

### Why Is It Important to Monitor and Evaluate Disaster- and Climate Shock-sensitive Components of Social Protection Programs?

Early integration of disaster risk management/climate change adaptation criteria into social protection programs' monitoring and evaluation plans, systems, and budgets allows for more effective capture of necessary information, including proxy indicators to measure the reduction of risk exposure. Organizations such as the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) have documented international experience in developing monitoring and evaluation systems that measure disaster risk management and climate change adaptation. Monitoring and evaluation systems have also been used after disasters to provide rapid real-time feedback on the appropriateness and coverage of the response, so that adjustments can be made.

## Monitoring and Evaluating Social Protection Programs' Efforts to Respond to Natural Disasters and Climate Change-Related Shocks

Rachel Cipryk and Mirey Ovadiya

### Key Elements of an M&E System

Disaster risk management/climate change adaptation activities are expected to contribute to two fundamental objectives of social protection:

1. Before disaster hits, they aim to reduce and mitigate the risks associated with disaster- and climate-related hazards by reducing poverty, increasing resilience, and promoting opportunities and livelihoods both before and after disasters strike. These objectives are part of the prevention and promotion functions of social protection.
2. After a disaster hits, they aim to protect poor and vulnerable households and help them cope with their impacts through relief activities and recovery and reconstruction interventions.

The following steps can make social protection M&E more disaster and climate sensitive:

1. During program preparation, select performance outcomes, outputs, indicators, and realistic interim targets.
2. During program preparation and early implementation, gather baseline data on: disaster- and climate-related risks or post disaster/climate change impacts, vulnerable households, and existing coping/adaptation mechanisms.
3. During program preparation, build a monitoring system that includes disaster risk management/climate change adaptation that can be adjusted and expanded if disaster strikes:

- Assess the capacity of the program to achieve program objectives, including those related to disaster risk management/climate change adaptation (for example, building emergency response capacity) ex ante and ex post.
  - Establish partnerships to coordinate data collection and define collective data collection plans for post disaster contexts.
  - Identify the methods and tools to use for the various components of the M&E plan both before and after a disaster.
  - Design an M&E feedback loop to inform program implementation.
4. Evaluate all program components for efficiency and effectiveness with regards to future programming. Consider conducting an impact evaluation.

**Step 1: Select Performance Outcomes, Outputs, Indicators, and Interim Targets**

Social protection programs need to be able to track changes to vulnerability and resilience so that performance measurement systems can be appropriately adapted. It is therefore important to build some flexibility into the M&E plan. In addition, all M&E plans should be participatory in nature and include both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

**Risk reduction and mitigation (ex ante measures)**

Outcomes, outputs, and indicators should measure the extent to which activities help beneficiaries reduce the risks from disasters and adapt to climate change, increase household and community resilience, and contribute to broader social protection or poverty reduction objectives. Examples include improving the diversity and sustainability of livelihood assets, improving infrastructure that builds resilience to shocks, increasing and improving institutional capacities, and ensuring social inclusiveness in the distribution of benefits.

If direct measurement of change is not possible, proxy indicators can be used. One type of proxy is the quantity and quality of physical mitigation measures constructed, for example the number of people/hectares of land protected by strengthened and improved embankments. Another is changes in awareness, attitudes, skills, and practices for risk reduction and climate adaptation, which may indicate the degree to which a community is prepared to respond to disaster.

**Risk coping (ex post measures)**

In the wake of a disaster, social protection projects are well positioned to respond quickly to the needs of their regular beneficiaries and to take on additional beneficiaries. Outputs, outcomes, and indicators for disaster response need to be identified to measure the results. A sample of these measures can be found in Ethiopia’s Products Safety Net Program (Table 1) which addresses chronic food insecurity among a highly climate-vulnerable population.

