ORGANIZATIONAL MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING (MEL) FRAMEWORK

2026–2030

Organizational Framework and Phased Operational Package
Prepared for NABU Ethiopia
MEL Function / Organizational Management
Version 2.0 | November 2026

Approved by the Senior Management Committee on November 14, 2026

Contents pages

Document Control....5
Change Log....5
How to Use This Framework....5
Core operating principle....5
Abbreviations....5
Executive Summary....6
What changes in Version 2.0....6
1. Introduction and Purpose....6
1.1 Objectives....6
2. Scope and Application....7
3. MEL Vision, Mission and Principles....7
3.1 Guiding principles and non-negotiable standards....7
4. Organizational Results Architecture....8
5. Organizational Theory of Change....8
5.1 Operational ToC....8
5.2 ToC management rules....9
6. Results Framework and Organizational KPI Matrix 2026–2030....9
6.1 Guidance for applying the Results Framework....10
6.2 Important implementation note....11
6.3 Baseline and target-setting procedure....11
6.3 Organizational baseline deliverables and timing....11
7. Indicator and KPI Management....11
7.1 Indicator hierarchy and selection....12
7.2 Minimum organizational indicator catalogue....12
7.3 Indicator Reference Sheet minimum fields....12
7.4 Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) data standards....12
8. Monitoring System and Reporting Cycle....13
8.1 Monitoring workflow and role ownership....13
8.2 Monitoring methods....13
9. Data Management Architecture....13
9.1 Digital field architecture....13
9.2 Common data standards and identifiers....14
10. Data Quality Assurance....14
10.1 DQA procedure....14
10.2DQA sampling and follow-up....15
10.3 DQA scorecard....15
11 GIS, Remote Sensing and Biodiversity Monitoring....15
11.1 Spatial MEL standards....15

11.2 Biodiversity monitoring minimum design 15
12 Evaluation Framework 15
12.1 Evaluation decision matrix 16
12.2 Evaluation types and minimum expectations 16
12.3 Methodological minimums 16
12.4 Evaluation governance 16
12.5 Evaluation budget guidance 17
13 Learning and Knowledge Management 17
13.1 Organizational learning agenda 17
13.2 Learning governance and action cycle 17
13.3 Learning products 17
13.4 Learning action register fields 18
14. Accountability, Feedback and Safeguarding Interfaces 18
15. Data Ethics, Protection and Research Ethics 18
15.1 Informed consent 18
15.2 Data minimization, security and access 18
15.3 Retention, archiving and disposal 19
15.4 Incident reporting and safeguarding referral 19
15.5 Roles 19
16. MEL Governance, Staffing and RACI 19
16.1 Roles and accountability 19
16.2 Staffing model and resource requirements 19
16.3 Indicative MEL resource and budget framework 20
17. Project MEL Planning and Implementing Partner Standards 21
17.1 Minimum project MEL plan 21
17.2 Minimum requirements for implementing partners 21
18. Standard Operating Procedures and Operational Instruments 21
18.1 Phased operational package 22
19. MEL Capacity Development 22
19.1 Five-year capacity sequence 22
20. Management Dashboard and Decision Support 23
20.1 Red-alert management protocol 23
21. Annual MEL Calendar 23
22. 2026–2030 Implementation Roadmap 24
22.1 First 100 days after approval 24
23. Year-Three Expected MEL System Performance (2028) 24
24. Risk Management and Sustainability 25
25. Review, Adaptation and Version Control 25
ANNEX 1. Organizational Indicator Catalogue and IRS Template 26

ANNEX 2. MEL System Gap and Maturity Assessment Tool....26
ANNEX 3. Quarterly DQA Checklist and Action Record....27
ANNEX 4. Evaluation Screening and Evaluation Matrix....27
ANNEX 5. Project MEL Plan Template....28
ANNEX 6. Organizational MEL Database Data Dictionary....28
ANNEX 7. Feedback and Complaints Register (Illustrative Structure)....28
ANNEX 8. Quarterly Organizational Performance Report Template....29
ANNEX 9. MEL Governance and RACI Matrix....29
ANNEX 10. Five-Year MEL Capacity-Building Plan....29
ANNEX 11. MEL Maturity Scorecard....30
ANNEX 12. Management MEL Dashboard Specification....30
ANNEX 13. MEL Resource and Budget Planning Template....30
ANNEX 14. Partner MEL and Data-Sharing Minimum Checklist....31
Conclusion....31

Document Control

Field	Specification
Document title	NABU Ethiopia Organizational Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Framework 2026–2030
Document type	Organizational framework with minimum operating standards and phased operational instruments
Version / date	Version 2.0 | November 2026
Owner	NABU Ethiopia MEL Function
Approval authority	Executive Director / designated senior management
Review cycle	Annual; formal mid-period review in 2028
Applies to	All NABU Ethiopia projects, programmes, regional offices, implementing partners and relevant organizational functions
Status	Revised in response to technical comments; subject to management approval and completion of phased tools

Change Log

Version	Date	Description of changes	Approval
1.0	September 2026	Initial organizational MEL framework and operational package.	Pending/record original approval status
2.0	November 2026	Revised following technical review: clarified scope and phasing; added staffing/resource framework, KPI baseline and target-setting process, GESI and data protection standards, evaluation decision criteria, RACI, learning/adaptation procedures, partner standards, dashboard alerts, annual learning cycle, maturity evidence column and Year-Three benchmark.	For approval by Executive Director / designated authority

How to Use This Framework

This document establishes the organizational MEL architecture, mandatory minimum standards, governance arrangements and implementation sequence for 2026–2030. It is the parent framework for project-specific MEL plans and detailed operational instruments. It does not imply that all digital tools, forms, databases or SOPs are already configured or deployed. Instruments identified as phased deliverables must be developed, tested, approved and version-controlled before routine use.

Core operating principle

MEL owns the system; project coordinators own project results. Project and field teams generate routine evidence. MEL provides methodological guidance, validation, data quality assurance, analysis, synthesis and learning facilitation. Management uses evidence to make and document decisions.

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
GIS	Geographic Information System
IRS	Indicator Reference Sheet
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
ODK	Open Data Kit
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
CTCAI	Completeness, Timeliness, Consistency, Accuracy and Integrity (five data-quality dimensions used in this Framework)
RACI	Responsible, Accountable, Consulted and Informed

Executive Summary

NABU Ethiopia requires an organization-wide MEL system that connects ecological, socioeconomic, institutional and project-management results. This Framework establishes a common architecture across projects while preserving project-specific theories of change, donor logframes and technical indicators. It positions MEL as a management cycle:

PLAN → MONITOR → VERIFY → ANALYSE → LEARN → ADAPT → REPORT → DECIDE.

The Framework covers results and strategy; indicators; monitoring and reporting; data management; data quality; GIS and biodiversity monitoring; evaluation; learning; accountability; governance; capacity; resourcing; and institutional sustainability. It sets minimum standards for all projects and implementing partners.

The technical review identified that several instruments referenced in Version 1.0 were not yet complete. Version 2.0 therefore distinguishes between (i) standards and instruments included in this Framework and (ii) operational products to be developed and approved during implementation. No unverified organizational baseline values, ecological targets or cost figures are invented. Instead, this Framework establishes a baseline exercise, target-setting rules, resource-planning template and approval process.

What changes in Version 2.0

Clarifies the Framework versus phased operational instruments and sequences the first 100 days around prerequisites.

Introduces a staffing model, indicative resource categories, cost-planning template and conditional 3–5% evaluation-planning benchmark subject to donor rules and project context.

Establishes an organizational baseline and target-setting process, with baseline status explicitly marked as to be established where data are unavailable.

Adds operational GESI data standards and inclusion accountability.

Adds evaluation selection criteria, methodological minimums and an evaluation decision matrix.

Adds data ethics, informed consent, data security, retention, sharing, breach response and safeguarding referral standards.
Revises RACI assignments to separate data collection, verification, MEL quality assurance and management accountability.
Strengthens learning registers, quarterly reflection, annual learning events and evidence-to-action tracking.
Adds dashboard red-alert response protocols, a Year-Three performance benchmark, partner MEL requirements and a four-component architecture alignment matrix.

1. Introduction and Purpose

This Framework establishes the organizational standards, processes and responsibilities through which NABU Ethiopia generates credible evidence on implementation, outputs, outcomes, ecological change, livelihood effects, institutional performance and learning during 2026–2030.

1.1 Objectives

- Create a single organizational MEL architecture across projects and programmes.
- Standardize definitions, indicator specifications, data flows and reporting.
- Improve completeness, timeliness, consistency, accuracy and integrity of data.
- Strengthen evidence for adaptive management and strategic decision-making.
- Integrate biodiversity, ecosystem, climate, livelihood, gender and institutional evidence.
- Establish proportionate evaluation approaches for different intervention sizes and learning needs.
- Create systematic feedback, accountability and learning loops.
- Build organizational MEL capacity and reduce dependence on individual staff.

2. Scope and Application

The Framework applies to all NABU Ethiopia projects, programmes, partnerships, regional offices and relevant organizational functions. Project-specific donor requirements remain applicable; projects shall map them to the organizational architecture wherever feasible. Where donor requirements are more stringent, the stricter applicable requirement prevails, subject to applicable law and organizational policies.

Level	Primary function	Minimum requirement
Organizational / Head Office	Strategy and portfolio performance	Organizational results framework, KPI catalogue, baseline/target register, consolidated database, dashboard and annual results report
Programme / project	Implementation and results	Approved project MEL plan, indicator matrix, reporting calendar, DQA plan, evaluation and learning agenda
Regional office / field / site	Primary evidence generation	Standardized tools, source records, site identifiers and GPS/geospatial evidence where relevant
Management	Decision support	Quarterly performance review, dashboard, risk/action log and documented decisions
Community / stakeholder	Participation and accountability	Accessible feedback channels, safe participation and documented response
Implementing partners	Partner-generated evidence	Agreed indicators, reporting formats, source evidence, quality checks, consent and data-sharing arrangements

3. MEL Vision, Mission and Principles

Vision: to become an evidence-driven, accountable and learning oriented organization that delivers sustainable biodiversity conservation, ecosystem restoration and sustainable community development outcomes through inclusive knowledge and informed decision-making

Mission: to strengthen organizational performance, accountability and learning by establishing an integrated, participatory and ethical MEL system that generates and uses credible evidence to inform planning, implementation, decision-making and adaptive management across NABU Ethiopia's programmes and projects.

