Review of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan for the CLEAR Program

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary
1.1. Research Overview

INANTA and CWS Indonesia are developing an Early Action project as part of Climate Change Adaptation (CCA). This program is known as Community-Led Early Action and Resilience (CLEAR). The program is planned for three years and targets four urban villages in Makassar. The CLEAR program has three main outcomes: (1) Increased knowledge, understanding, motivation, and capacity of community members to assess climate and disaster vulnerability and act independently; (2) Disaster impacts can be proactively mitigated through the successful implementation of anticipatory action and strengthening of early warning systems (EWS); (3) Improved access for communities to alternative livelihoods to reduce the impact of disasters and other displacement triggers.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the existing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan for community-based programs, provide recommendations to improve program interventions, and develop strategies to mitigate the adverse impacts of climate change, particularly on vulnerable communities.

1.2. Main Findings

A comprehensive review of existing community-based program monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans has revealed several significant challenges. The current monitoring and evaluation frameworks (MEFs) are often fragmented and lack comprehensive mechanisms to effectively engage vulnerable groups. There is a significant lack of integration of participatory approaches, which limits the ability of these programs to address the specific needs and challenges faced by vulnerable groups. Additionally, data collection and analysis methods are often inadequate, leading to gaps in understanding the real impact of interventions on these groups.

Our assessment of community monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has shown that existing M&E channels in communities are often underutilized or not well integrated into the broader program framework. Effective M&E requires leveraging local knowledge and structures to create more inclusive and responsive systems. Communities have varying levels of capacity to conduct participatory M&E, influenced by factors such as education, organizational support, and available resources. Building local capacity through training and support is essential to enhance the effectiveness of participatory M&E efforts. This could include workshops, mentorship programs, and the development of local M&E networks to facilitate knowledge exchange and collaboration.

1.3. Recommendations

To enhance intervention and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, we recommend several key actions. **Firstly,** community involvement should be strengthened through participatory monitoring and evaluation frameworks that engage community members and urban village government elements in program planning, implementation, and evaluation. This approach ensures that the voices and experiences of vulnerable groups are central to program development and assessment. **Secondly,** there is a need to strengthen the capacity of local organizations and community members to effectively monitor and evaluate interventions. This can be achieved through training on the project cycle management (PCM) cycle, including targeted training on monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning (MEAL) and support initiatives. **Thirdly,** leveraging data analysis to

identify trends, measure impact, and adapt strategies in real-time is crucial to meet the needs of vulnerable groups more effectively.

In conclusion, this assessment highlights that existing monitoring and evaluation plans require significant improvement to effectively engage these groups. Our recommendations focus on enhancing community participation, building local capacity, and implementing data-driven approaches to improve program interventions.

2.   Introduction

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is crucial for community-based program implementation. M&E is a process that helps assess whether a program has achieved its objectives, identify areas for improvement, and ultimately, ensure that resources are used efficiently to support vulnerable groups. Unfortunately, many monitoring and evaluation plans designed for programs targeting vulnerable groups lack comprehensiveness. This makes it difficult to accurately measure program effectiveness and adapt strategies to better serve the specific needs of communities.

This study aims to bridge the gap in existing monitoring and evaluation practices by proposing a more comprehensive framework for evaluating programs targeting vulnerable groups in the context of climate change. This framework will contribute to improved program design and implementation, ultimately leading to increased effectiveness in supporting vulnerable groups and building resilience to climate change.

2.1. Objectives

This review aims to:

- Review existing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans for community-based programs targeting vulnerable groups.
- Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the M&E frameworks in achieving program goals..
- Provide recommendations for improving the effectiveness of intervention and M&E mechanisms to better meet the needs of vulnerable communities.

2.2. Scope of Study

The review of the CLEAR program's M&E framework will cover all aspects of the M&E framework, including:

- **Program goals and objectives:** The review will ensure that the CLEAR program's goals and objectives are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound).
- **Indicators and targets:** The review will assess whether the M&E indicators for the CLEAR program are appropriate, measurable, and relevant to the program's goals and objectives. Targets for the M&E indicators will also be evaluated to ensure that they are ambitious yet achievable.
- **Data collection methods:** The review will assess whether the data collection methods for the CLEAR program's M&E indicators are appropriate, reliable, and valid.
- **Data collection frequency:** The review will assess whether the data collection frequency for the CLEAR program's M&E indicators is appropriate for tracking program progress.
- **Data analysis:** The review will assess whether the data analysis methods for the CLEAR program's M&E indicators are appropriate and will generate useful information for decision-making.
- **M&E reporting:** The review will assess whether the CLEAR program's M&E reports are clear, concise, and informative.
- **Use of M&E data:** The review will assess whether the CLEAR program's M&E data is being used to inform decision-making and improve the program.

2.3. Methodology

In general, for efficiency and effectiveness purposes, these activities are conducted in parallel with the vulnerability study. The review of the CLEAR program's M&E framework will be conducted using the following methods:

- **Document review**: Researchers will review all relevant documents related to the CLEAR program's M&E framework, including:

  - CLEAR program M&E framework
  - CLEAR program M&E plan
  - CLEAR program M&E reports
  - Other relevant CLEAR program documents

- **Interviews:** Researchers will interview CLEAR program staff, CLEAR program partners, and other stakeholders to gather information about the implementation of the CLEAR program's M&E framework.
- **Data analysis:** Researchers will analyze the CLEAR program's M&E data to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.