**Table 1. Outcomes, Outputs, and Indicators for Risk Financing Mechanism in Ethiopia’s Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP)**

Measure	Objectively verifiable indicator
<b>Goal</b> Livelihoods and lives protected from shocks in PSNP districts	
<b>Outcome</b> Transitory cash and food needs addressed effectively in PSNP districts, to the limit of risk financing resources	<p>(Program’s own impact)</p> <p>1. Consumption ensured and assets protected by existing PSNP beneficiaries, with rapid response team (RRT)</p> <p>2. Consumption ensured and assets protected by non-PSNP beneficiaries receiving risk financing assistance, with RRT</p>

<i>Outputs</i>	
1. Accurate early warning of shocks achieved	<p>1.1 Early warning issued within x weeks of first indication</p> <p>1.2 Early warning messages balance triangulated data sources and resolve inconsistencies, with RRT</p> <p>1.3. Early warning message is accepted and agreed by State Minister for Disaster Reduction and Food Security</p> <p>1.4 Ex post evaluation of early warning shows acceptable accuracy</p>
2. Appropriate contingency plans ready when needed	<p>2.1. Contingency plans for all PSNP districts submitted to Early Warning Response Department in July each year</p> <p>2.2. Contingency plans updated every 12 months, following feedback from regional and federal level</p> <p>2.3. Quality review process for contingency plans operates effectively</p>
3. Adequate contingent financing resources available where and when needed	<p>3.1. Pooled fund is at intended level before shock</p> <p>3.2. Agreements made with key donors on nature, timing, and scale of response to contingent appeal</p> <p>3.3. Early warning system provides adequate early notice of scale, nature, location, and timing of resources needed</p> <p>3.4. National committee approves fund release as guided</p> <p>3.5. Performance standards for funds flows achieved at all levels</p> <p>3.6. Communication and coordination between key stakeholders on funding need, utilization, and problems is effective</p>
4. Planned systems and processes for risk financing mechanism function effectively	<p>4.1. Early warning system functions according to performance standards</p> <p>4.2. Contingency plans meet quality standards</p> <p>4.3. Funding flows function according to performance standards</p> <p>4.4. Coordination meets performance standards</p> <p>4.5. Decision-making systems follow technical guidance</p> <p>4.6. Clear guidance for roles and responsibilities and response to transitory needs in PSNP districts followed by key actors</p> <p>4.7. Transitions between instruments and actors meet performance standards</p> <p>4.8. Staff capacity able to scale up as needed and meet performance standards</p> <p>4.9. Logistical capacity able to scale up as necessary and meet performance standards</p>
5. Effective coordination with other financial and delivery instruments and actors achieved	<p>5.1. Shared policy and strategy framework agreed for transitory response in PSNP districts</p> <p>5.2. Guidelines for transitory response followed by key actors</p> <p>5.3. Joint planning for transitory response between actors</p> <p>5.4. Effective communication of transitory response information between actors</p> <p>5.5. Transitions between instruments smooth</p>

## **Step 2: Gather Baseline Data and Conduct a Post Disaster Needs Assessments**

To measure the contribution of an intervention, it is first necessary to obtain a baseline that assesses current and projected risks, frequency of the disaster, the disaster's impact on vulnerable groups, and coping mechanisms used mitigate the disaster's impact. This analysis should be carried out as part of the overall poverty and risk assessment process. It will also act as the foundation for designing project objectives, outcomes, outputs, and performance indicators in the M&E plan.

### **Risk coping**

Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNAs) are government-led efforts, supported by bilateral and multilateral development partners. They are typically undertaken three to four weeks after a disaster. A PDNA uses two methodologies: 1) the World Bank–led Damage and Loss Assessment (DaLA) methodology, which examines damage, losses, and sector-specific needs; 2) the United Nations–led Human Recovery Needs Assessment (HRNA) methodology, which assesses the impact of the disaster on human needs and development achievements.

A qualitative methodology called social impact analysis (SIA) has recently been introduced into the PDNA processes to provide insights into the post disaster social consequences that are not easily observable. (Box 1). The SIA assesses areas such as community dynamics, social cohesion, demographic marginalization, and household-level challenges to livelihoods restoration. The information gathered from a PDNA and SIA form a baseline for identifying key social protection needs and monitoring whether and how these needs are met.