3.1 Guiding principles and non-negotiable standards

Theme	Principles / minimum standard
Evidence quality and utility	Results orientation; decision relevance; standardized definitions; triangulation; transparent limitations; proportionate data collection.
Ethics, inclusion and accountability	Do no harm; informed consent; confidentiality; participation and inclusion; accessible feedback; safeguarding referral; transparency.
Learning and adaptation	Continuous reflection; documented lessons; management response; action tracking; use of evidence in planning.
Institutional consistency	One organizational architecture; common data standards; project-specific indicators mapped to organizational results; version control.
Context and feasibility	Localization; contextual validity; proportionality; feasible and sustainable methods; continuous improvement.

Non-negotiable for every project: (1) an approved MEL plan; (2) defined indicators and data sources; (3) documented source evidence; (4) routine project-level checks and periodic DQA; (5) ethical data collection and secure handling; (6) sex- and age-disaggregated data where relevant and safe; (7) timely reporting; and (8) documented management response to material findings.

4. Organizational Results Architecture

The Organizational Results Architecture provides a common framework for consolidating, assessing and communicating NABU Ethiopia's overall contribution to conservation, ecosystem restoration, climate resilience, sustainable livelihoods, institutional development and organizational learning. Individual projects shall retain their respective theories of change, results frameworks and donor-specific reporting requirements while demonstrating their contribution to relevant organizational result domains through clearly defined indicators, verifiable evidence and periodic performance reporting. The architecture will facilitate organizational-level performance assessment, cross-project learning, strategic decision-making and accountability without imposing identical indicators across projects.

Result domain	Illustrative organizational result	Evidence areas
Ecosystems	Improved ecological integrity, conservation and sustainable management of priority forest, wetland and other critical ecosystems	Forest/wetland condition/survived seedling number, management areas, degraded areas under restoration
Biodiversity	Improved conservation status of priority species, habitats and biodiversity values through effective protection and sustainable management.	Threatened Species Population trends, Protected Priority Species & Habitats, Habitat Quality & Connectivity Changes, Biodiversity threat Reductions, Community Conservation & Monitoring
Climate	Enhanced climate resilience of ecosystems and local communities through ecosystem-based adaptation, restoration and other nature-based climate solutions.	Climate-Resilient Restoration & Management, Household Climate Adoption, Vegetation Survival & Performance, Carbon Sequestration and Resilience to Shocks,
Livelihoods	Improved and diversified nature-compatible livelihoods, equitable economic opportunities and resilience of local communities dependent on natural resources.	Income, diversification, practices, livelihood outcomes My Proposal: Income growth, Practice Adoption, Women Empowerment, Resilience and Diversification and Enterprise support
Institutions	Strengthened capacity, functionality and collaboration of community institutions, government authorities and local partners for participatory and sustainable natural resource governance.	PFM groups & community institutions count; Supported institutions implementing approved plans (%); Institutional capacity & governance performance; Number of community participation in natural resource decisions; Supported community enterprises & cooperatives count
Knowledge and learning	Evidence is generated and used for adaptation	Evaluations, learning actions and management decisions
Accountability and inclusion	Stakeholder feedback and inclusion evidence inform action	Feedback availability, Timely resolution, Compliant satisfaction, Community approval, Adaptive implementation, stakeholder communication

5. Organizational Theory of Change

NABU Ethiopia's organizational pathway assumes that finance, staff, technical expertise, partnerships, community structures and information enable conservation, restoration, biodiversity monitoring, livelihood support, climate action and community engagement. These activities generate outputs such as restored or managed sites, trained people, improved practices and supported institutions. Where interventions are appropriate, inclusive, adequately resourced and sustained, these outputs contribute to improved ecosystem management, reduced degradation, biodiversity protection, climate resilience and improved livelihoods. Over time, these outcomes contribute to healthy ecosystems, resilient communities and sustainable biodiversity conservation.

5.1 Operational ToC

NABU Ethiopia mobilizes financial, human, technical and institutional resources and works through partnerships with communities, government authorities and other stakeholders. These inputs enable the organization to implement targeted conservation, restoration, biodiversity, climate and livelihood interventions. The interventions produce direct outputs, such as improved management of priority sites, trained community members, strengthened institutions and the introduction or adoption of sustainable practices. Where these outputs are relevant, of adequate quality and supported by enabling conditions, they contribute to medium-term outcomes, including better ecosystem condition, reduced degradation, improved biodiversity protection, stronger governance and more resilient livelihoods. In the longer term, these outcomes contribute to healthy

ecosystems and resilient communities. NABU Ethiopia will assess and report its contribution to these changes, recognizing that impact is also shaped by external actors and contextual factors.

Level	NABU pathway	Key assumptions / risks
Inputs	Financial resources; qualified staff; technical expertise; strategic partnerships; community and government structures; data, information and operational systems.	Resources are secured, timely, adequate and appropriately allocated. Staff and partners have the required capacity, and enabling institutional arrangements are in place.
Activities	Forest and wetland conservation; ecosystem restoration; biodiversity monitoring; climate-resilience and nature-based solutions; sustainable livelihood and value chain development; capacity strengthening; community engagement and policy dialogue.	Interventions are evidence-based, technically appropriate, adequately resourced and locally relevant. Communities and partners participate meaningfully, and implementation risks are managed
Outputs	Sites managed or restored; people trained; sustainable practices promoted/adopted; community and government institutions supported; monitoring evidence generated.	Outputs are delivered on time and at the required quality and scale. Participation is meaningful, and outputs are accessible to intended groups.
Outcomes	Improved ecosystem management; reduced degradation; improved biodiversity and habitat condition; stronger climate resilience; improved nature-compatible livelihoods; stronger governance.	Behavioural, institutional and ecological responses occur over time; external conditions do not overwhelm contribution.
Impact	Healthy ecosystems, resilient communities and sustainable biodiversity conservation.	Long-term political, climatic, economic and ecological conditions permit sustained results; NABU contribution is interpreted alongside other actors.

5.2 ToC management rules

The following rules shall guide the development, review and use of organizational and project-level Theories of Change:

- Every project shall define its own causal pathway, key assumptions, external factors and risks, and show how its expected outputs and outcomes contribute to relevant organizational result domains.
- Outputs shall describe direct deliverables that can reasonably be attributed to project implementation. Outcomes and impacts shall generally be assessed as contributions, unless a credible evaluation design supports stronger attribution.
- Indicators and evidence shall be selected according to their relevance to results, management decisions, accountability and learning; data shall not be collected solely because it is readily available.
- Monitoring and evaluation shall document unintended positive and negative effects, including effects on different groups, ecosystems and local institutions, and identify appropriate mitigation or response measures.
- The Theory of Change shall be reviewed periodically and when significant changes occur in context, risks, implementation strategy or expected results. Revisions shall be documented, justified and approved by the designated management authority.
- Changes to a project Theory of Change shall be communicated to relevant stakeholders and donors where required by agreements or reporting obligations.

Operational note: Project teams should maintain a concise Theory of Change diagram or results pathway, supported by a narrative explaining the causal links, assumptions, risks and external influences. The diagram should be reviewed during annual planning and major project reviews.

6. Results Framework and Organizational KPI Matrix 2026–2030

The organizational KPI matrix is the common performance reference. The first organizational baseline assessment shall be completed during the initial implementation phase, targeted within the first six months after Framework approval. Until verified, baseline values are recorded as “to be established (TBE)” rather than estimated. Ecological and livelihood outcome targets shall be derived from project baselines, approved project targets, technical feasibility and portfolio aggregation rules.

Code / KPI	Unit	Baseline / reference	2028 milestone	2030 target / rule	Frequency / source / owner
ORG-01 Area under improved ecosystem management	ha	TBE; establish from verified site polygons and management records	Portfolio baseline consolidated; annual target approved from active project plans	Cumulative verified hectares against approved portfolio target	Annual; GIS + field verification; Project Manager accountable, technical team collects, MEL validates
ORG-02 Area restored or rehabilitated	ha	TBE; map and validate existing restoration sites	Cumulative area and geospatial coverage verified	Cumulative verified area against approved project/portfolio targets	Quarterly/annual; project records + GIS; Project Manager
ORG-03 Restoration seedling survival rate	%	TBE by restoration cohort and agreed observation period	Baseline cohorts and repeat-survey protocol operational	Project-specific survival targets aggregated only where methods and timepoints are comparable	Seasonal; field sample; technical lead
ORG-04 Households adopting defined sustainable practices	# / %	TBE through project household baseline; define practice threshold	All reporting projects use common definition and disaggregate where relevant	Against approved project targets; no double counting across projects without unique IDs	Annual; household survey/Kobo; Project Manager
ORG-05 Selected biodiversity index	Index	TBE; protocol and taxa-specific baseline required	Priority projects have repeatable protocols and baseline datasets	Trend reported for comparable sites and methods; targets set by technical assessment	Annual/seasonal; biodiversity surveys; technical lead
ORG-06 Indicator/flagship species observations	# / status	TBE; establish site/species reference lists	Priority sites use standardized observation protocols	Report verified observations and trends; avoid unsupported population claims	Seasonal/annual; biodiversity monitoring; technical lead
ORG-07 Mean annual livelihood income	ETB	TBE; baseline survey with seasonality and income definition	Comparable household measurement in relevant projects	Project-specific target based on baseline and intervention logic	Annual; household survey; Project Manager/MEL
ORG-08 Women meeting defined decision-making participation criterion	%	TBE; define decision-making criterion and eligible body	Relevant projects report sex-disaggregated participation and influence measures	Project targets set from baseline; evidence of meaningful participation	Semiannual; survey/meeting records; Project Manager
ORG-09 Unique beneficiaries reached	#	TBE; establish deduplication rules and IDs	Common beneficiary counting and deduplication applied	Annual cumulative unique reach based on verified project targets	Quarterly; beneficiary database; Project Manager
ORG-10 Projects with current approved MEL plans	%	Establish inventory at approval; initial baseline review	100% of active projects have approved MEL plans	100% of active projects have current approved MEL plans	Quarterly; MEL compliance review; MEL Officer
ORG-11 Indicators passing DQA	%	First DQA establishes baseline score	At least 80% of sampled indicators meet agreed DQA standard, with corrective plans for others	At least 90% of sampled indicators meet agreed standard	Quarterly; DQA reports; MEL Officer
ORG-12 Evaluation recommendations acted upon	%	Establish evaluation action tracker baseline	At least 75% of due actions implemented with evidence	At least 85% of due actions implemented with evidence	Semiannual; action tracker; Project Manager / Management
ORG-13 Learning actions completed	%	Establish organizational learning register	At least 75% of due actions completed and evidenced	At least 85% of due actions completed and evidenced	Quarterly; learning register; MEL Officer
ORG-14 Feedback/complaints resolved within agreed timeframe	%	Baseline from first complete reporting cycle; set category-based timeframes	At least 85% of non-sensitive cases resolved within agreed timeframe	At least 95% of non-sensitive cases resolved within agreed timeframe	Monthly/quarterly; restricted feedback register; designated focal point

Target note: The percentages for system-performance indicators (ORG-10 to ORG-14) are proposed institutional planning benchmarks for management validation. They are not historical performance claims. For ORG-01 to ORG-09, numerical portfolio targets must be approved only after baseline validation, project target consolidation and technical review. Baseline register must state value, reference year, method, source, coverage, disaggregation and confidence/limitations.