2.4. Research Limitations

Throughout the study, several challenges were encountered that affected data collection, including:

- The design of this study is descriptive and does not allow for causal analysis. This means that the causal relationship between program interventions and outcomes cannot be definitively established.
- External factors, such as socioeconomic and political conditions, can influence the outcomes of the CLEAR program. This can make it difficult to attribute observed changes solely to program interventions.
- Other programs operating in the same area may produce synergistic or antagonistic effects, which can obscure the impact of the CLEAR program.

Despite these limitations, the review of the CLEAR program's M&E framework provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of the program and identifies areas for improvement. These findings can be used to inform future decision-making and improve the outcomes of the CLEAR program.

3.   Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation (M&EP)

In disaster management, Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (M&EP) is an important approach that encourages active involvement from various stakeholders. This includes communities, government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector. M&EP is not just about collecting data, but also creating a space for dialogue and collaboration to learn from experiences, identify shortcomings, and improve the effectiveness of disaster response programs and policies.

M&EP has several key principles. First, participation, where all stakeholders are involved in the M&EP process, from planning to decision-making. Second, bias towards disaster-affected communities. This means that M&EP focuses on their needs and priorities. Third, sustainability, which is M&EP as a process that continuously learns and adapts to change. Other principles are openness of information about M&EP and accountability of all parties to the results of M&EP, as well as actions to improve the effectiveness of disaster response programs and policies.

3.1. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in the Four Target Urban Villages

The four target urban villages in Biringkanaya and Manggala face significant vulnerability to flooding. INANTA-CWS has developed the CLEAR Program to effectively reduce disaster risk and build resilience, and a comprehensive approach that involves the community is essential. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (M&EP) is a powerful tool that empowers communities to become active participants in the climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction process.

Respondents from the four target urban villages generally have a good understanding of the meaning of monitoring and evaluation, especially urban village government staff, health center RT/RW (neighborhood unit) stakeholders, school teachers, or workers in the formal sector. They understand that there is a urban village Musrenbang (Participatory Planning and Development Consultation) process which is the basis for developing development plans in the urban village. This is understood to have M&E consequences for the process of developing and implementing programs. The M&E system is periodically carried out formally. However, there is no system like a complaint feedback mechanism (CFM) for the general public to provide direct input or objections.

However, this understanding of M&EP is not the same as the understanding of other ordinary people, including people with disabilities or other marginalized groups. Even some community members said that the issue of M&EP is sensitive so that the community and employees or officials are not used to discussing it together.

Regarding M&EP in the community, researchers found a gap in understanding in M&EP. A survey conducted in the four target sub-districts revealed interesting insights into the understanding of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices. Stakeholders in the formal sector showed an understanding of M&E issues. The survey found that individuals working in the formal sector, such as sub-district government officials, health center stakeholders, school teachers, and even RT/RW representatives (environmental figures), showed a relatively good understanding of the concept of monitoring and evaluation. They acknowledged the existence of a "musrenbang" process, a participatory sub-district development planning mechanism. They understand that monitoring and evaluation plays an important role in providing input for program planning and implementation. In addition, they acknowledged the existence of a formal and periodic monitoring and evaluation system at the sub-district level.

On the other hand, there is a significant gap in terms of community involvement in monitoring and evaluation, namely the lack of a Community Feedback Mechanism. The survey found a lack of a formal "Complaint Feedback Mechanism" (CFM) for the general public to directly provide input or raise concerns. The lack of a structured channel hinders community participation in maintaining program accountability and providing suggestions for improvement.

Regarding the knowledge gap among the general public, this study also highlights the difference in M&E awareness between formal sector representatives and ordinary people. People with disabilities and other marginalized communities often lack a clear understanding of the M&E concept. Furthermore, some community members even stated that the issue of M&E is a sensitive one, indicating the potential reluctance to openly discuss M&E with officials or relevant stakeholders.

These findings highlight the need for targeted M&E awareness campaigns aimed at the general public, particularly marginalized groups. By clarifying monitoring and evaluation and promoting transparency, these campaigns can encourage community participation in the monitoring and evaluation process. Additionally, building an easy-to-use CFM system can empower communities to provide valuable feedback and contribute to program improvement.

Overall, bridging the knowledge gap on monitoring and evaluation is crucial to ensure effective and accountable planning and program implementation in the sub-districts.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation (M&EP) are a methodology that emphasizes the active involvement of community members in all stages of monitoring and evaluating DRR initiatives. It goes beyond the traditional top-down approach where experts design programs and assess their effectiveness. In M&EP, citizens become partners, contributing their knowledge, experiences, and perspectives throughout the process.

M&EP is an important strategy for target communities in the four target urban villages because:

- Understanding the Specific Context: Residents have a deep understanding of the local environment, vulnerabilities, and existing capacities. Their participation ensures that early warning and action strategies in API/DRR are tailored to the specific needs and contexts of the four target urban villages.
- Empowerment and Ownership: Residents involved in M&E can feel a sense of ownership over the API/DRR process. This fosters a sense of responsibility and encourages active participation in preparedness and mitigation efforts.
- Identifying Gaps and Weaknesses: By incorporating community feedback, M&EP helps identify gaps and weaknesses in DRR programs, leading to more effective interventions and better resource allocation.
- Sustainability and Long-term Commitment: Community ownership fosters sustainability and a long-term sense of commitment to DRR initiatives. M&EP helps ensure that programs are sustained beyond the initial implementation phase.

3.1.1. M&EP Strategies in the Four Target Urban Villages

M&EP is an important strategy for target communities in the four target urban villages because:

- Community Needs Assessment: Conducting workshops and surveys with residents to identify vulnerabilities, priorities, and their preferred approaches to early warning and action as an integral part of API/DRR efforts.

