AI/ML for Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning (MEL)

Okay, here’s a breakdown comparing the two reports:

**I. Similarities:**

* **General Structure & Format:** Both reports adhere to the same template, with sections on:
  + Report metadata (Date submitted, approved, etc.)
  + Engagement with Policy & Decision Makers
  + Performance Against Work Plans
  + Additional Achievements/Updates
  + Challenges & Lessons Learned
  + Plans & Targets for Next Quarter
  + Business Development
  + Publications
  + Alliances
* **Theme & Focus:** Both reports are for the same theme: “HAW - Health and Wellbeing.”
* **Organization:** Both reports are from the same organization “aphrc.”
* **Geographic Focus:** Both reports showcase activities primarily in Kenya and other African countries, with some international engagements.
* **Types of Activities:** Both reports describe a range of activities, including:
  + Consultative meetings with policymakers
  + Conferences and workshops
  + Dissemination workshops
  + Technical group participation
  + Training and mentorship
  + Research and Data Analysis
  + Manuscript writing/Publications
* **Emphasis on Collaboration:** Both reports frequently mention partnerships with other organizations (UN agencies, NGOs, Universities, Government Ministries, etc.).
* **Alignment with Core Values:** Both reports emphasize adhering to core values for excellence, fairness and collaboration.
* **Inclusion of project-level details**: For projects that did well, those that experienced challenges, and the proposed mitigation strategies.

**II. Differences:**

* **Time Period:** Report 1 covers Quarter 1 of 2024, while Report 2 covers Quarter 2 of 2024.
* **Specific Activities & Projects:** The specific activities and projects reported on differ, reflecting the different tasks undertaken during each quarter.
* **People Involved:** The names of the APHRC staff involved and the specific policymakers engaged with are different in each report, as is expected.
* **Level of detail**: Report 1 provided more information about the stakeholders contacted in the various engagements, which are missing from report 2.
* **Types of Consultative Meetings**: Consultative meetings for Q1 mainly focused on stakeholder engagement and consultations for SRHR, whereas Q2 consultative meetings focused on maternal, newborn, and child nutrition interventions.

**III. Gaps:**

* **Quantitative Metrics:** While the reports mention the “count” of institutions present at events, there is a general lack of specific, measurable, quantitative metrics of success. For example:
  + How many policies were *influenced* by APHRC’s engagement (not just attended)?
  + What was the *reach* of dissemination activities (number of people impacted/reached)?
  + What was the change in knowledge/awareness due to the training sessions?
* **Impact Measurement:** The reports detail activities and outputs (reports, manuscripts), but there’s a limited discussion of the *impact* of these activities on the target populations or health outcomes.
* **Systematic Reporting on DEI:** While both reports mention that publications addressed diversity, equity, and inclusion, the criteria used to determine how the publications aligned to these ideals is missing.
* **Description of Alliance engagements**: Although both the Q1 and Q2 report provide a template for “Alliances” there is no additional information.
* **Brief comments about all activities:** Although the reports mention several dissemination activities that APHRC took part in, it is only from the few technical reports or publications mentioned that I can get more context about their impact on the focus country.
* **Contact information for key personnel**: While the reports share a variety of partner organizations, contact information, which could strengthen future alliance opportunities.

**In summary:** The two reports provide a similar structured overview of the Health and Wellbeing (HAW) theme’s activities at APHRC for two consecutive quarters in 2024. They demonstrate consistent engagement and productivity. The main opportunities for improvement lie in developing more robust quantitative metrics to assess impact and track progress towards strategic goals and providing specific criteria for projects that emphasize DEI strategies.