6.1 Guidance for applying the Results Framework

- **Project alignment:** Each project shall identify the organizational result domains to which it contributes and map relevant project indicators to the corresponding organizational KPI families.
- **Indicator definitions:** Core indicators shall have standardized definitions, units, calculation methods and minimum evidence requirements. Project-specific indicators may be added where needed.
- **Baselines and targets:** Baselines and targets shall be established using available evidence and realistic project and organizational ambitions. Where baseline data are unavailable, this limitation and the planned baseline approach shall be documented.

- **Disaggregation:** Beneficiary and outcome data shall be disaggregated, where relevant and safe, by sex, age, location, disability or vulnerability status and other context-appropriate categories.
- **Data quality and verification:** Project teams shall maintain source documentation and conduct routine data-quality checks. GIS, survey and administrative data should be triangulated where appropriate.
- **Aggregation and double counting:** Organizational reporting shall use unique identifiers or documented counting rules to avoid double counting people, sites, hectares or results supported by multiple projects.
- **Contribution and attribution:** Organizational reporting shall distinguish direct project outputs from wider outcomes to which NABU Ethiopia contributes alongside communities, government and other actors.
- **Use of evidence:** Performance findings shall be reviewed periodically and used to inform management decisions, resource allocation, corrective action, communication and organizational learning.

6.2 Important implementation note

The framework should not be interpreted as requiring every project to report against every KPI family. Each project shall select only the result domains and indicators that are relevant to its approved objectives and actual contribution. Organizational targets should be set after reviewing project portfolios, geographic coverage, baselines, implementation periods, available resources and the risk of double counting. Indicator selection and aggregation should be technically feasible and proportionate to the scale and complexity of interventions.

6.3 Baseline and target-setting procedure

1. Inventory active projects, indicators, sites, beneficiary records, existing studies and available historical datasets.
2. Classify each KPI as baseline available, baseline partial, or baseline to be established; record source and limitations.
3. Prepare baseline protocols, sampling plans and tools; obtain ethical approvals/consent where required.
4. Collect or compile baseline evidence; verify source records, methods, geographic coverage and comparability.
5. Calculate baseline values and document disaggregation and limitations in the organizational KPI register.
6. Set 2028 milestones and 2030 targets using project commitments, technical feasibility, resources and organizational priorities.
7. Review proposed targets with project managers and technical leads; submit to management for approval.
8. Update dashboard thresholds and annual targets; preserve prior versions and reasons for changes.

6.3 Organizational baseline deliverables and timing

Deliverable	Lead	Timing after approval	Evidence of completion
KPI and project inventory	MEL Officer + Project Coordinators	Month 1–2	Approved inventory and baseline status register
Baseline protocol and data collection plan	MEL Officer + technical leads	Month 2–3	Approved methods, tools, sampling and ethics checklist
Baseline compilation / collection	Project teams and partners	Month 3–5	Datasets, source evidence, GIS layers and field reports
Baseline validation and target-setting workshop	MEL Officer + management	Month 6	Validated baseline report and approved 2028/2030 target register

7. Indicator and KPI Management

The central indicator catalogue is the authoritative organizational reference. Indicator definitions, calculation methods and disaggregation rules, not merely indicator names, must be consistent before aggregation.

7.1 Indicator hierarchy and selection

Impact; outcome; output; process/activity; context/risk; learning and accountability indicators.

Indicators should be **SMART** (**S**pecific, **M**easurable, **A**chievable/appropriate, **R**elevant and **T**ime-bound), sensitive to change, feasible to collect, disaggregable where useful, ethically collectable and decision-relevant.

7.2 Minimum organizational indicator catalogue

The 14 KPIs in Section 6 form the minimum organizational catalogue. Projects may add donor- or context-specific indicators. Each organizational indicator and every project indicator used for organizational aggregation must have an approved IRS before reporting.

7.3 Indicator Reference Sheet minimum fields

Field	Required content
Identity	Unique code, exact title, result level and version
Definition and rationale	Operational definition; inclusion/exclusion rules; management question
Measurement	Unit; formula; numerator/denominator; counting and deduplication rules
Disaggregation	Sex, age, disability status where appropriate and safe, geography and other justified dimensions
Baseline and targets	Value, reference year, source, method; annual, 2028 and 2030 targets and rationale
Data source and collection	Primary/secondary source; tool; sampling; frequency; timing
Roles	Collector, project verifier, MEL reviewer, technical approver and reporting approver
DQA and limitations	Verification requirements, known bias, confidence and interpretation limits
Use	Reporting, management decisions, evaluation and learning applications

7.4 Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) data standards

- Disaggregate relevant beneficiary and participation indicators by sex and age using agreed age bands appropriate to the project and donor.
- Collect disability status only where relevant, feasible, safe, voluntary and consistent with applicable ethical and data-protection requirements; do not infer disability.
- Record geographic disaggregation at the appropriate administrative/site level while protecting identities and sensitive locations.
- Project MEL plans must include a short GESI analysis: who participates, who benefits, who may be excluded, barriers to access and how findings will change implementation.
- Tools should capture meaningful participation and experience, not attendance alone, where the intervention seeks influence in decision-making.
- Use accessible and culturally appropriate methods, including separate consultations where needed to enable safe participation.
- Project/field staff collect; Project Managers ensure completeness and use; MEL reviews disaggregation, quality and interpretation; technical/GESI focal expertise is consulted where available.
- Do not publish small-cell or identifiable data where disclosure could expose individuals or groups to harm.

8. Monitoring System and Reporting Cycle

Cycle	Minimum inputs / outputs	Decision and use
Monthly	Activity progress; indicator updates; challenges/risks; success stories; source evidence; data-quality issues	Operational follow-up and timely correction
Quarterly	Performance report and dashboard; DQA summary; risk/action status; learning and feedback trends	Management review, red-alert response and adaptation
Quarterly learning session	Reflection on planned vs achieved, reasons, inclusion, ecological signals and emerging lessons	Agreed adaptations and learning action register
Semiannual	Project performance and learning review; evaluation progress; outcome evidence	Project/strategic adaptation and resource decisions
Annual	Validated annual results report; evaluation synthesis; annual reflection and learning event	Annual planning, budget prioritization, donor and organizational reporting

8.1 Monitoring workflow and role ownership

Stage	Core action	Lead role / support
PLAN	Approve project MEL plan, indicators, targets, tools and schedule	Project coordinator accountable; MEL Officer provides standards and technical support
MONITOR	Collect routine activity, output, outcome and contextual evidence	Project/field staff and partners; Project MEL focal coordinates
VERIFY	Check source records, calculations, completeness and plausibility	Project Coordinator/designated project verifier; technical staff for technical data
ANALYSE	Validate, consolidate, disaggregate, interpret and flag gaps	MEL Officer with Project coordinator and technical leads
LEARN	Discuss findings, validate lessons and implications	MEL Officer facilitates; Project coordinator and teams participate
ADAPT	Agree changes, owners, resources and deadlines	Project coordinator accountable; management approves material changes
REPORT	Submit approved project and organizational reports	Project coordinator approves project report; MEL consolidates organizational report
DECIDE	Review evidence and document decisions	Executive Director / management and relevant Project Managers

8.2 Monitoring methods

Routine administrative and project records; digital field monitoring (Kobo/ODK); household/beneficiary surveys; key informant interviews and focus groups; direct observation and site verification; biodiversity/ecological surveys; GIS and remote sensing; partner reporting; photographic/geotagged evidence where appropriate and consented.

9. Data Management Architecture

Layer	Content	Controls
Layer 1: Project / partner	Beneficiaries, activities, outputs, observations, training, restoration, biodiversity, community and partner data	Project data dictionary; source-document standards; role-based access; unique IDs
Layer 2: Organizational MEL database	Projects, sites, indicators, targets, achievements, beneficiaries, geography, outcomes, risks, lessons and evaluations	Validation rules; master indicator catalogue; version control; deduplication; metadata
Layer 3: Dashboard and reporting	Portfolio performance, geographic coverage, outcomes, risks, learning, accountability and DQA	Approved reporting periods; role-based access; refresh log; data caveats

9.1 Digital field architecture

The proposed workflow is Enumerator / field staff → Kobo or ODK → secure data server → validation and cleaning → organizational database → dashboard → analysis → decision. Platform selection and configuration shall follow a

documented feasibility, cost, security, connectivity and interoperability assessment.

- Standard form naming convention and version control.
- Unique project, site, household/respondent and activity identifiers.
- Required fields, range checks, skip logic and constraints.
- GPS capture only when justified, consented and safe.
- Automated timestamps and enumerator IDs where appropriate.
- Offline collection and secure synchronization where feasible.
- Validation and cleaning log before analysis; controlled export and backup.

9.2 Common data standards and identifiers

Entity	Minimum identifier / fields
Project	Project ID; project name; donor; implementing partners; geography; start/end dates; Project Manager
Partner	Partner ID; legal/operational name; agreement; reporting obligations; data focal person
Site	Site ID; Project ID; administrative location; ecosystem type; coordinates/polygon where appropriate; status
Beneficiary / household	Pseudonymous Beneficiary/HH ID; Project ID; relevant disaggregation; consent status; participation; avoid unnecessary direct identifiers
Indicator	Indicator code; approved definition; unit; result level; frequency; IRS version
Target	Indicator code; project/organizational level; period; target value; approval source
Achievement	Indicator code; period; value; disaggregation; source; verification status; reporting version
Activity	Activity ID; Project ID; date; location; output; status; evidence link
Evaluation	Evaluation ID; project; type; ToR; methods; findings; management response and action status
Learning / feedback	Learning ID or restricted case ID; issue; finding/action; owner; due date; status

10. Data Quality Assurance

NABU Ethiopia will institutionalize five core data-quality dimensions: **Completeness**, **Timeliness**, **Consistency**, **Accuracy** and **Integrity** (**CTCAI**). DQA is a management control and capacity-support process, not solely a compliance exercise.