- Participatory Risk Mapping: Where community support organizations like INANTA work with community members to create risk maps that identify flood-prone areas, evacuation routes, and critical infrastructure.
- Early Warning System (EWS) Monitoring: Involving residents in testing and providing feedback on the flood early warning system.
- Evaluating the Effectiveness of Post-Flood Accommodation: Conducting this study together with residents to evaluate the adequacy and accessibility of shelters.

3.1.2. Benefits of M&EP for the Four Target Urban Villages

By implementing M&EP, the four target urban villages can reap several benefits:

- More effective and inclusive DR strategies.
- Increased community ownership and commitment to preparedness.
- Enhances communication and collaboration between residents and stakeholders.
- Increased capacity for long-term risk reduction.

M&EP is not just a technical exercise but a powerful tool for empowering communities and building resilience. By actively involving residents in the four target urban villages in M&EP, stakeholders can create a more sustainable and effective approach to disaster risk reduction, ultimately leading to a safer future for the surrounding environment.

3.2. Objectives of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (M&EP)

Community in the four target urban villages face significant vulnerability to flooding. To effectively address these challenges, a collaborative approach that empowers residents is crucial. M&EP offers a robust framework to achieve this goal. By setting clear objectives for M&EP in these settings, stakeholders can ensure active citizen participation and maximize the effectiveness of API/DRR initiatives.

Deepening Contextual Understanding. Gathering local knowledge, particularly those with invaluable knowledge of their environment, past flood events, and existing vulnerabilities. M&EP aims to collect this local wisdom through workshops, focus groups, and interviews. This information is crucial for tailoring DRR strategies to the specific needs and contexts of each setting.

Identifying Unique Challenges. The four target urban villages may face varying vulnerabilities. M&EP facilitates the identification of these variations, ensuring that DRR programs address the most pressing issues in each location.

Fostering Ownership and Community Empowerment. Shared decision-making by actively involving residents in the monitoring and evaluation process, M&EP fosters a sense of ownership over DRR initiatives. This empowers communities to take an active role in shaping their future and making informed decisions about preparedness and mitigation measures.

Enhanced Community Accountability through participation in M&EP, residents become more invested in the success of DRR programs. This leads to increased accountability for preparedness activities and a willingness to contribute their efforts.

Improving Program Effectiveness and Efficiency. M&EP provides an opportunity for continuous monitoring of CLEAR's early warning programs. Residents can provide valuable feedback on the

effectiveness of these initiatives, identifying weaknesses and areas for improvement. This feedback loop ensures that programs continue to evolve and adapt to meet changing community needs.

Targeted Resource Allocation. Through M&EP, stakeholders can gain a clearer understanding of which DRR activities yield the most significant outcomes. This allows for more strategic resource allocation, ensuring that funds are directed towards the most impactful interventions.

3.2.1. Building Long-term Resilience

- Sustainability Beyond the Project: The sense of ownership fostered through M&EP can enhance long-term commitment to API/DRR early warning programs. Residents become invested in maintaining preparedness measures and advocating for continued risk reduction efforts, even after the CLEAR project's timeline ends.
- Empowering Citizens: M&EP provides opportunities for communities to develop their skills and knowledge in disaster preparedness. This enhanced capacity empowers residents to take on more prominent roles in future API/DRR initiatives, ensuring long-term sustainability.

By setting clear objectives like these, M&EP in the four target urban villages can go beyond mere data collection. It can become a transformative tool for empowering citizens, fostering ownership, and ultimately building a more resilient future for communities in the face of disaster risks, particularly floods.

3.3. Assessing the Participatory M&E System

The effectiveness of the CLEAR program in the four target urban villages will also heavily depend on a robust Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system. However, traditional top-down monitoring and evaluation approaches can miss critical insights from those most affected by disasters: the communities themselves. In the four target urban villages of the CLEAR program, a participatory approach to M&E, utilizing data collection, the use of appropriate tools, and community meetings with feedback sessions, is a powerful tool for assessing existing systems and processes.

3.3.1. The Strength of Data Collection

By employing a mixed-methods approach to data collection, stakeholders can gain a comprehensive understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing M&E system in the four target urban villages.

Focus Group Discussions: As the CLEAR program has done in the past, bringing together residents in facilitated discussions allows them to share their experiences with past floods, their perceptions of existing DRR programs, and their suggestions for improvement. These discussions can uncover blind spots in the M&E system and highlight aspects that traditional data collection methods may miss.

Household Surveys: Structured surveys, such as the CLEAR program's Baseline survey, distributed to a representative sample of households can provide valuable quantitative data. These surveys can assess awareness levels of whether residents understand flood-related risks and existing preparedness measures, as well as preparedness actions based on residents' steps to prepare for floods, such as constructing homes or storing emergency supplies. Satisfaction with M&E is also important, where residents feel their voices are heard and have channels to report and/or provide input as an integral part of M&E for program quality improvement.

Participatory Mapping: The CLEAR program's participatory mapping process, which has involved residents in creating maps of flood-prone areas, evacuation routes, and critical infrastructure, can generate crucial spatial data that traditional methods may miss. This collaborative process highlights local knowledge and allows residents to pinpoint areas where existing monitoring and evaluation processes may fall short.

3.3.2. Strengthening Community Voice through Community Meetings and Feedback Sessions

Data collection is just one part of the M&E process. Community meetings and feedback sessions are crucial for amplifying community voices and gaining a deeper understanding of the M&E system's effectiveness.

