

## 8 Continuous monitoring and reporting in line with pre-established KPIs

The conflict in Syria poses a number of difficulties in implementing a programme as ambitious and wide reaching as AJACS. The client requires a rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodology in place at both the programmatic and intervention logic. This will ensure AJACS remains relevant in relation to developments on the ground.

Coffey's M&E approach will determine whether AJACS' objectives and goal are being met (see table 3 for example indicators for monitoring progress at the objective level). We will monitor and evaluate individual interventions in a way that is commensurate with their length and budget. This will guarantee that results are fed back into the overall programme design, fed into decisions about scaling up/down and guide future decisions in a timely manner.

### 8.1 Monitoring and reporting on the quality of service delivery

#### 8.1.1 Intervention level monitoring

The Scope of Work outlines the need for findings and analyses to feed into programme design and implementation. Accurate and timely monitoring and analysis of completed interventions will help to ensure future interventions remain relevant and have the greatest impact. We will determine the level of monitoring and data collection for a given intervention based on its length, budget and strategic importance. It will range from a 'light-touch' monitoring against the TOR to a more in-depth logframe approach with specific indicators. Our team will work with the Secretariat to develop monitoring systems for each intervention to ensure the information gathered is compatible with AJACS overarching goal. This will ensure that chosen interventions maintain their clarity of purpose as outlined in the SoW; promote rapid identification of opportunities and risks to inform programme adaptation; and, remain consistent with the overall programme

#### Peace Building Support to the Post Conflict Needs Analysis

As part of this £25 million programme Coffey set up a research and innovation unit. The unit has overall responsibility for developing the Theory of Change (ToC) documentation at the programme, output and project levels; the logframe; and the research and monitoring and evaluation framework for the programme. The RME unit is also responsible for contributing to the baseline data collection as assigned, including collaboration on the design and instrumentation, research fielding, data management and reporting. The unit develops project-level RME activities as projects are rolled out, including criteria setting and, for a select number of projects, project monitoring and formative evaluations through the life of the project.

#### 8.1.2 Intervention level evaluation

The extent of the evaluation of individual interventions will depend on the budget, length and strategic importance of the interventions. We will evaluate larger interventions based on a framework similar to AJACS evaluation framework. However for shorter, cheaper interventions where a 'rough and ready' evaluation is required, a light touch approach, such as checking off against milestones/ToR will be adopted. We will submit final evaluations to the client as part of the weekly reporting cycle.

#### 8.1.3 Reporting

It is absolutely essential that the above monitoring is accompanied by accurate and timely reporting. By committing to weekly, quarterly, mid and final project reporting cycles as outlined in the SoW, we will keep the client abreast of developments on the ground. In addition to the expected reporting, we also commit to following up with an evaluation of an individual intervention within three weeks of completion so that any lessons learned are fed back into the programme design/intervention in a timely manner.

### 8.1.4 Quality assurance KPIs

The KPIs below demonstrate how we will be held accountable for ensuring quality delivery of the AJACS.

Criteria	Indicators
Quality of deliverables and alignment of project interventions to AJACS' goal and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft theory of change finalised by end of inception and reviewed quarterly thereafter</li> <li>Quarterly reports highlight progress against milestones, linking all activities to outputs and overall project need</li> </ul>
Timeliness of milestone delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement of all programme milestones as detailed in the workplan (see section 4)</li> <li>Quarterly (or more often if circumstances change) review of milestone schedules with clear reporting on any changes required</li> </ul>
Quality and timeliness of reporting (including financial reporting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliverables submitted in line with agreed reporting schedule to required standard</li> </ul>

**Table 3: Quality and delivery KPIs**

## 8.2 Monitoring and evaluating impact of activities in Syria

### 8.2.1 Programme level monitoring

During inception we will develop a programme level theory of change drawing together AJACS goals, objectives and indicative activities outlined in the SoW. This will be accompanied by a monitoring framework (see table 3 below) which we will use to develop a programme level logframe setting out clear indicators and data sources.

