry of Agriculture, tablets and digitalized reporting formats etc
Total Indicative Monitoring Budget				912,900	

Table 5: Evaluation Plan for Tanzania

Evaluation				
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget	Budget comments
Formative	Baselines <i>Baseline will be conducted at the initial stage of Programme start up</i>	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Outcome	Thematic or Outcome studies/assessments -Conducted to provide data and informed view justifying MTR	Independent	392,800	While Regional studies will be important, National Level Studies may be important due to uniqueness of context. Details shall be harmonized with Regional Outcome studies. At least 2 surveys during the project life @196,400 each
Outcome	Mid Term Conducted midway to help determined for the Programme is progressing	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Participatory	Beneficiary feedback survey	Independent	392,800	National survey may be important due to unique context of implementation. This shall feed the National surveys conducted. At least 2 surveys during the project life @196,400 each
Impact	Impact Evaluation <i>Conducted after the project closure to determine the achievement realized and the impact on the beneficiaries</i>	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Total Indicative Evaluation Budget			785,600	
Overall Indicative Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Budget			1,698,500	

Table 6: Monitoring Plan for Uganda

Monitoring					
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	Budget Comments
National inception meetings - with stakeholders to raise awareness on DAIMA approach and projected impact	Focus groups	One-time project inception workshop	Workshop report	44,000	
National start-up activities: Review and update of the first annual work plan and budget and the Project Manuals	Focus groups	Annual	Reviewed Annual Work Plan(s)	60,000	
National Annual workplan and budget and review workshops	Focus groups	Annual	Annual Work Plan(s)	150,000	The activity is spread for annual for period 6 years @ 25,000*6 USD
National Monitoring and evaluation System development and operationalization eg M&E plan/ strategy development. M&E tools development and operationalization etc- <i>A detailed M&E plan /strategy and tools for operationalization of the M&E system</i>	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, key informant interviews and focused group discussion	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and evaluation plan/ strategy M&E tools M&E products TA Reports 	240,000	The budget has been spread across period 6 years @ 40,000 annually
National Development, maintenance, and update of MIS system eg GIS, Website and M&E system development, automation, and operationalization	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MIS tools and Systems eg website 	120,000	The cost is spread for 6 years @20,000 annually
National M&E TA/ Consultancy support during the initial startup.	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, Field observation,	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E Tools, TA Reports 	60,900	The budget has been spread across period 6 years

National Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) plan/ strategy development, tools, operationalization, and production of various KMC products	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping and key informant interviews	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KMC plan/ strategy • KMC tools • KMC products 	120,000	The cost is spread for 6 years @20,000 annually
National M&E Capacity building of staff and field staff (<i>MIS, and related M&E tools</i>)	Government data/records	Continuous	# of Training reports produced # of people trained	60,000	yearly capacity building of staff @10,000*6 =60,000
Total Indicative Monitoring Budget				794,400	

Table 7: Evaluation Plan for Uganda

Evaluation				
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget	Comment
<i>Formative</i>	Baselines Baseline will be conducted at the initial stage of project start up	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
<i>Outcome</i>	Thematic / Outcome studies/assessments - Conducted to provide data and for informed view justifying MTR	Independent	392,800	While Regional studies will be important, National Level Studies may be important due to uniqueness of context. Details shall be harmonized with Regional Outcome studies. At least 2 surveys during the project life @196,400 each
<i>Outcome</i>	Mid Term Conducted midway to help determined for the project is progressing	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
<i>Participatory</i>	Beneficiary feedback survey	Independent	392,800	At least 2 surveys during the project life @196,400 each
<i>Impact</i>	Impact Evaluation Conducted after the project closure to determine the achievement realized and the impact on the beneficiaries	Independent	N/A	The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony
Total Indicative Evaluation			785,600	
Overall Indicative Monitoring & Evaluation Plan			1,580,000	

Table 8: Monitoring Plan for Kenya

Monitoring					
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	Budget Comments
National inception meetings - with stakeholders to raise awareness on DAIMA approach and projected impact	Focus groups	One-time project inception workshop	Workshop report	40,000	
National start-up activities: Review and update of the first annual work plan and budget and the Project Manuals	Focus groups	Annual	Reviewed Annual Work Plan(s)	60,000	
National Annual workplan and budget and review workshops	Focus groups	Annual	Annual Work Plan(s)	240,000	The budget is also spread for annual for period 6 years @ 40,000*6 USD
National Monitoring and evaluation System development and operationalization eg M&E plan/ strategy development. M&E tools development and operationalization etc- A detailed M&E plan /strategy and tools for operationalization of the M&E system	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, key informant interviews and focused group discussion	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and evaluation plan/ strategy M&E tools M&E products TA Reports 	240,000	<i>The budget is spread across period 6 years @ 40,00 USD annually</i>
National Development, maintenance, and update of MIS system eg GIS, Website and M&E system development, automation, and operationalization	Other (please specify). Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MIS tools and Systems eg website 	240,000	<i>The budget is spread for a whole year @40,000 USD annually</i>
National M&E TA/ Consultancy support during the initial start up	Other (please specify). Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping, Field observation,	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E Tools, TA Reports 	80,900	<i>The budget is spread across period 6 years</i>
National Knowledge Management and Communication (KMC) plan/ strategy development, tools, operationalization, and production of various KMC products	Other (please specify) Surveys, Government data /records, document review, baseline study, GIS data, stakeholders mapping and key informant interviews	Continuous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KMC plan/ strategy KMC tools KMC products 	180,000	<i>The budget is spread across period 6 years @ 30,000 annually</i>
National M&E Capacity building of staff and field staff (MIS, and related M&E tools)	Government data/records	Continuous	# of Training reports produced # of people trained	60,000	yearly capacity building of staff @ 10,000*6 = 60,000
Total Indicative Monitoring Budget				1,100,900	

Table 9: Evaluation Plan for Kenya

Evaluation				
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget	Comment
Formative	Baselines: <i>Baseline will be conducted at the initial stage of project start up</i>	Independent	N/A	<i>The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony</i>
Outcome	Thematic / Outcome studies/assessments -Conducted to provide data and for informed view justifying MTR	Independent	392,800	<i>While Regional studies will be important, National Level Studies may be important due to uniqueness of context. Details shall be harmonized with Regional Outcome studies. At least 2 surveys during the project life @196,400 each</i>
Outcome	Mid Term. Conducted midway to help determined for the project is progressing	Independent	N/A	<i>The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony</i>
Participatory	Beneficiary feedback survey	Independent	392,800	<i>National survey may be important due to unique context of implementation. This shall feed the National surveys conducted. At least 2 surveys during the project life @196,400 each</i>
Impact	Impact Evaluation: <i>Conducted after the project closure to determine the achievement realized and the impact on the beneficiaries</i>	Independent	N/A	<i>The cost is captured in the Regional Budget for implementation harmony</i>
Total Indicative Evaluation			785,600	
Overall Indicative Monitoring & Evaluation Plan			1,886,500	