Following data collection, it is essential to conduct accurate data analysis and interpretation. Collaborative analysis sessions involving stakeholders and residents should be held. This ensures that local knowledge is incorporated into the data interpretation process, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of the M&E system's strengths and weaknesses.

Community feedback sessions are crucial where residents can provide feedback on preliminary findings. They can highlight issues they feel have not been heard, identify limitations in the monitoring and evaluation process, and propose improvements to ensure their needs are adequately addressed.

Finally, Action Planning Workshops should be organized where stakeholders and residents work together to develop an action plan for improvement. This plan should address identified weaknesses, outline specific strategies, timelines, and responsibilities for implementing the necessary changes. This collaborative approach fosters ownership and increases the likelihood of successful implementation.

3.3.3. Assessing Specific Aspects of the M&E System

Through these data collection and feedback sessions, CLEAR program stakeholders can assess various aspects of the monitoring and evaluation system in the four target urban villages. This includes several aspects of the questions that arise for later discussion between INATA and the target community.

- Does the M&E system track relevant data or align with actual vulnerabilities and community priorities?
- Does the monitoring and evaluation system encompass comprehensive data from various early warning and API/DRR aspects, such as preparedness, response, and recovery?
- Are the data collection methods accessible to all residents, regardless of literacy level or social status?
- Is data collected and analyzed in a timely manner to inform decision-making and program adjustments?
- Are M&E findings communicated transparently to the community in an easily understandable manner?

By adopting a participatory approach to monitoring and evaluation, the four target urban villages can do more than just collect data. This approach empowers residents to become active participants in evaluating the effectiveness of the CLEAR program and the M&E system. The insights gained from data collection and community feedback sessions can ultimately lead to a stronger and more

responsive monitoring and evaluation system that truly serves the needs of the community and builds a more resilient future for all residents.

4.   Analysis of Findings

A participatory approach to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&EP) in the four target urban villages of Biringkanaya and Manggala sub-districts, Makassar City, highlights community perceptions, identifies program successes, and reveals challenges in API/DRR early warning strategy efforts. By analyzing data from document reviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), interviews, household surveys, community meetings, and feedback sessions, stakeholders can gain a deeper understanding of the M&E system's effectiveness and community priorities.

4.1. Spectrum of Experiences Related to Community Perceptions and Inputs

This analysis reveals variations in community awareness levels, particularly in target community areas. Some residents have a strong understanding of flood risks and preparedness measures, while others may require more intensive and targeted outreach and education programs.

Household surveys can show the extent to which residents have taken preparedness steps or actions to prepare for floods. This data can reveal gaps in preparedness and highlight areas where DRR programs have not effectively reached certain segments of the community.

During feedback sessions, residents expressed a desire to have their voices heard in the M&E system. This concerns their trust in the M&E process and their hope for information and complaint channels with prompt and appropriate responses. A lack of trust can hinder participation and reduce the overall effectiveness of the process.

4.1.1. Keberhasilan dan Tantangan: Tinjauan terhadap Sistem M&E

On the positive side, this analysis can identify aspects of the M&E system that are functioning well. Examples include effective data collection methods that capture relevant information or transparent communication processes that keep the community informed about monitoring and evaluation findings.

In terms of data gaps, participatory mapping can reveal areas where the monitoring and evaluation system lacks critical spatial data. Residents can identify flood-prone zones or evacuation routes that were previously not covered by existing data collection methods.

On issues of accessibility, this analysis may reveal limitations in the accessibility of data collection methods. Language barriers or the use of complex surveys can exclude some residents from participating, leading to biased data.

4.2. Examples of Specific Findings

During FGDs in target communities, some residents, particularly marginalized groups, expressed that people in their urban villages, especially those with low incomes, felt excluded from the program planning process. This highlights the need for more inclusive M&E strategies.

Household surveys (baseline) showed that most residents do not have flood insurance. This indicates a need for financial literacy programs or exploring microinsurance options.

Participatory mapping also showed discrepancies between the official evacuation locations expected by affected communities and the locations actually used by residents, including official government

evacuation routes and those frequently used by residents during floods. This requires a revision of evacuation route and shelter plans based on local knowledge and expectations.

4.3. Addressing Challenges: A Way Forward

Analyzing community perceptions and inputs, as well as identifying successes and challenges in the M&E system, will pave the way for M&E system development in the community.

Based on the identified awareness gaps, targeted outreach efforts can be developed to educate residents about flood risks, preparedness measures, and the monitoring and evaluation process.

Inclusive data collection through using local customs and languages, simplifying surveys, and utilizing diverse data collection methods (such as interviews or focus groups) can ensure broader participation and more representative data.

Implementing transparency and feedback through a Complaint Feedback Mechanism (CFM) or regular communication of M&E findings to the community in an easily accessible format will build trust and empower residents to provide ongoing feedback, ensuring the system remains responsive to their needs.

By analyzing data and integrating input from residents in the four target urban villages, M&EP efforts can move beyond a generic M&E approach. This participatory approach fosters ownership and empowers residents to become active partners in building a more resilient future. The insights gained from this analysis will provide input for the development of a stronger, more inclusive, and responsive M&E system, which will ultimately lead to more effective implementation of the CLEAR program and truly address vulnerabilities, particularly in the urban villages in Pecerakkang, Katimbang, Tamangngapa, and Manggala.

5. Integration of Findings

5.1. Correlation of Vulnerability Studies and M&E Results

The CLEAR program in the four urban villages will heavily rely on a strong understanding of community vulnerabilities and the effectiveness of programs designed to address these challenges. Vulnerability assessments and a well-functioning M&E system provide a crucial set of data. By analyzing the correlation between these two sets of information, stakeholders, including INANTA, can gain valuable insights to improve early warning strategies, API/DRR, and build resilience.