Statement (Objective)	Indicator	Research Methods/ data sources
Develop capacity of IG and the moderate opposition to plan and prepare security and justice interventions so they are able to act quickly to consolidate when opportunities arise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of training sessions provided to S&amp;J actors as per training needs assessment.</li> <li>Number of instances of collaboration between IG and moderate opposition in matters of security and justice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal (police, courts, legal assistance committees) reports.</li> <li>Attendance records</li> <li>Key stakeholder interviews</li> </ul>

**Table 4: A sample of the programme level monitoring framework we will develop.**

### 8.2.2 Programme level evaluation

The client needs an evaluation framework that is flexible and can be adapted as the programme evolves and lessons learned feed into its design and implementation. We will develop our evaluation framework within the first month. We will base it on a series of research questions framed by the OECD-DAC 'Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance'. Our research questions will be drawn directly from AJACS theory of change and will be accompanied by a clear assessment criteria and tangible indicators. Data collection (see table 4) and the data collection strategy will also be outlined here.

Data Source	Assessment Purpose
<b>The AJACS SoW</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent to which AJACS activities met the outcome and impact envisioned (<b>relevance</b>).</li> </ul>
<b>AJACS Mid-term and Final Analytical Reporting.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Findings across all aspects of programme delivery, including <b>impact</b></li> <li>Lessons learned and <b>effectiveness</b></li> <li><b>Effectiveness</b> of AJACS communication strategy</li> </ul>
<b>Intervention level evaluations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of all aspects of programme delivery, including <b>impact</b>.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Completion Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interventions across all aspects of programme delivery, including <b>impact</b></li> </ul>
<b>Independent monitoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Relevance, effectiveness, impact and value for money.</b></li> </ul>

**Table 5: We will draw on a range of data sources to evaluate the progress of AJACS.**

### 8.3 The challenges of M&E in Syria

Syria also poses a number of logistical and security challenges, meaning conventional evaluation techniques like household surveys become fraught with challenges. The scale of the challenge and the perception that the population is to some extent inaccessible can instil doubt in the reliability of results.

Coffey has considerable experience of, and internationally recognised expertise in, conducting M&E activities in fragile environments. Our experience means we are able to offer a pragmatic approach to M&E in the Syrian context, appreciating that the security situation can change at any moment. When it does, the client needs to have confidence that we are able to adapt the M&E approach accordingly.

Scenario	Data sources/ methodology
<b>Minimal security risk:</b> moderate opposition in complete control, no imminent threat of attack, freedom of movement within AJACS target regions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Face to face FGD's (in-country) with implementing partners, beneficiaries, the moderate opposition, IG etc.</li> <li>• Face to face KIIs (in-country) with community leaders, S&amp;J actors within the moderate opposition</li> <li>• Household surveys</li> </ul>
<b>Moderate security risk:</b> moderate opposition in control with risk of attack, some freedom of movement within AJACS target regions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Face to face KIIs and FGDs with IG</li> <li>• Telephone FGDs and KIIs (as above where possible)</li> <li>• Telephone polling</li> </ul>
<b>High security risk:</b> moderate opposition control of local area under considerable threat, minimal freedom of movement within AJACS target regions telecommunications system down.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback from local partners and in-country staff</li> <li>• Interviews with relevant members of IG in Gaziantep</li> <li>• Informal feedback</li> </ul>

**Table 6: We are able to adapt our approach to M&E according to the realities on the ground.**

### 8.4 Managing obstacles to delivery and quality

The situation in Syria means it is almost inevitable that some interventions will not have the desired impact in relation to AJACS overarching goal of improving the provision of legitimacy, security and justice. The key is to ensure that such developments are caught early and the appropriate remedial actions taken. Our tailored approach to monitoring will allow us to identify whether an intervention is falling behind at the earliest opportunity. Progress against the work plan, milestones or indicators will be checked weekly, monthly or quarterly depending on the length of the intervention.

If we determine that an intervention is falling behind we will first seek to identify what the cause of the failing is. If it is something within our control e.g. resourcing we will present a solution to the AJACS Secretariat for approval. This will include KPIs specifically geared towards bringing the intervention back on track. The in-country team will be able to draw on resources within Coffey to help with any additional management requirements. Updates against the KPIs will be provided to the client as part of the weekly reporting cycle.

If an intervention is falling behind for reasons outside of our control e.g. a loss of territory by the moderate opposition, this will be fed back to the client as part of the weekly reporting cycle. This will ensure these developments help to inform the programme design and future interventions.