Dimension	Diagnostic question	Minimum test / evidence
Completeness	Are all required records and fields present?	Missing forms/fields; reporting coverage; required disaggregation
Timeliness	Was information submitted by the agreed deadline?	Submission dates and timestamps against reporting calendar
Consistency	Are definitions and values consistent across sources and periods?	Report/database reconciliation; indicator definition and unit checks
Accuracy	Does reported information match source evidence?	Risk-based sample back-check; recalculation; field verification
Integrity	Can the record be traced and protected from inappropriate alteration?	Audit trail; access rights; correction log; source evidence

10.1 DQA procedure

- Confirm indicator definition, reporting period, unit and approved IRS version.
- Select a risk-based sample of projects, indicators and source records; document the sampling rationale.
- Review source evidence, completeness, timeliness, calculations, aggregation and consistency with database/dashboard.
- Conduct back-checks or field verification where the risk and context justify them.
- Rate each dimension as satisfactory, needs improvement or unsatisfactory, with evidence and explanation.
- Agree corrective actions, responsible person and due date with the Project Manager.

- Record corrections in a controlled log; retain original and corrected values and audit trail.
- Share DQA findings and provide coaching; escalate repeated material weaknesses to management.

10.2DQA sampling and follow-up

At least quarterly, MEL selects a risk-based sample. Higher-risk indicators receive more frequent or deeper verification. Risk factors include high-value donor reporting, sensitive beneficiary data, complex calculations, partner-generated data, unexpected performance changes, weak source documentation and prior DQA findings. The sampling rate and sample size must be justified in the DQA plan; there is no universal sample size for every indicator.

10.3 DQA scorecard

Indicator / project	Completeness	Timeliness	Consistency	Accuracy	Integrity	Overall finding	Corrective action / owner / due date
Illustrative record only	Satisfactory / Needs improvement / Unsatisfactory	S / NI / U	S / NI / U	S / NI / U	S / NI / U	Pass / conditional / fail	Action, named owner, deadline

11 GIS, Remote Sensing and Biodiversity Monitoring

Spatial and biodiversity monitoring are integral to NABU Ethiopia's MEL system. Relevant evidence includes forest cover, land-use change, restoration areas, wetland extent, habitat change, intervention locations and biodiversity hotspots; priority/indicator/flagship species, threatened species, birds, mammals, vegetation, invasive species and habitat condition.

11.1 Spatial MEL standards

- Every intervention site should have a standardized geographic identifier.
- Maintain intervention points/polygons in the organizational spatial repository where appropriate.
- Spatial datasets require metadata, date, source, coordinate reference system, custodian and access classification.
- Remote-sensing products must document sensor/source, period, processing method and limitations.
- Maps distinguish verified information from interpretation; sensitive species/community locations are access-restricted.

11.2 Biodiversity monitoring minimum design

Component	Minimum design standard
Target taxa	Document priority/indicator/flagship taxa and selection rationale.
Sampling	Define site selection, sampling unit, timing, effort, repeatability and any comparison sites.
Observation	Record observer, date, site, method, effort and relevant environmental conditions.
Quality	Use documented field protocols, taxonomic verification and expert review where required.
Analysis	Define index/metric calculation and treatment of missing observations before routine reporting.
Interpretation	Distinguish observations from population inference; report limitations and detectability issues.
Learning	Record ecological findings and management implications.

12 Evaluation Framework

Evaluation intensity shall be proportionate to the evaluation question, intervention scale, budget, duration, feasibility, risk and decision need. Evaluation types may include baseline, process review, midterm/outcome evaluation, final/endline evaluation and post-project impact/sustainability assessment where justified.

12.1 Evaluation decision matrix

Decision factor	Lower-intensity response may be suitable when…	Enhanced / independent evaluation is indicated when…
Budget and duration	Small budget, short duration, limited geographic scope and low evaluation risk.	Large or multi-year investment, multiple sites or substantial public/donor resources.
Beneficiary profile and scale	Small, relatively homogeneous target group and routine monitoring answers key questions.	Large or diverse population, significant inclusion questions or potential unintended effects.
Technical complexity / geography	Established intervention and limited operational complexity.	Innovative, complex, multi-sector or geographically dispersed intervention.
Uncertainty / risk	Low uncertainty and low environmental/social risk.	High uncertainty, material ecological/social risk or contested assumptions.
Donor / strategic importance	No donor requirement and limited strategic significance.	Donor requires evaluation; strategic flagship; scale-up or continuation decision depends on evidence.
Evidence gap / decision	Routine monitoring can answer the management question.	Causal contribution, outcome sustainability, effectiveness or value-for-money question requires deeper study.

Decision rule: Donor requirements and applicable agreements take precedence. For other projects, the Project Manager and MEL Officer prepare a short evaluation screening note using the factors above. Management approves the evaluation type, independence level, timing and budget. High-risk or strategically significant evaluations should normally be independently commissioned or externally quality-assured.

12.2 Evaluation types and minimum expectations

Type	When / purpose	Minimum output
Baseline / diagnostic	Before or early implementation; establishes starting condition and informs targets.	Protocol, sampling plan, tools, baseline dataset and report.
Process / implementation review	During implementation; tests delivery, quality, relevance and bottlenecks.	Methods note, evidence, findings and corrective action plan.
Midterm / outcome evaluation	At midpoint or when a major adaptation/continuation decision is needed.	Evaluation report, limitations, recommendations and management response.
Final / endline evaluation	At project end; assesses results, relevance, effectiveness, inclusion and contribution.	Final report, validated dataset, lessons and action plan.
Impact / sustainability assessment	Post-project where justified by scale, duration, evidence and resources.	Sustainability/impact assessment with credible attribution or contribution analysis.

12.3 Methodological minimums

- Every major study must have approved ToR or protocol, evaluation questions, methods, sampling approach, tools, analysis plan, ethics/consent procedures, budget and quality-assurance arrangements.
- Household surveys must define target population, sampling frame, unit of analysis, sample-size rationale, selection method, non-response handling, disaggregation and limitations. Sample size must be calculated from the study objective and statistical assumptions; no fixed universal sample size is prescribed.
- Biodiversity assessments must specify taxa, survey design, season, sampling effort, observation protocol, detectability/limitations, taxonomic verification and analysis approach.
- Qualitative studies must explain participant selection, saturation rationale, triangulation, consent, safe facilitation and transparent analysis.
- Where causal attribution is claimed, the design must justify comparison strategy and assumptions. Use contribution analysis or outcome harvesting where attribution is not feasible.
- Evaluation reports must distinguish findings, interpretation, limitations and recommendations. Management response is mandatory for major evaluations.

12.4 Evaluation governance

- ToR approved before commissioning; independence and conflict-of-interest considerations documented.
- Methods, instruments and analysis plan documented and reviewed before data collection.
- Data quality, ethics and safeguarding requirements included in contracts and field protocols.

- Findings validated for factual accuracy without compromising evaluator independence.
- Management response specifies accepted/rejected recommendations, rationale, actions, owners and deadlines.

12.5 Evaluation budget guidance

As a planning benchmark only, projects may consider allocating approximately 3–5% of the project budget to evaluation where appropriate to project scale, donor rules and the evaluation question. This is not a mandatory organizational rate and must not override donor ceilings or contractual rules. Evaluation budgets should be justified by the required methods, sample, geography, independence, travel, analysis and dissemination.

13 Learning and Knowledge Management

The purpose of learning is to turn evidence into changed practice. Quarterly learning and reflection sessions ask: What was planned? What was achieved? Why did differences occur? Who benefited or was left out? What ecological or livelihood changes are emerging? What did we learn? What will change?

13.1 Organizational learning agenda

Learning question	Evidence source	Review frequency	Potential use
Which conservation practices produce sustained ecological improvement?	Monitoring and evaluation	Annual	Technical design
Which restoration approaches show better survival and condition?	Restoration monitoring	Seasonal/annual	Restoration planning
What enables durable community adoption?	Household surveys and qualitative evidence	Annual	Programme design
How do interventions affect women and other groups?	Disaggregated monitoring and qualitative studies	Semiannual/annual	Inclusion strategy
Which partnerships strengthen implementation and evidence quality?	Partner reviews and outcome evidence	Annual	Partnership decisions
Which lessons recur across projects and should change organizational standards?	Learning register and evaluations	Quarterly/annual	Organizational standards

13.2 Learning governance and action cycle

- Project teams record emerging lessons with evidence, context and limitations in the project learning log.
- Project Manager validates relevance and factual accuracy; MEL Officer checks evidence quality and maintains the organizational learning register.
- Quarterly learning sessions review findings, inclusion, ecological signals, risks and implications across projects.
- Management or designated decision-makers agree whether to adapt, investigate further, scale, stop or retain current practice.
- Each agreed action receives an owner, deadline, required resources, status and verification evidence.
- MEL follows up at the next quarterly session and records the effect of the adaptation.
- Annual reflection synthesizes lessons and feeds directly into annual work planning, budgets and project design.
- A learning action is marked completed only when evidence shows that the agreed management decision or operational adjustment has been implemented. A discussion, recommendation or meeting minute alone is not proof of completion.

13.3 Learning products

Learning briefs; case studies; success stories; lesson/failure briefs; policy and technical briefs; GIS story maps; project learning reports; annual learning synthesis.

13.4 Learning action register fields

Field	Required entry
Learning ID / date / project	Unique identifier, date, project/site
Question and finding	Learning question; evidence-based finding and source
Interpretation	Meaning, limitations, affected groups and implications
Decision / action	Specific adaptation, scale-up, further inquiry or no-change decision with rationale
Owner / due date / resources	Named accountable owner, deadline and resource implication
Status	Open / in progress / completed / deferred / cancelled
Verification	Document, revised plan/tool, field evidence or other proof of implementation
Follow-up learning	Observed effect after adaptation and next decision

14. Accountability, Feedback and Safeguarding Interfaces

NABU shall maintain accessible feedback and complaints channels such as designated focal persons, suggestion boxes, telephone/SMS, meetings, staff and digital channels. The intended loop is Community → NABU → Response → Action → Community. Channels should be accessible to women, youth, persons with disabilities and other groups who may face barriers.