5.1.1. M&E Results: Measuring Program Effectiveness

The effective monitoring and evaluation system in the four target urban villages is geared towards collecting data on various aspects of the DRR program, such as:

- The extent to which residents have participated in preparedness workshops, evacuation drills, or pre-positioning/emergency supplies.
- Community awareness through changes in knowledge levels and attitudes towards flood risks and preparedness measures.
- Utilization of other programs such as microfinance program initiatives for flood prevention or social support networks during emergencies.
- The strength of the correlation by identifying gaps and informing action.

By analyzing the correlation between vulnerability assessment findings and monitoring and evaluation results, stakeholders can identify key areas for improvement:

- Economic Vulnerability and Preparedness: If monitoring and evaluation results show low participation in preparedness activities despite high economic vulnerability, it indicates the need for financial assistance programs or exploring alternative preparedness measures that require fewer resources.
- Social Vulnerability and Awareness Programs: The absence of a direct correlation between the presence of marginalized groups and the effectiveness of awareness campaigns calls for targeted outreach strategies in accessible formats and languages.
- Environmental Vulnerability and Program Utilization: If M&E results show low participation in programs aimed at mitigating environmental risks, it may indicate the need for increased communication about the long-term benefits of these initiatives.

5.1.2. Continuous Improvement Cycle

Analyzing the correlation between vulnerability assessments and monitoring and evaluation results drives a continuous improvement cycle:

- More Refined Vulnerability Assessments: Insights from M&E data, such as identifying previously overlooked vulnerabilities, can inform future vulnerability assessments, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of community risks.
- Targeted Early Warning Strategies or CLEAR Program Activities: Linking vulnerabilities to program effectiveness allows stakeholders to tailor DRR initiatives to address the most pressing needs of specific vulnerable groups.
- Resource Allocation: A clear understanding of vulnerability locations and program gaps enables more strategic resource allocation, ensuring resources are directed towards interventions with the most significant impact.

In conclusion, by analyzing the correlation between vulnerability assessments and M&E results, the four target urban villages can do more than just collect data. This approach transforms data into actionable insights and informs effective CLEAR program strategies. It drives a more targeted and responsive approach to building resilience, ultimately leading to a safer future for all residents.

6. Action Plan and Recommendations

6.1. Empowering Vulnerable Communities with Monitoring & Evaluation

This action plan prioritizes interventions that directly address the needs of vulnerable communities within a three-year timeframe or during the CLEAR program duration. It also outlines a robust Monitoring and Evaluation strategy to ensure effectiveness and community ownership.

Short-term Interventions (0-1 year)

Objective: Address vulnerabilities promptly and equip vulnerable communities with essential preparedness measures.

Action 1: Targeted Outreach and Capacity uilding (Months 1 – 6)

- Conduct targeted outreach campaigns in vulnerable areas, ensuring accessibility for people with disabilities or other marginalized groups.
- Organize first aid and CPR training sessions specifically tailored to the local context and understandable to the vulnerable population.
- Conduct evacuation drill simulations with clear scenarios, instructions, and designated assembly points for those with limited mobility.
- Engage INANTA, urban village and city governments, Community Self-Reliance Groups (KSB), and community leaders in these activities.

Action 2: Resource Mobilization and Equitable Distribution (Months 2 – 9)

- Establish and maintain emergency supplies at strategic locations within vulnerable neighborhoods, ensuring easy access.
- Develop targeted cash-for-work (CVA) programs that consider the specific needs of vulnerable groups (e.g., single mothers, people with disabilities, elderly residents). These assistance programs should include providing access to capital for small businesses such as grocery stores, food stalls, online motorcycle taxis, and family farms like hydroponics. Supporting these efforts through a series of relevant training workshops for their small businesses and financial management would be very helpful.
- Partner with community organizations to ensure equitable distribution of emergency supplies and financial assistance.
- INANTA, KSB, and urban village and city governments will be the organizers and implementers of these activities.

Action 3: Infrastructure Improvement with Community Participation (Months 3-12)

- Prioritize the cleaning and maintenance of drainage systems in the four target urban villages, particularly areas prone to waterlogging, involving community volunteers for ownership and skill development.
- Distribute sandbags to flood-prone areas, focusing on vulnerable residents' homes.
- Explore low-cost, community-based flood mitigation solutions, such as raising walkways or constructing small-scale flood barriers using locally available materials.
- INANTA, urban village and city governments, KSB, and community leaders will coordinate these activities.

Action 4: Strengthening Social Networks and Community Support (Months 1-12, Ongoing)

- Identify and map existing social networks within vulnerable communities, focusing on those most in need of support (e.g., people with disabilities or elderly residents living alone).
- Facilitate the formation of new support networks through targeted outreach and social events.
- Train community members, particularly social workers and leaders, to provide psychosocial support to vulnerable residents during and after floods.
- INANTA, community leaders, social workers, and KSB will coordinate these activities.

6.2. M&E Strategy (Ongoing)

Objective: Track progress and advancement, ensure efficiency and effectiveness, and inform adjustments to the action plan based on community feedback.

- Develop clear and measurable community-specific indicators to track the progress of interventions, considering each community's unique vulnerabilities.
- Utilize a variety of data collection methods, including household surveys, focus group discussions, and participatory mapping, to ensure inclusivity and capture diverse perspectives.
- Prepare and share monitoring and evaluation reports with stakeholders (community members, government agencies, NGOs) in easily accessible formats and languages.
- Establish clear channels for community members to provide feedback (CFM) on interventions and suggest improvements to the action plan.