### **Box 1. Using social impact analysis to assess the effectiveness of social protection in Thailand**

During the 2011 floods in Thailand, a social impact analysis team was deployed with the Post Disaster Needs Assessments team. For the first time, SIA findings were used to inform recommendations for post disaster recovery actions by the social protection system. Integration of the social impact and social protection system analysis provided the basis for recommendations that responded to the difficulties many households were facing but which had escaped attention in the Damage and Loss Assessment (DaLA) process. Pairing the two sets of recommendations, the team identified existing social protection mechanisms that could have been used to uncover particularly vulnerable households and channel resources to them. The recommendations suggested that pensions for the elderly and grants for poor households be doubled for three months in order to provide additional support until the floods abated; that livelihood interventions target women and not only men (as the first round of assistance had done); and that low-interest rate loans be made available to facilitate the repayment of high-interest, informal loans that had become a necessity for many low-income households.

## **Step 3: Build the M&E System**

### **Capacity assessment and preparedness**

Providing training, using specialist expertise on evaluations, and forming partnerships with disaster risk management/ climate change adaptation organizations will help prepare teams to monitor the program and expand monitoring capacity to respond quickly to a disaster (box 2). Necessary skills include the ability to conduct social analysis for post disaster contexts, use of participatory approaches, and an understanding of both the social protection system and the disaster and climate risk context.

### **Box 2. Training Indonesian officials in social research after the tsunami**

To help them assess the ongoing impacts of the 2004 Asian tsunami in Aceh, Indonesia, the Aceh Community Assistance Research Project (ACARP) provided its evaluation team with a two-week training course on social research methodologies. The course covered basic concepts of quantitative and qualitative research and research techniques, practical skills in interviewing and research notation, rapid and participatory methods, and gender balance in research and reporting. Participants learned how to design and use questionnaires and conduct a range of research engagements, including focus group discussions, structured and semistructured interviews, village histories, and data analysis.

It is important to have agreements in place with agencies or organizations with which the social protection program can partner (Box 3). Such partnerships allow a qualified team to be quickly deployed after a disaster.

### **Box 3. Expanding community outreach in Pakistan after an earthquake**

The Earthquake Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Program (E3RP) of Pakistan's Poverty Alleviation Fund's (PPAF) deployed 47 social mobilization teams in Azad Jammu Kashmir and 60 in North West Frontier Province. The teams played a critical role by carrying out damage assessments, inspiring social mobilization, providing training, and conducting quality control.

Each team was supposed to include an engineer and a male and female social organizer and be responsible for 800–1,000 households. In the event, some teams lacked adequate numbers of women, reducing the capacity of PPAF to work with vulnerable households, particularly households headed by women. Partner organizations did not appear to understand gender issues or housing design that met the needs of people with disabilities. The PPAF concluded that, in the future, it would be desirable to train and monitor partner organizations on vulnerability and gender issues.

## ***Partnerships and coordination***

M&E may involve a variety of implementing partners including different national ministries, local governments, and outside agencies. Ensuring that all parties contribute to the ongoing needs of the M&E framework requires that responsibilities, lines of communication, and coordination be clear and agreed to by all parties.

Coordination and information sharing are particularly important after disasters. Establishing shared protocols regarding who is responsible for what information is useful. Existing data sources, such as predisaster baselines and social program monitoring information, should be shared with all post disaster assessment teams.

## ***Methods and instruments***

An M&E plan guides ongoing assessment of progress. It should include both qualitative and quantitative methods, which can be used to manage project risks, oversee quality control, and measure performance. Existing social protection methodologies and tools can be modified to capture disaster risk management/climate change adaptation information. Such methodologies include participatory approaches, financial and technical audits, management information systems (MIS), social audits, and other beneficiary feedback methods, such as grievance and redress systems.

MIS is an important tool for targeting, beneficiary coverage, and fiduciary control. It can also be used to track disaster risk outcomes and overlapping them with data about beneficiary coverage or poverty density.

The grievance and redress systems that are in place for normal operations should continue during the post disaster period. However, they may need to be adjusted and streamlined to deal with the temporary surge in caseloads. Advance planning is needed to ensure that they can be scaled up quickly on demand. Grievance systems ensure two-way communications with the public and help clarify program eligibility, objectives, and benefits.