Register field	Minimum requirement
Case ID	Unique identifier; do not use names as case IDs.
Date / location	When and where received; minimize sensitive location details.
Category / channel	Issue classification and how received.
Responsible focal person	Assigned authorized person; restricted access for sensitive cases.
Action / response	Action taken and date of response.
Status / closure	Open / under review / referred / resolved / closed; closure date and confirmation where safe.
Escalation / learning	Referral route and systemic lesson where appropriate; no sensitive case details in general MEL reports.

Sensitive safeguarding, protection, exploitation, abuse, harassment or other high-risk cases must be referred immediately through NABU's designated safeguarding procedures and specialist case-management arrangements. MEL personnel must not investigate or manage individual safeguarding cases unless formally designated and trained. MEL reporting should use anonymized, aggregated trend information only where safe and authorized.

15. Data Ethics, Protection and Research Ethics

All MEL activities must follow applicable Ethiopian law, donor requirements and NABU policies on privacy, safeguarding, research ethics and information security. Where a relevant organizational policy or legal requirement is more stringent, it prevails.

15.1 Informed consent

- Explain the purpose, intended use, voluntary nature, risks, confidentiality limits and contact/complaints channel in a language and format participants understand.
- Obtain and document informed consent before interviews, surveys, photographs, audio/video recording or GPS collection when these involve identifiable people or sensitive information.
- Participation must be voluntary; refusal must not affect access to services or project benefits.
- For children or persons requiring additional protection, follow applicable legal and safeguarding procedures, including guardian consent and age-appropriate assent where required.
- Separate consent for participation from consent for identifiable photographs, quotations or public communications.

15.2 Data minimization, security and access

- Collect only personal data necessary for a defined MEL purpose; use pseudonymous IDs in the organizational database wherever possible.
- Store names, phone numbers, consent forms and other direct identifiers separately from analytical datasets, with

restricted access.

- Use role-based access, strong authentication, approved storage locations, encryption where available and secure transfer methods.
- Do not share identifiable beneficiary information with donors, government or partners unless necessary, authorized, covered by consent/legal basis and governed by a data-sharing arrangement.
- Publish only aggregated or anonymized data; suppress small cells and sensitive geospatial information where re-identification or harm is possible.

15.3 Retention, archiving and disposal

Each project MEL plan shall state retention periods based on donor contracts, applicable law and organizational policy. Records must be archived securely with access controls and a clear custodian. At the end of the approved retention period, personal data must be securely deleted or irreversibly anonymized, unless a legal or contractual hold applies. A retention and disposal log should be maintained.

15.4 Incident reporting and safeguarding referral

- Any suspected loss, unauthorized access, disclosure, alteration or misuse of data must be reported promptly to the designated management/data-protection contact under the organizational incident procedure.
- Record the incident securely, contain access where feasible, assess affected people and information, and follow applicable notification and remediation requirements.
- Ethical concerns and safeguarding disclosures must be escalated through designated safeguarding channels; do not record sensitive narratives in general project databases.
- Only authorized personnel may determine external notification, case referral or communications.

15.5 Roles

Project and field staff implement consent and safe collection; Project Managers ensure compliance in project operations; MEL provides standards and checks compliance in MEL processes; IT/administration or designated data custodian maintains technical controls; management authorizes access and incident response; safeguarding focal persons handle specialist referrals and case management.

16. MEL Governance, Staffing and RACI

16.1 Roles and accountability

Role	Core accountability
Executive Director / senior management	Strategic oversight; approve framework, resources, targets and major evaluations; review dashboard; decide corrective action and ensure evidence use.
MEL Officer / MEL Function	System owner; standards and tools; indicator catalogue; organizational database/dashboard coordination; DQA oversight; validation and synthesis; capacity development; learning facilitation; annual reporting.
Project Managers	Accountable for project results, approved MEL plans, timely and accurate reports, staff/partner compliance, corrective action and project-level data approval.
Project MEL Focal Persons	Coordinate project monitoring calendar, tools, data collation, routine checks, documentation and submission; support MEL Officer.
Technical / field staff	Primary collection of routine field evidence, technical observations, site verification and interpretation within their expertise.
Regional office staff	Coordinate field-level reporting, verify completeness and timeliness, maintain site records and support project monitoring.
Finance / Operations	Provide relevant administrative and financial evidence; reconcile financial and activity data where required; support procurement and system resourcing.
Implementing partners	Collect and report agreed data, retain source evidence, comply with quality/ethics standards and facilitate verification under agreements.
Communities / stakeholders	Participate voluntarily, provide local knowledge and feedback, and engage in validation where appropriate.

16.2 Staffing model and resource requirements

The MEL system should be implemented through a lean central MEL function supported by designated project MEL focal persons and routine evidence generation by project, regional and field teams. The existing organizational staffing baseline must be confirmed during the first 30 days; this Framework does not assume unverified positions or headcount.

Capacity area	Minimum arrangement / requirement	Planning action
Central system leadership	MEL Officer at Head Office as system owner and coordinator.	Confirm workload, authority, reporting line and annual workplan.
Project-level coordination	Named MEL focal person for each active project; may be a designated existing staff member where feasible.	Project Manager nominates focal person and allocates time in workplan.
Routine data generation	Project, technical, regional and field staff collect evidence as part of implementation.	Include data duties in job descriptions/workplans and training.
Specialist support	GIS/remote sensing, biodiversity, evaluation/statistics, GESI and data-protection expertise as required.	Use internal technical staff, partner expertise or short-term consultants based on need.
Digital/data stewardship	Named database administrator or designated IT/data custodian; access controlled by role.	Assess whether this can be covered internally or requires budgeted support.

16.3 Indicative MEL resource and budget framework

A costed organizational MEL budget shall be prepared annually and consolidated across projects. Amounts must be based on actual staffing, vendor quotations, platform choices, travel requirements and donor eligibility; no unsupported monetary estimates are assigned in this Framework.

Budget line	Cost components / basis	Potential financing
Human resources	MEL Officer time; project MEL focal-person time allocation; temporary specialist inputs; field enumerator time where needed.	Core organizational budget; eligible project personnel budgets.
Digital infrastructure	Kobo/ODK hosting or server, database, dashboard/software licenses, connectivity, devices, backup and technical support.	Shared organizational investment; project cost-sharing; eligible donor budgets.
Monitoring and DQA	Field travel, supervision, source verification, data cleaning, translation, printing and tools.	Project MEL budgets; shared cross-project DQA allocation.
Baseline and evaluations	Survey design, sampling, enumerators, biodiversity experts, independent evaluators, analysis and dissemination.	Project budgets; donor-specific evaluation lines; organizational strategic funds.
Capacity development	Training, coaching, refresher sessions, manuals, mentoring and peer learning.	Organizational capacity budget; project training allocations.
Learning and accountability	Quarterly reflection sessions, annual learning event, feedback channels, accessible communication and response mechanisms.	Organizational and project budgets.
GIS and biodiversity	GPS/GIS equipment or services, imagery/data, field protocols, specialist surveys and spatial repository.	Relevant project budgets; shared technical investment.
Contingency / maintenance	System maintenance, replacement, upgrades, secure archiving and incident response.	Core organizational budget and eligible project allocations.

Budgeting rules: (1) cost the minimum mandatory standards first; (2) share common systems and services across projects where donor rules permit; (3) avoid charging the same cost twice; (4) document allocation methods; (5) include MEL costs in project design from inception; (6) use the 3–5% evaluation benchmark only as a planning reference where appropriate and donor-permitted; and (7) review affordability and sustainability annually.

10.2 RACI definitions and governance rule

R = Responsible (performs the work); A = Accountable (ultimately answerable and approves); C = Consulted; I = Informed. Each activity should have one clear accountable role wherever practicable.

Process	Executive Director	MEL Officer	Project Manager	Project MEL Focal	Technical / Field Staff	Finance / Ops
Framework and organizational standards	A	R	C	I	C	C
Project MEL plan preparation and approval	I	C	A	R	C	C
Routine data collection	I	C	A	C	R	I
Project-level source verification	I	C	A	R	R/C	I
Organizational data validation / DQA	I	A/R	C	R	C	C
Project report preparation and approval	I	C	A	R	C	C
Organizational consolidation / dashboard	I	A/R	C	C	C	C
Evaluation commissioning / ToR approval	A	R	C	C	C	C

Learning register maintenance	I	A	R	R	C	I
Quarterly learning / reflection	A	R	R	C	C	I
Corrective action implementation	I	C	A	R	R	C
Data access, protection and incident response	A	R/C	R	C	I	R/C
Budget allocation and MEL resourcing	A	C	R	I	C	R/C

The Project Manager remains accountable for project-level results and reporting. Project/field staff are the primary routine data collectors. MEL personnel do not replace project data collection; they provide standards, technical support, validation, quality assurance, analysis and organizational synthesis.

17. Project MEL Planning and Implementing Partner Standards

17.1 Minimum project MEL plan

Section	Required content
Project overview	Goal, objectives, geography, target population, partners and implementation period.
Stakeholder / GESI analysis	Stakeholder map, participation barriers, inclusion risks and mitigation.
Theory of change	Pathway, assumptions, risks and unintended effects.
Results framework	Outputs, outcomes, indicators, baselines and targets.
Indicator matrix / IRS	Definition, formula, disaggregation, source, frequency and responsibility.
Data collection plan	Methods, tools, sampling, schedule and field responsibilities.
Data flow and management	Data-flow diagram, identifiers, storage, access, privacy, retention and archiving.
DQA plan	Verification, quality risks, sampling and corrective action.
Evaluation plan	Evaluation questions, type, timing, methods and budget.
Learning agenda	Priority questions, learning products, reflection schedule and action register.
Accountability	Feedback channels, response timelines, escalation and safeguarding interface.
Reporting calendar	Internal, donor, partner and organizational reporting deadlines.
MEL staffing and RACI	Named roles, time allocation and responsibility matrix.
MEL budget	Monitoring, DQA, evaluation, data systems, learning and capacity costs.
Risk and mitigation	Operational, data, ethics, inclusion and environmental risks.