6.3. Developing a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (MEF)

Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (MEF)

Option 1

This Monitoring and Evaluation Framework outlines how to monitor and evaluate a project aimed at strengthening the resilience of urban communities in Makassar to climate change. It focuses on three multi-year outcomes:

CLEAR Project Goal: Strengthen the resilience of urban communities in Makassar to better mitigate the impacts of climate change.

Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators

Outcome 1: Increased Community Knowledge and Preparedness

- Conduct a baseline survey to assess community members' knowledge, understanding, motivation, and ability to assess climate and disaster vulnerabilities before the project starts.
- Set specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) targets in each area by the end of the project period.
- Monitoring Indicators
  - Number of workshops and/or trainings conducted on climate change and disaster preparedness.
  - Number of community members who participate in workshops and awareness campaigns.
  - Pre- and post-test results measuring knowledge gains on climate change and disaster risks.
  - Number of risk assessments developed by communities.
  - Number of households with an emergency preparedness plan.

- Evaluation Methods
  - Analyze pre- and post-test results to assess knowledge gains.
  - Conduct focus group discussions to understand community perceptions of their preparedness.
  - Review risk assessments developed by communities.

Outcome 2: Mitigating Disaster Impacts

- Collect data on the frequency and severity of historical disasters in Makassar.
- Set SMART targets to reduce disaster impacts through early warning systems and proactive measures.
- Monitoring Indicators
  - Functionality and effectiveness of the early warning system (e.g., reach, timeliness, accuracy of warnings).
  - Number of community-led preparedness drills conducted.
  - Number of disaster events and their severity compared to baseline data.
  - Documentation of successful community response actions to disasters.
- Evaluation Methods
  - Analyze disaster data to see if the frequency or severity has decreased.
  - Conduct interviews with community members to understand their use of the early warning system and their preparedness actions.
  - Review documentation of successful community responses.

Outcome 3: Enhanced Livelihood Options

- Analyze baseline survey results to assess the diversity of livelihoods of target communities and their vulnerability to climate change and disasters.
- Set SMART targets to increase the number of livelihood options available (SMEs, online motorcycle taxis, housekeeping services, home gardening) and reduce community dependence on vulnerable sectors.
- Monitoring Indicators
  - Number of training programs offered on alternative livelihoods.
  - Number of community members participating in livelihood diversification programs.
  - Number of new or improved livelihoods created.
  - Income diversification of community members (compared to baseline data).
- Metode Evaluasi
  - Track the number of new livelihoods created and their sustainability.
  - Conduct surveys to assess changes in income diversification and vulnerability.
  - Conduct focus group discussions to understand community experiences with alternative livelihoods.

Data Collection Methods

- Surveys (baseline, mid-term, and end-line)
- Focus group discussions
- Key informant interviews
- Observations of training workshops and community activities
- Document and project report reviews

Reporting

- Regular monitoring reports summarizing key findings and recent progress.
- Mid-term and final evaluation reports with analysis of collected data and recommendations for improvement.
- Stakeholder Engagement:

Stakeholder Engagement

- Community members should be involved in project development, implementation, and monitoring to ensure ownership and effectiveness.
- Regular communication with stakeholders to ensure transparency and address any concerns.
- This framework is a starting point and can be adapted based on the specific details and context of the project.

Table 1 M&E Framework Matrix

Outcome	Baseline	Targets	Monitoring Indicators	Evaluation Methods
Outcome 1: Increased Community Knowledge and Preparedness	- Baseline survey on knowledge, understanding, motivation, and capacities regarding climate and disaster vulnerability	- Increase in knowledge scores on climate change, disaster risk, and anticipatory actions (X%) by the end of the project - #% of households with an emergency preparedness plan within 2 years - #% of communities conducting regular preparedness drills after project completion	- Number of training workshops on climate change, disaster preparedness, and anticipatory actions - Number of workshop/campaign participants - Pre- and post-test results on knowledge gain - Number of risk assessments developed by communities considering various climate scenarios - Number of households with an emergency preparedness plan - - Number and type of preparedness drills conducted (including anticipatory actions)	- Analyze pre- and post-test results on knowledge of anticipatory actions - Focus group discussions on preparedness, training effectiveness, and understanding of anticipatory actions - Review risk assessments developed by communities to assess completeness and potential anticipatory actions - Observe preparedness drills for participation, effectiveness, and incorporation of anticipatory actions

Outcome 2: Mitigating Disaster Impacts	- Collect data on the frequency and severity of historical disasters in Makassar	- Reduce disaster-related deaths and injuries by X% by the end of the project - Increase early warning lead time by Y% within 2 years - #% of community members reporting that they use the early warning system and take effective preventive actions	- Functionality and effectiveness of the early warning system - Number of community-led preparedness drills conducted - Number and severity of disaster events compared to the baseline - Number of disaster-related deaths and injuries - Survey/FGD on the use of the early warning system, preventive actions, and awareness of anticipatory actions	- Analyze disaster data (frequency and severity) - Interviews on the use of the early warning system, preparedness actions, and response to anticipatory actions - Review of successful community responses to disasters, highlighting the use of anticipatory actions
Outcome 3: Enhanced Livelihood Options	- Baseline survey on livelihood diversity, vulnerability to climate change and disasters	- Increase in the number and diversity of livelihood options - Reduce community dependence on vulnerable sectors	- Increase in the number and diversity of livelihood options - Number of training programs offered on alternative livelihoods - Number of participants in livelihood programs - Number of new or improved livelihoods created - Income diversification of community members (compared to baseline) - Reduce community dependence on vulnerable sectors	- Track the creation and sustainability of new livelihoods - Survey on income diversification and vulnerability - Focus group discussions on alternative livelihood experiences
Outcome 4: Enhanced Sustainable Anticipatory Action Strategies	- Baseline/Assessment of existing early warning systems and community capacity for anticipatory action	- Increased accuracy and timeliness of forecasts informing anticipatory actions (X%) by	- Accuracy and timeliness of forecasts - Number of communities receiving and	- Analyze forecast data and compare it with actual weather events

