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Sector Strategy Knowledge & learning

Monitoring Evaluation Accountability & Learning Team, July 2019

# PURPOSE OF THIS CHECKLIST

The MEAL (Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning) Compliance checklist is a sup- port tool for developing project and program proposal. The MEAL compliance checklist was developed by MEAL Team at Head Office to assure the content of proposals are complying with MEAL requirements of WHH. The questions under each chapter provide reference points, which shall be considered by project and program developers during the proposal writing process to ensure all necessary requirements are fulfilled.

# TARGET GROUP

Staff who is involved in project and program proposal development process at Head Office and Country Office level, in particular Head of Programmes, and Meal Experts. External consul-tants, who are involved in proposal development of WHH, need to consider this checklist.

# MEAL COMPLIANCE FOR PROJECT / PROGRAM PROPOSALS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What?** | **Considered?** |
| **Assessments*** Are the capacities of the partner organisation regarding MEAL assessed and described (experience regarding surveys, evalua- tions, participatory processes, functional MEAL structure und staff etc.)?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |
| **Logical Framework*** Is the logical framework logical?Consider: hypothesis of effects: “if” – ”then”!
* Are the vertical levels logically separated from each other?No use of “through” or “in order to”!
* Are the targets achievable within the given time frame and under the given conditions?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**  |
| **Budget*** Are proposal, logical framework and budget consistent?
* Are there enough resources for MEAL activities allocated? Our recommendation: a minimum of 5 percent of the total amount of the project / program! The budget should cover all

relevant MEAL costs: staff, surveys, assessments, evaluations, capacity development, Feedback and Complaints Response Mechanism (CRM), information sharing activities, events such as participatory reviews or workshops, supplies and equipment for digital data gathering etc.* Is at least one MEAL officer budgeted per project?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What?** | **Considered?** |
| **Indicators*** No indicators at activity level! Indicators at impact level only if required by the donor.
* Are qualitative as well as quantitative indicators considered?
* Are #measuring success indicators considered (requirements: project volume equal to/more than 100.000 Euro plus project duration equal to/more than 12 months)?
* Have CHS-Indicators been considered?
* Do standardized donor indicators exist and are they reflected in the logical framework?
* Is the number of outputs and outcomes reasonable? (recom- mendation: not more than 3–4 outputs and a maximum of 2 out- comes – in case of emergency projects 1 outcome is enough).
* Is the number of indicators per output / outcome reasonable? (recommendation: not more than 3 per output and 3 per out- come)
* Are the indicators SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound)?
* Are the indicators disaggregated regarding relevant categories as gender etc.?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**  |
| **Sources of verification*** Are the sources of verification / methods appropriate (including gender-sensitive data collection)?
* Is there a mix of methods planned (including qualitative and quantitative tools)?
* Is secondary data considered?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |
| **Assumptions and risks*** Is the differentiation between assumptions and risk clear?
* Are risks really located out of the responsibility or control of the project management?
* Are risks adequately addressed and monitored by the risk management of the project?
* Are measures to minimize risks defined?
* Are risks also defined with reference to “Do no Harm”, also vulnerable groups and gender-related risks?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |
| **Evaluation*** Does the project apply to the evaluation criteria?Project evaluation required if: Project volume >= 2.5 Million Euro OR Project Duration >=3 years OR project volume per month >= 150,000 Euros OR project is of specific strategic relevance. If yes – is an evaluation planned and budgeted?
* Is adequately explained why or why not an evaluation is fore- seen?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |
| **Setting up a MEAL system*** Is the development of a MEAL system explicitly planned for after project has started?
* Is learning / exchange part of the project / program approach?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |

1. **MEAL COMPLIANCE REGARDING BMZ PRIVATE AGENCIES / GLOBAL PROGRAMMES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What?** | **Considered?** |
| **Capacity of local partners*** Are capacity needs of the local partner based on an assess-ment (as partner assessment)?
* Is capacity development regarding MEAL explicitly mentioned?
* Is WHH MEAL supporting staff regressive? Is an exit strategy in place to strengthen the local partner to take over MEAL role?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |
| **Programme approach*** Is the added value of the Global programme clearly described in the log frame?
* Is an additional output for mutual learning and experience change developed?
 | [ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes**[ ]  **No** [ ]  **Yes** |
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