17.2 Minimum requirements for implementing partners

- Partner agreement or data-sharing annex identifies indicators, definitions, formats, reporting frequency, deadlines and responsible focal persons.
- Partner data must include source evidence, collection methods, disaggregation where relevant, geographic/site identifiers and reporting period.
- Partner-generated data are subject to NABU validation, risk-based DQA and reasonable source verification rights.
- Partners must follow consent, confidentiality, data minimization, safeguarding and secure transfer standards.
- Data ownership, permitted use, storage, retention, onward sharing and publication must be agreed in writing.
- Partner reports must disclose methodology changes, missing data, estimates, limitations and corrections.
- Project Manager is accountable for partner performance; MEL provides technical standards and quality assurance.

18. Standard Operating Procedures and Operational Instruments

The following SOPs and instruments are required. Version 2.0 establishes their minimum content and ownership. Where a complete form, database or digital workflow has not yet been configured, it is a phased deliverable and must be approved and

tested before operational deployment.

Code	SOP / instrument	Minimum contents	Lead / approval
SOP-01	MEL planning and approval	Project MEL plan template, annual update, approval and change control.	Project Manager + MEL; management approval
SOP-02	Indicator registration and change	IRS, catalogue, code assignment, definition/target change request and version control.	MEL Officer
SOP-03	Routine monitoring and reporting	Monthly data flow, evidence checklist, deadlines, review and escalation.	Project Manager
SOP-04	Digital form design and deployment	Form naming, testing, consent, skip logic, versioning, user access and archiving.	MEL / authorized data staff
SOP-05	Data cleaning and validation	Validation rules, query log, correction process, audit trail and sign-off.	Project Manager + MEL
SOP-06	Quarterly DQA	Risk-based sampling, scorecard, field checks, corrective actions and reporting.	MEL Officer + Project
SOP-07	Database and version control	Data dictionary, IDs, access, backups, update log and archiving.	MEL + designated data custodian
SOP-08	Dashboard publication	Refresh, approval, thresholds, red alerts, caveats and access rights.	MEL Officer
SOP-09	Evaluation commissioning	Screening matrix, ToR, independence, ethics, quality review and management response.	Management + MEL
SOP-10	Learning and adaptive management	Lesson validation, quarterly reflection, action register and verification.	MEL + Project Managers
SOP-11	Feedback / complaints data	Safe intake, restricted register, response timelines, referral and anonymized reporting.	Designated accountability / safeguarding focal
SOP-12	Data protection and archiving	Consent, access, sharing, retention, disposal, breach response and incident log.	Management + data custodian / MEL

18.1 Phased operational package

Phase	Operational deliverables	Acceptance / readiness test
Phase 1: Minimum standards	Approved MEL plan and IRS templates; core KPI register; data-flow map; DQA checklist; partner reporting template; data-protection checklist; reporting calendar.	Templates tested by at least one project; roles, fields and approval routes confirmed.
Phase 2: Digital and analytical tools	Kobo/ODK forms; data dictionary; project/organizational database; site/GIS repository; dashboard prototype; validation and backup procedures.	User acceptance test; sample records flow from collection to dashboard; access and backup tested.
Phase 3: Evaluation, learning and accountability	Evaluation ToR/methodology package; learning register; feedback register and referral protocol; annual learning synthesis format.	Pilot completed; confidentiality and safeguarding checks passed; actions and response process demonstrated.
Phase 4: Institutionalization	Full SOP manual; capacity plan; annual MEL budget; maturity scorecard; system review and sustainability plan.	Management approval; named owners; annual budget and calendar incorporated into organizational planning.

19. MEL Capacity Development

Capacity development is continuous and role-specific rather than a one-time training event.

Audience	Priority competencies	Mode / evidence
Senior management	Dashboard use, evidence interpretation, adaptive decisions and resource allocation.	Briefings/coaching; documented management decisions.
Project Managers	Results management, indicator interpretation, reporting accountability and corrective action.	Workshops/coaching; approved MEL plans and action tracking.
Project MEL focal persons	MEL plans, data management, DQA, Kobo/ODK and reporting.	Hands-on training; accurate timely submissions.
Regional / field staff	Digital forms, sampling, ethical collection, consent and source documentation.	Practical field training; complete traceable records.
Technical specialists	Biodiversity/ecological monitoring, GIS, remote sensing and interpretation.	Technical clinics; protocol-compliant datasets.
Partners	NABU standards, reporting, data quality, confidentiality and consent.	Orientation/supportive supervision; compliant partner reports.

19.1 Five-year capacity sequence

Year	Competency focus	Key activities	Evidence

2026	MEL fundamentals	Orientation, standards, ToC, indicators and DQA basics.	Approved initial project MEL plans.
2027	Digital and data quality	Kobo/ODK, database, dashboards and DQA.	Routine digital workflows and DQA reports.
2028	Outcome and spatial MEL	GIS, biodiversity monitoring and outcome measurement.	Integrated spatial/outcome reports.
2029	Advanced evaluation and learning	Contribution analysis, synthesis and learning facilitation.	Cross-project learning products.
2030	Institutionalization	Mentoring, succession and system review.	Internal trainers and sustainable SOPs.

20. Management Dashboard and Decision Support

The dashboard should answer: Are targets being achieved? Where are we performing? Who are we reaching? What is changing? What is not working? What are we learning? Dashboard traffic-light categories are management signals, not judgments about individual staff.

Panel / metric	Display / refresh	Threshold and response
Portfolio overview	Projects, status and reporting completeness; monthly.	Missing/late reports flagged to Project Manager and regional focal.
Results	Indicator target versus achievement; quarterly.	Threshold set in approved KPI register; deviations explained.
Geography	Map of intervention areas and selected outcomes; quarterly/annual.	Show data date, verification status and limitations.
People / inclusion	Unique beneficiaries and relevant disaggregation; quarterly.	Review coverage gaps and safe inclusion data.
Ecological results	Restoration, ecosystem and biodiversity measures; seasonal/annual.	Technical interpretation; no unsupported trend inference.
Risk and DQA	Red/amber risks, DQA status and data gaps; quarterly.	Escalate material risks and overdue corrective actions.
Learning	Lessons, decisions, action owners and adaptation status; quarterly.	Show only completed actions with implementation evidence.
Accountability	Feedback cases and closure status; monthly/quarterly.	Restricted details; report anonymized trends only.

20.1 Red-alert management protocol

- Trigger: dashboard classifies a KPI or project performance measure as red using the pre-approved threshold or identifies a material data-quality, safeguarding or implementation risk.
- Notification: MEL Officer alerts the relevant Project Manager and designated management focal within five working days of validation; urgent safeguarding or data incidents are escalated immediately under specialist procedures.
- Diagnosis: Project Manager leads a documented root-cause review with project/technical staff and MEL support within ten working days, or a shorter donor/management deadline.
- Corrective action: Project Manager submits a corrective action plan stating issue, evidence, action, owner, resources, deadline and expected improvement.
- Approval: management approves actions requiring material budget, scope, timeline or risk decisions.
- Follow-up: Project MEL focal updates action status monthly; MEL verifies evidence and reflects status in the next dashboard.
- Closure/escalation: close only when corrective action is implemented and evidence reviewed; unresolved or repeated red alerts are escalated to the Executive Director.
- Thresholds must be agreed in advance, documented in the KPI register and reviewed annually. A red status should trigger inquiry and support, not automatic attribution of blame.

21. Annual MEL Calendar

Period	Core organizational activity
January	Annual MEL plan; targets and indicator catalogue confirmation; baseline/target register update; annual workplan and budget alignment.
February–March	Routine monitoring; baseline/evaluation activities; partner reporting orientation; data-quality checks.
April	Q1 performance dashboard; quarterly organizational learning/reflection session; management review and action log.
May–June	Field verification; DQA; capacity development; evaluation and GESI review.
July	Q2 dashboard; midyear performance and learning review; quarterly reflection; target/risk review.
August–September	Outcome/evaluation activities; partner performance review; annual planning inputs; quarterly learning session.
October	Q3 dashboard; risk and learning review; quarterly reflection and corrective action follow-up.
November	Annual results data validation; evaluation synthesis; preparation of annual reflection event.
December	Annual results report; annual reflection and learning event; learning synthesis; management decisions and next-year MEL plan/budget.

22. 2026–2030 Implementation Roadmap

Year / phase	Institutional milestone	Key deliverables / accountable lead
2026 – Establish	Diagnostic, governance and minimum standards.	Framework approval; role nominations; project inventory; KPI and baseline register initiated; MEL Officer leads, management approves.
2027 – Standardize and digitize	Common tools and data architecture operational.	Approved SOPs; Kobo/ODK architecture; data dictionary; database and dashboard; quarterly DQA; Project Managers and MEL lead.
2028 – Integrate	GIS/biodiversity MEL integration and outcome measurement strengthened.	Mid-period system review; spatial repository; repeatable biodiversity protocols; outcome measurement; management approval.
2029 – Learn and scale	Cross-project learning and advanced evaluation.	Learning synthesis; contribution analysis where appropriate; evidence-use strengthening; MEL and Project Managers.
2030 – Institutionalize	End-period review and sustainability.	Organizational MEL review; sustainability and resourcing plan; revised 2031+ MEL strategy; management approval.

22.1 First 100 days after approval

Timing	Priority	Deliverables	Lead
Days 1–15	Mobilize and confirm	Appoint project MEL focal persons; inventory projects, partners, staff capacity, data systems and existing baselines.	MEL Officer + Project Managers
Days 16–30	Diagnose and resource	Complete system/capacity gap assessment; staffing and budget assessment; risk and data-protection review.	MEL Officer + Finance/Operations
Days 31–45	Design and standardize	Confirm organizational ToC; approve KPI catalogue/IRS; baseline protocol; reporting calendar and data standards.	MEL Officer + technical leads
Days 46–60	Develop prerequisites	Complete core SOPs; DQA checklist; data dictionary; partner reporting and data-sharing templates; GESI and consent tools.	MEL Officer + Project Managers
Days 61–75	Pilot data tools	Configure and test Kobo/ODK forms; database prototype; site IDs; access controls and backup.	MEL / data custodian
Days 76–85	Baseline and verify	Begin baseline collection/compilation; conduct first DQA pilot; resolve tool issues.	Project teams + MEL
Days 86–95	Learning and dashboard prototype	Set learning register; hold first reflection; develop dashboard prototype and red-alert thresholds.	MEL Officer + Project Managers
Days 96–100	Approve and launch	Management reviews readiness, approves phase-two workplan, resource allocation and implementation schedule.	Executive Director / management

Dependencies: data dictionary and identifiers must precede database configuration; approved indicators and IRS must precede form configuration; consent and data-protection standards must precede field data collection; validation rules and DQA procedures must precede dashboard publication. The organizational baseline exercise continues beyond day 100 and is targeted for validation by month six.