		the end of the project - Increased community awareness and understanding of anticipatory actions (Y%) within 2 years - #% of communities implementing effective anticipatory actions before disasters occur	understanding forecasts - Number and types of anticipatory actions implemented by communities (e.g., resource stockpiling, livelihood diversification) - Cost-effectiveness of implemented anticipatory actions	- Conduct focus group discussions to assess community understanding and use of forecasts for anticipatory action - Review and evaluate the effectiveness of implemented anticipatory actions, including a cost-benefit analysis - Conduct case studies of successful anticipatory actions for wider dissemination

Option 2

Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: Enhancing Resilience in Four Target Urban Villages in Makassar

Project Objective: Strengthen the resilience of urban communities to better mitigate the impacts of climate change.

Multi-year Outcomes

- **Outcome 1**: Increased knowledge, understanding, motivation, and capacity of community members to assess climate and disaster vulnerability and take action on their behalf.
- **Outcome 2:** Disaster impacts can be proactively mitigated through the successful implementation of anticipatory action measures and strengthening early warning systems.
- **Outcome 3:** Increased community access to alternative livelihoods to reduce disaster impacts and other displacement drivers, incorporating anticipatory action approaches.

Overall Approach: This framework employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection methods, and incorporating forecast data for anticipatory action. Stakeholder engagement is crucial throughout the entire process.

Data Collection Methods

- **Quantitative Methods**
    - Baseline, Mid-Term, and Final Surveys: Standardized surveys conducted with a representative sample of community members (stratified by gender) to assess knowledge,

attitudes, behaviors, and socio-economic conditions regarding climate change, disaster preparedness, and livelihoods.

- Project Management Information System (PMIS) Data: Data collected through the project management system on activities, outputs, resource allocation, and cost-effectiveness of implemented anticipatory action and livelihood programs.
- Forecast Data (Weather & Climate): Utilizing data from relevant agencies to inform anticipatory action, assess timeliness and accuracy.

- **Qualitative Methods**
  - Focus Group Discussions (FGDs): Conducted with community members, separated by gender, to gain deeper insights into experiences, perceptions, and needs regarding preparedness, anticipatory action, livelihood options, and gender considerations.
  - Key Informant Interviews (KIIs): Conducted with project staff, government officials, local experts, weather forecasters, and community leaders to understand contextual factors, perspectives, capacity development needs, and gender mainstreaming strategies.
  - Case Studies: In-depth exploration of successful community-led initiatives or individual experiences regarding livelihood diversification, preparedness actions, effective anticipatory responses, and the role of gender.
  - Observations: Direct observation of training workshops, community meetings, disaster preparedness drills, implementation of anticipatory actions, and livelihood program activities.

Reporting

- Quarterly Monitoring Reports: Summarize key findings from PMIS data, highlight ongoing activities, identify emerging challenges, assess the effectiveness of anticipatory actions and livelihood programs, and track gender considerations.
- Mid-Term Review (MTR) Report: Analyze data collected at the midpoint of the project, assess progress towards outcomes, recommend course corrections, evaluate the integration of anticipatory action and economic/livelihood programs, identify areas for improvement in gender mainstreaming and environmental sustainability.
- Final Evaluation Report: Provide a comprehensive assessment of project achievements, its impact on target communities, offer recommendations for sustainability, highlight learnings on anticipatory action strategies and livelihood development, and showcase success stories for dissemination.

Stakeholder Engagement

- Establish a steering committee: Comprising representatives from government agencies (including gender and environmental focal points), NGOs, community leaders (including women's groups), weather forecasters, and project implementing partners to provide oversight, guidance, ensure effective implementation, and promote a gender-responsive approach.
- Conduct regular meetings and workshops: With community members, separated by gender, to ensure ownership, participation in the monitoring and evaluation process, and gather feedback on anticipatory actions, livelihood options/economic activities, and gender considerations.
- Utilize culturally appropriate communication strategies: Considering gender needs, to disseminate findings, recommendations, early warnings, information about available resources, and livelihood opportunities.

Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Outcome 1: Enhanced Community Knowledge and Preparedness

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Data Collection Methods	Frequency
Knowledge score on climate change, disaster risk, and anticipatory actions (disaggregated by gender)	Baseline Survey	Increased by X% by the end of the project	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line Surveys	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line
% of households with an emergency preparedness plan (disaggregated by gender)	Baseline Survey	#% within 2 years	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line Surveys	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line
% of communities conducting regular preparedness drills (disaggregated by gender participation)	Baseline Survey	#% by project completion	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line Surveys, Observation	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line
Number and types of training workshops conducted on climate change, disaster preparedness, and anticipatory actions (disaggregated by gender participation)	Project records	Data on topics covered, number of participants	PMIS data, Observation	Ongoing
Number of community-developed risk assessments considering various climate scenarios and incorporating anticipatory actions	Project records	Existence and completeness of assessments	PMIS data, Review of Risk Assessments	Ongoing