## ***Step 4: Evaluate Performance***

Performance assessment measures efficiency, effectiveness, and impact. To measure efficiency and effectiveness, it is important to cover the following dimensions:

- Communications at multiple levels, including within the implementation team at the ground and higher up, with partnering organizations and with core and disaster-related beneficiary groups.
- Operations related to planned and unplanned responses, including readiness, the availability of resources for swift response, plans of action, and partnerships to maximize resources.
- Preparedness of the implementation team, program resources, and communities with which the program has been working (if preparedness activities had been taking place).
- Targeting the most vulnerable households as well as providing an adequate level of benefits that meet the needs and priorities of beneficiaries (such as debt relief in addition to the meeting of immediate needs).
- M&E of the disaster event, including the accuracy of post disaster assessments, to ensure that resources and assistance are appropriately distributed and to determine whether the M&E system contributed to corrective action.

Evaluating the impact of disaster and climate resilience components of social protection programs can be difficult if there are few measurable or observable changes in the environment or a disaster does not occur within the project's duration. As discussed above, proxy indicators may have to suffice as a means of evaluating the degree to which a program has built resilience to a hazard or climate shocks. Generally, however, the high cost of impact assessments means that they are conducted only when a program demonstrates particularly innovative or important results.

In disaster response, it is important to ensure that the impact of the mitigation measures be tracked following the event in order to assess the impact. The social impact assessment methodology can be used for medium- to long-term monitoring of the social impacts of the disaster. Comparing these findings against findings for a control group provides an indication of the effects and impacts of mitigation and preparedness activities.



## Tips for Practitioners: Principles to Follow in Conducting M&E

The following tips can help practitioners monitor and evaluate social protection programs' efforts to mitigate and respond to disaster and climate risks:

1. Ensure that the M&E system captures all areas of programming. All elements should be reflected in the M&E instruments. Ensuring sufficient human and financial resourcing for activities such as logframes, M&E plans, operational guides, and needs assessments is essential.
2. Ensure that program staff have the skills to conduct M&E, including the ability to adjust programs based on post disaster assessment findings
3. Partner with other agencies where possible, particularly when monitoring slow-onset disasters or responding to disasters. Establish protocols to identify who has what information and will be responsible sharing it. Identify gaps and make plans to fill them.
4. Plan ahead for disasters.
5. Create contingency plans for financing and implementing post disaster M&E.
6. Use existing systems, to the extent possible. Post disaster environments are often complex, rushed, and confusing. Avoid complicating programs or adding new activities and formats when these needs can be met through existing mechanisms.
7. Ensure that social accountability mechanisms remain in place during and after disasters. Although post disaster chaos can cause social accountability to be missed or deemed too difficult, it is important to ensure that transparency and accountability are maintained.
8. Continue to monitor. Although easy to drop amidst post disaster chaos, M&E provides valuable information.

---

### Additional Resources

ALNAP.org is a learning network that supports the humanitarian sector in its efforts to improve humanitarian performance through learning, peer-to-peer sharing, and research.

*Learning to ADAPT: Monitoring and Evaluation Approaches in Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction: Challenges, Gaps and Ways Forward*

<http://community.eldis.org/.5a093c0d>

*Making Livelihoods and Social Protection Gender Sensitive*

<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2012/10/16875747/making-livelihoods-social-protection-gender-sensitive>

*Monitoring and Evaluation in Disaster Risk Management*

[http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/01/05/000333038\\_20110105000313/Rendered/PDF/587940BRI0211M10BOX353819B01PUBLIC1.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/01/05/000333038_20110105000313/Rendered/PDF/587940BRI0211M10BOX353819B01PUBLIC1.pdf)

*Social Impact Assessment Guidelines: Analyzing the Social Impacts of Disasters. Vol. I: Methodology*

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEAPREGTOPSOCDEV/Resources/PostDisasterSocialAnalysisToolsVolumeI.pdf>

*Social Impact Assessment Guidelines: Analyzing the Social Impacts of Disasters. Vol. II: Tools*

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEAPREGTOPSOCDEV/Resources/PostDisasterSocialAnalysisToolsVolumeII.pdf>