23. Year-Three Expected MEL System Performance (2028)

By the end of 2028, a functioning NABU Ethiopia organizational MEL system is expected to demonstrate the following minimum conditions:

- All active projects have current approved MEL plans mapped to organizational result domains and donor requirements.
- Project reports are submitted on schedule using common definitions and agreed reporting formats; reporting completeness and timeliness are visible on the dashboard.
- Core organizational KPIs have validated baseline values or documented reasons and timelines for remaining gaps; 2028 milestones and 2030 targets are approved.
- Routine project data are collected by project/field teams, checked by Project Managers and subjected to risk-based quarterly DQA by the MEL Function.
- A functioning organizational database and dashboard consolidate approved data, show geographic coverage and disaggregated results where safe, and retain source/verification status.
- Staff and partner focal persons understand their data responsibilities, consent procedures, indicator definitions and reporting deadlines.
- Quarterly learning sessions and an annual reflection event result in documented decisions, assigned actions and verified adaptations.
- Evaluation recommendations and feedback trends are tracked; management decisions are traceable to evidence.
- GIS and biodiversity information are integrated for priority sites using documented protocols and metadata.

The Year-Three benchmark is assessed through the MEL maturity scorecard, reporting timeliness, DQA trends, dashboard functionality tests, training records, evaluation action tracker, learning register and management decision records.

24. Risk Management and Sustainability

Risk	Potential effect	Mitigation / owner
Fragmented project systems	Inconsistent evidence and duplication.	Organizational standards, project mapping and common identifiers; MEL Officer.
Weak indicator definitions	Invalid aggregation and misleading reporting.	Mandatory IRS and approval/change control; MEL Officer.
Low data quality	Poor decisions and reporting risk.	Quarterly risk-based DQA, coaching and corrective action; Project Managers/MEL.
Overcollection	Staff burden and weak data use.	Decision-driven indicator selection and data minimization; Project Managers.
Limited MEL capacity	Delayed or poor reporting.	Role-specific training, focal persons and resourcing; management/MEL.
Connectivity constraints	Delayed field synchronization.	Offline-first tools and controlled manual fallback; data custodian.
Staff turnover	Loss of institutional memory.	SOPs, repositories, mentoring and version control; management.
Weak management use	MEL becomes reporting-only.	Quarterly evidence-to-action reviews and documented decisions; Executive Director.
Privacy / safeguarding risks	Harm, breach or loss of trust.	Consent, access controls, secure storage and specialist referral; management/focal persons.
Unfunded system maintenance	Digital tools or DQA become unsustainable.	Annual costed MEL budget, shared-cost rules and donor/core funding strategy; Finance/management.

25. Review, Adaptation and Version Control

The Framework will be reviewed annually and formally reassessed at mid-period in 2028. Revisions must be evidence-based, approved by the designated authority and documented in the change log. Project indicator or target changes must preserve previous versions and state the rationale, approval date and effect on comparability.

Review question	Evidence
Are indicators still decision-relevant?	Indicator-use review and management feedback.
Are reporting burdens proportionate?	Project/partner feedback and time-use review.
Is data quality improving?	DQA trend and correction logs.
Are evaluations informing decisions?	Evaluation action tracker and management responses.
Are learning actions implemented?	Learning register and implementation evidence.
Can communities provide feedback safely?	Feedback mechanism review and anonymized trend analysis.
Is management using evidence?	Decision records, review minutes and resource allocations.

Every major quarterly review ends with an evidence-to-action record: finding → interpretation → decision/action → owner → deadline → resource implication → follow-up evidence.

ANNEX 1. Organizational Indicator Catalogue and IRS Template

The 14 organizational KPIs are defined in Section 6. This annex provides the operational registration template. Each indicator must have a completed IRS and be approved before use in consolidated reporting.

IRS field	Required entry
Indicator code / name	ORG-XX or project code; exact standardized title.
Result level	Impact / outcome / output / process / context / learning / accountability.
Definition / rationale	Operational definition, purpose, inclusion/exclusion rules and management question.
Unit / formula	Unit; calculation; numerator and denominator where applicable; rounding rules.
Disaggregation	Sex, age, disability where appropriate and safe, geography and other justified dimensions.
Baseline / targets	Value, year, source, method, annual targets, 2028 milestone and 2030 target.
Source / tool / frequency	Primary and secondary sources; Kobo/survey/GIS/records; collection frequency.
Roles	Collector, verifier, MEL reviewer, technical approver and reporting approver.
DQA / limitations	Verification method, evidence, known bias, missing-data rules and interpretation limits.
Use / approval	Management/reporting/learning use; version, approval date and approving authority.

ANNEX 2. MEL System Gap and Maturity Assessment Tool

Score each domain using the following scale before completing the assessment matrix.

Score	Maturity level	Scoring guidance
1	Ad hoc	No consistent process; activities are informal, fragmented or person-dependent.
2	Emerging	Some tools or practices exist but are inconsistently applied and weakly documented.
3	Functional	Core processes, roles and tools are documented and routinely applied in most relevant areas.
4	Integrated	Systems are linked across projects/offices; data are quality-assured and routinely used.
5	Learning-oriented	Evidence consistently drives adaptation; performance and learning are institutionalized and improved.

Domain	Assessment question	Score 1–5	Supporting evidence / reference	Gap / action
Governance	Are roles, responsibilities and approval routes defined?			
Results / ToC	Are organizational and project ToCs/results frameworks in place and aligned?			
Indicators	Are definitions, baselines, targets and IRS standardized?			
Monitoring	Are routine systems functional and timely?			
Data management	Are data secure, version-controlled and retrievable?			
DQA	Are data verified systematically and corrective actions tracked?			
Evaluation	Are evaluation questions, decision criteria and schedules established?			
Learning	Are lessons validated and actions documented and followed up?			
Accountability	Are feedback channels safe, accessible and functioning?			
GESI	Are relevant indicators disaggregated and inclusion findings used?			
Capacity	Do staff and partners have required MEL skills?			
Management use	Does evidence influence documented decisions and resource allocation?			

Assessment rule: cite documents, datasets, meeting minutes, interviews or direct observations. Scores must be justified; unsupported scores should not be treated as verified. The organizational ambition is to reach Level 4 (Integrated) as the primary target and progress toward Level 5 (Learning-oriented).

ANNEX 3. Quarterly DQA Checklist and Action Record

Check	Verification question / evidence	Result (Y/N/NA)	Finding / reference	Action / owner / due date
Indicator definition	Correct approved definition, unit, period and IRS version used?			
Completeness	Required records, fields, sites and disaggregations present?			
Timeliness	Submitted by agreed deadline?			
Source evidence	Can reported values be traced to original records?			
Accuracy	Sample records match source; formulas recalculated?			
Consistency	Project report, database and dashboard reconcile?			
Plausibility	Outliers, duplicates and unusual changes explained?			
Integrity	Access controls, audit trail and correction log maintained?			
Ethics / consent	Consent and confidentiality requirements followed?			
Closure	Corrective actions assigned and prior actions followed up?			

DQA summary must state scope, sample rationale, methods, limitations, dimension-level findings, overall conclusion, corrective actions, responsible persons and deadlines. Use the DQA procedure in Section 10.

ANNEX 4. Evaluation Screening and Evaluation Matrix

Screening item	Assessment / evidence	Implication for evaluation
Donor / contractual requirement	Required / not required; reference clause.	Mandatory evaluation type and timing.
Budget and duration	Budget band, project duration and investment scale.	Proportionate evaluation depth and independence.
Beneficiary scale / diversity	Number, profile, vulnerability and geographic spread.	Sampling and inclusion design.
Technical complexity	Innovation, sectors, sites and partner structure.	Need for specialist / mixed methods.
Risk / uncertainty	Environmental, social, safeguarding and implementation risks.	Independent review or enhanced safeguards.
Strategic decision	Scale-up, continuation, exit or policy decision at stake.	Evaluation question and timing.
Evidence availability	Baseline, monitoring quality, comparison data and gaps.	Feasible design and limitations.

Evaluation type	Core question	Methodological minimum	Output / approval
Baseline	What is the starting condition?	Population and sampling frame; sample-size rationale; tools; consent; analysis plan.	Baseline dataset/report; Project Manager + MEL review.
Process	Is delivery timely, appropriate and complete?	Implementation records; purposive stakeholder sample; triangulation; delivery fidelity.	Process review and action plan.
Midterm / outcome	What is changing, for whom and why?	Mixed methods; comparison where credible; GESI analysis; contribution/causal logic.	Evaluation report and management response.
Final / endline	What was achieved and what contributed?	Baseline/endline comparability; representative sample where required; transparent limitations.	Final report, dataset and action plan.
Impact / sustainability	What longer-term change persists and why?	Credible counterfactual or contribution approach; longitudinal/context analysis where feasible.	Impact/sustainability assessment.

Sample-size guidance: the study protocol must justify sample size using the primary outcome, expected variability/proportion, confidence level, precision/power where applicable, design effect, clustering, non-response and available resources. Qualitative sample sizes are justified by diversity, depth and saturation. Biodiversity sample size and effort follow taxa-specific protocols and ecological conditions.

ANNEX 5. Project MEL Plan Template

Section	Project-specific entry / prompts
1. Project summary	Project title/ID, donor, objectives, period, sites, target groups and partners.
2. Stakeholder and GESI analysis	Who participates/benefits; barriers; inclusion risks; mitigation and safe disaggregation.
3. Theory of change	Pathway, assumptions, risks and unintended effects.
4. Results framework	Outputs, outcomes, indicators, baselines, annual and end targets.
5. Indicator matrix	Code, definition, unit, formula, disaggregation, source, frequency, owner and IRS.
6. Baseline and target plan	Methods, sampling, tools, timing, validation and target rationale.
7. Monitoring plan	Data collection methods, tools, schedule, responsibilities and field supervision.
8. Data flow	Who collects, checks, verifies, enters, validates, analyzes and approves.
9. DQA plan	Risks, verification methods, sample rationale, schedule and corrective action.
10. Evaluation plan	Questions, type, decision criteria, timing, methods, independence and budget.
11. Learning agenda	Questions, quarterly reflection, products and action register.
12. Accountability	Feedback channels, response timelines, restricted referral and safeguarding interface.
13. Data management	IDs, storage, access, consent, privacy, sharing, retention and archiving.
14. Partner arrangements	Reporting format, evidence, DQA, confidentiality and data-sharing clauses.
15. Reporting calendar	Internal, donor, partner and organizational submission dates.
16. Staffing / RACI	Named responsible, accountable, consulted and informed roles; time allocation.
17. MEL budget	Human resources, monitoring, DQA, evaluation, digital systems, learning and training.
18. Risks and mitigation	Data, operational, ethical, inclusion, environmental and capacity risks.