Outcome 2: Disaster Impact Mitigation through Anticipatory Actions and Early Warning Systems

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Data Collection Methods	Frequency
Functionality and effectiveness of early warning systems (reach, timeliness, accuracy of warnings)	Existing data, User Surveys	Documented improvements	System Checks, User Surveys (disaggregated by gender)	Ongoing
Timeliness and accuracy of forecasts received by the project	Project records	Increased timeliness and accuracy	PMIS data, Forecast Data Analysis	Ongoing
Number and types of anticipatory actions implemented by communities (e.g., resource stockpiling, livelihood diversification)	Project records	Increased number and effectiveness	PMIS data, Observation	Ongoing
% of communities implementing effective	Project records	#% by project completio	PMIS data, Observation	Ongoing

anticipatory actions before disasters				

Outcome 3: Peningkatan Pilihan Mata Pencaharian Masyarakat dengan Tindakan Antisipatif

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Data Collection Methods	Frequency
Number of training programs offered on alternative livelihoods, incorporating climate change considerations and anticipatory actions	Project records	Data on topics covered, number of participants	PMIS data	Ongoing
Number of participants in livelihood programs (disaggregated by gender)	Project records	Increased participation	PMIS data	Ongoing
Number of new or improved livelihoods established as a result of the project	Project records	Documented evidence of establishment and sustainability	PMIS data, Field Visits	Ongoing
Income diversification of community members compared to baseline income (disaggregated by gender)	Baseline Survey	Increased income diversity	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line Surveys	Baseline, Mid-term, End-line

Additional Considerations

- Ensure data collection and analysis consider gender inequalities and how the project addresses the specific needs of women and girls. Disaggregate data by gender whenever possible.
- Regarding environmental sustainability, monitor the environmental impacts of implemented anticipatory actions, livelihood options, and project activities.
- Regarding capacity building, ensure to track the project's capacity-building efforts, including training provided to government officials, community leaders, and BMKG.

6.4. Resource Mobilization

- Advocate for increased budget allocation from local and national governments for disaster preparedness programs targeted at vulnerable communities.
- Partner with NGOs and international organizations specializing in social justice and community development to secure grants for vulnerable groups.
- Explore public-private partnerships with local businesses to support specific interventions, such as skills development training or infrastructure improvements in vulnerable neighborhoods.
- Coordinating parties: INANTA, KSB, MEAL team (including community representatives).

This action plan prioritizes the needs of the most vulnerable communities in the four target urban villages of Biringkanaya and Manggala sub-districts. Focusing on targeted interventions, capacity building, and strong monitoring and evaluation strategies with community participation will foster a

sense of ownership and ensure program effectiveness over a three-year timeframe. Remember, this is a flexible framework, and adjustments may be necessary based on ongoing monitoring and community feedback. By working together, stakeholders can build a more resilient future for all citizens, especially those most at risk.

7. Conclusion

7.1. Building Resilience Together

The monitoring and evaluation strategy outlined in this action plan serves as a foundation to build resilience in Paccerakkang, Katimbang, Tamangngapa, and Manggala, particularly for the most vulnerable communities. The key points and strategies in supporting these populations are as follows:

- Establishing clear and measurable community indicators that consider each community's unique vulnerabilities. The M&E strategy ensures interventions can address specific community needs. This ensures resources are allocated effectively and interventions have a real impact on improving the lives of vulnerable populations.
- Utilizing diverse, inclusive data collection methods such as household surveys, focus group discussions, and participatory mapping activities ensures the voices of all community members, especially the most vulnerable, are heard. This promotes inclusivity and ensures the action plan reflects the real-life realities faced by these community groups.
- Regular Reporting and Transparency by preparing and sharing monitoring and evaluation reports in formats and languages accessible to stakeholders, including vulnerable community members, will promote transparency and accountability. This allows vulnerable groups to understand how the program is addressing their needs and provides them with opportunities to voice concerns or suggest improvements.
- Community Feedback Mechanisms Establishing clear channels for community members, particularly vulnerable residents, to provide feedback (such as a CFM system) is crucial. This empowers them to actively participate in shaping the direction of the program and ensures interventions continue to meet their evolving needs.

7.2. Supporting Vulnerable Groups

By focusing on these key points, the M&E strategy directly supports vulnerable groups in the four target urban villages. Targeted outreach during data collection ensures their voices are included. Disseminating reports in easily accessible formats will empower them to understand the program's impact. Community feedback mechanisms provide them with a platform to advocate for their specific needs. Ultimately, this comprehensive monitoring and evaluation strategy fosters a sense of ownership and ensures the program is responsive to the vulnerabilities faced by communities.

7.3. Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy for Future Community Development

In addition to the three-year action plan of the CLEAR program, this M&E strategy also lays the groundwork for long-term community development in the program locations. The data collected can inform future initiatives focused on:

- Livelihood diversification programs by understanding the specific economic vulnerabilities faced by different groups can guide the development of targeted programs that support sustainable livelihoods beyond flood-prone sectors.
- Monitoring and evaluation data can be used to advocate for social protection programs that provide a safety net for vulnerable residents during and after floods.
- Data on specific challenges faced by vulnerable groups (e.g., elderly residents with mobility limitations) can inform the design of inclusive infrastructure projects such as easily accessible evacuation routes or flood shelters.

By consistently prioritizing the needs of vulnerable communities and utilizing the monitoring and evaluation strategy as a tool for continuous improvement, Biringkanaya and Manggala can build a more resilient and inclusive future for all residents.

8. Attachment

Glossary of Terms

References and Bibliography

Acknowledgements

Project Team