ANNEX 6. Organizational MEL Database Data Dictionary

Entity	Key fields	Validation / relationship rule
Project	Project_ID, name, donor, dates, manager, status	Unique Project_ID; referenced by sites, activities, indicators and partners.
Partner	Partner_ID, name, agreement, focal person, reporting schedule	Unique Partner_ID; linked to Project_ID through project-partner relationship.
Site	Site_ID, Project_ID, admin location, coordinates/polygon, ecosystem, status	Unique Site_ID; coordinates validated; sensitive sites restricted.
Beneficiary / HH	Pseudonymous_ID, Project_ID, sex, age band, optional disability field, participation	No duplicate ID within agreed scope; direct identifiers stored separately.
Indicator	Indicator_Code, title, definition, unit, level, frequency, IRS_version	Unique code; approved IRS required.
Target	Indicator_Code, Project_ID/org level, period, value, approval reference	Linked to indicator and period; versioned when changed.
Achievement	Indicator_Code, Project_ID, period, value, disaggregation, source, verification status	Must match approved unit/definition; source and verifier recorded.
Activity	Activity_ID, Project_ID, date, Site_ID, status, evidence reference	Unique ID; valid Project_ID and Site_ID.
Evaluation	Evaluation_ID, Project_ID, type, date, ToR, findings, actions	Linked to project; management response and action tracker.
Learning	Learning_ID, question, finding, action, owner, due date, status, evidence	Completion requires implementation evidence.
Feedback	Case_ID, date, category, channel, restricted status, action, closure date	Restricted access; personal identifiers not in general dashboard.

ANNEX 7. Feedback and Complaints Register (Illustrative Structure)

Case ID	Date	Location code	Category	Channel	Assigned focal	Status	Response date	Closure / referral
FB-0001	YYYY-MM-DD	SITE-XX	Information request	Community meeting	Role / name in restricted register	Closed	YYYY-MM-DD	Response communicated
FB-0002	YYYY-MM-DD	SITE-YY	Project implementation concern	Phone	Role / name in restricted register	Under review		Action pending
FB-0003	YYYY-MM-DD	Restricted	Sensitive safeguarding concern	Designated focal	Restricted access	Referred		Managed through safeguarding procedure; no case details in MEL report

This is a register structure, not a record of actual cases. Sensitive cases must be stored separately in an access-restricted case-management system and must not be entered in the general MEL database.

ANNEX 8. Quarterly Organizational Performance Report Template

Section	Required content / prompts
1. Executive summary	Key results, major deviations, decisions required and reporting coverage.
2. Portfolio status	Project status, reporting completeness/timeliness, major implementation constraints.
3. KPI performance	Target vs achievement; trend; definition/unit; disaggregation; source and verification status.
4. Ecosystem and biodiversity	Restoration, ecosystem management, biodiversity evidence, site maps and limitations.
5. Livelihoods and inclusion	Household outcomes, participation, sex/age and other safe disaggregation; who may be left behind.
6. Data quality	DQA scope, findings, scorecard, unresolved data gaps and corrective action.
7. Risks and safeguards	Material risks, mitigation, escalation and anonymized feedback trends.
8. Learning and adaptation	Validated lessons, decisions, adaptations and evidence of implementation.
9. Accountability	Feedback volume by category/channel, response/closure performance and systemic actions; no sensitive case details.
10. Management action tracker	Decision/action, evidence, owner, deadline, resources, status and follow-up.

Each KPI row should report: indicator code and definition; reporting period; baseline; annual/period target; achievement; variance; disaggregation; source; verification status; explanation; corrective action; owner and deadline.

ANNEX 9. MEL Governance and RACI Matrix

This matrix is aligned with Section 16. R = Responsible; A = Accountable; C = Consulted; I = Informed.

Process	Executive Director	MEL Officer	Project Manager	Project MEL Focal	Technical / Field Staff	Finance / Ops
Framework approval	A	R	C	I	C	C
Project MEL plan	I	C	A	R	C	C
Routine data collection	I	C	A	C	R	I
Project source verification	I	C	A	R	R/C	I
Organizational DQA	I	A/R	C	R	C	C
Project report approval	I	C	A	R	C	I
Dashboard consolidation	I	A/R	C	C	C	C
Evaluation commissioning	A	R	C	C	C	C
Learning register	I	A	R	R	C	I
Corrective action	I	C	A	R	R	C
Data protection / incident response	A	R/C	R	C	I	R/C

ANNEX 10. Five-Year MEL Capacity-Building Plan

Year	Competency focus	Key activities	Evidence of capacity
2026	MEL fundamentals	Orientation, organizational standards, ToC, indicators, reporting and DQA basics.	Project MEL plans, approved IRS and baseline plan.
2027	Digital and data quality	Kobo/ODK, database, dashboard, validation, privacy and DQA.	Routine digital workflows, dashboard and DQA reports.
2028	Outcome and spatial MEL	GIS, biodiversity monitoring, GESI analysis and outcome measurement.	Integrated spatial/outcome reports and mid-period review.
2029	Advanced evaluation and learning	Contribution analysis, mixed methods, synthesis and learning facilitation.	Cross-project learning products and evaluation quality reviews.
2030	Institutionalization	Mentoring, succession, SOP refresh and system review.	Internal trainers, sustained SOPs and approved sustainability plan.

ANNEX 11. MEL Maturity Scorecard

Level	Organizational condition	2026–2030 aspiration / evidence
1 Ad hoc	Fragmented and person-dependent.	Move beyond through assigned roles, common standards and documented baseline.
2 Emerging	Some tools/processes but inconsistent.	Minimum standardization; approved MEL plans, indicators and reporting calendar.
3 Functional	Core systems work routinely.	Consolidate; DQA, database, dashboard and learning actions routinely used.
4 Integrated	Systems linked across portfolio.	Primary target; aligned project and organizational data, spatial evidence and management decisions.
5 Learning-oriented	Evidence routinely drives adaptation.	Long-term target; demonstrated organizational learning, sustained capacity and continuous improvement.

ANNEX 12. Management MEL Dashboard Specification

Metric / panel	Display	Refresh	Threshold governance / response
Projects reporting on time	% and traffic light	Monthly	Approved reporting deadline; late report alert to Project Manager.
Projects with approved MEL plans	%	Quarterly	Target 100%; follow-up with projects without current plans.
KPI target vs achievement	Value, variance and trend	Quarterly	Indicator-specific threshold approved in KPI register.
DQA pass rate	% and dimension breakdown	Quarterly	2028 planning milestone ≥80%; 2030 ≥90%; action plans for failures.
Evaluation actions completed	% of due actions with evidence	Semiannual	2028 ≥75%; 2030 ≥85%; overdue items escalated.
Learning actions completed	% of due actions with evidence	Quarterly	2028 ≥75%; 2030 ≥85%; evidence required for closure.
Feedback closure	% within agreed timeframe	Monthly/quarterly	2028 ≥85%; 2030 ≥95% for non-sensitive cases; category-specific timelines.
Geographic coverage	Map and verified area	Quarterly/annual	Metadata, date and verification status displayed.
GESI coverage	Relevant disaggregated data	Quarterly	Missing disaggregation flagged; suppress unsafe small cells.

ANNEX 13. MEL Resource and Budget Planning Template

Cost category	Unit / quantity	Unit cost	Frequency / duration	Estimated total	Funding source / allocation basis
MEL staffing / time allocation					
Project MEL focal-person time					
Monitoring field visits					
Quarterly DQA					
Baseline / household surveys					
Biodiversity / GIS / remote sensing					
Kobo/ODK / server / database / dashboard					
Devices / connectivity / backup					
Evaluation / external expertise					
Training / coaching / mentoring					
Quarterly learning sessions / annual event					
Feedback and accountability channels					
Data protection / archiving / security					
Maintenance / contingency					
TOTAL					

Complete this template annually. Record whether each cost is core-funded, charged to a specific project, shared across projects or provided in-kind. Document donor eligibility and allocation methodology.

ANNEX 14. Partner MEL and Data-Sharing Minimum Checklist

- Partner focal persons and responsibilities identified.
- Indicators, definitions, units, reporting periods and deadlines agreed.
- Standard reporting template and source-document requirements provided.
- Data collection and verification responsibilities distinguished.
- Disaggregation and GESI requirements agreed and safe to implement.
- Consent, confidentiality, data minimization and secure transfer procedures agreed.
- Data access, ownership, permitted use, retention, onward sharing and publication documented.
- Right and process for NABU source verification / DQA established.
- Method changes, missing data, estimates and corrections disclosed.
- Safeguarding concerns referred through designated specialist channels.

Conclusion

NABU Ethiopia's 2026–2030 Organizational MEL Framework establishes one coherent architecture while preserving project-specific technical requirements and donor obligations. Its central operating logic is evidence for action: planning is linked to measurement; measurement to verification; verified evidence to interpretation; interpretation to learning; and learning to adaptation and management decisions.

Version 2.0 responds to the technical review by strengthening governance, baseline and target-setting, GESI, evaluation, data protection, partner standards, resourcing, learning and dashboard response procedures. It also clarifies that detailed operational products—including configured Kobo/ODK forms, a live database, dashboards and fully deployed SOPs are phased implementation deliverables. They must be developed, tested, approved and resourced before routine deployment.

Implementation should begin with management approval, role assignment, project and capacity inventory, minimum standards, baseline planning and the core SOPs. Digital tools and dashboards should follow the approval of indicators, data dictionary, data-protection requirements and validation rules. The framework will be reviewed annually and formally reassessed in 2028. Management approval, adequate resourcing and consistent use across projects and partners are essential to institutionalizing a credible, useful and sustainable MEL system.