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**2019 Annual Data Validation**

**Climate Change Programme (CCP)**

# CHAPTER 1- INTRODUCTION

* 1. Programme Overview

**Climate Change Programme** One of the very first missions of BRAC since its inception was to provide relief to the disaster-affected population. DMCC evolved in 2008 from the need to address disaster management more effectively. It has been working to reduce the effects of climate change and minimise the vulnerability of exposed populations since then. In the last half of 2018, DMCC programme divided into two as Climate Change Programme (CCP) which includes addressing climate change related activities and Humanitarian Programme which includes natural or manmade disaster management related activities or emergency situations. BRAC CCP programme works alongside the government, non-governmental organisations and communities across Bangladesh for building resilience, fostering adaptability, and responding comprehensively to the effects of climate change and natural disasters.

**BRAC Monitoring Department (BMD)** works to support the institutional efficiency of the organisation in planning, implementing, tracking various programs and functions, and facilitating organizational learning at various levels. BMD’s major objective is to provide dynamic decision support to BRAC in improving **operational efficiency. In view of that Monitoring department assess the quality and effectiveness of the program interventions as well as the corresponding reporting.**

* 1. Study Background

In 2017 and 2018, BRAC Monitoring Department (BMD) conducted data validation for SPA RF indicators and AOP results (2018 only) which were reported from various program MISs. For 2019 also, as per management decision, data validation has been conducted **for 2019 AOP results**, for all development programs of BRAC - **regardless of SPA-funded or not**.

As a part of this, BMD conducted an assessment for AOP results reported by CCP for the year 2019.

# 1.3 Study Objective

The objectives of the 2019 Annual Data Validation by Monitoring Department were to:

* Validate annual results reported for 2019 through the program AOPs and SPA RF
* Recommend ways of improvement in the data system
* Provide support for the upcoming DFID IRR (applicable programs only)

Thus the primary objective of this data validation study is to validate AOP results of CCP programme, specifically on the selected activities of the objective 3. In addition, all output and outcome level data reported under SPA RF indicators, which are not directly reported through the program AOP updates, were checked.

Secondly, CCP program MIS also assessed for its effectiveness and efficiency in producing quality data for reporting.

In the end, program got,

* Verification results from the exercise
* Evaluated MIS rank
* Recommendations and Action Plan to improve the present data collection and MIS system
  + Immediate
  + Long-term

# 1.4 Scope

Thus the study was mainly limited to validation of –

* Program selected activities under objective 3 from CCP 2019 AOP results
* CCP reported achievements in SPA RF for 2019

The scope of the exercise included -

a.1. Validate the quality of annual results data generated from various program MISs (cross-cutting gender and disability inclusion)

a.2. Evaluate and rank the various program MISs as per standard data quality criteria

b. Verify the quality of these results delivery, and the sustainability of the results delivered for the beneficiary

c. Recommend ways for improving the data collection and program MIS systems and quick remedies before the upcoming Independent Results Review (IRR) to be conducted by DFID (tentatively in March 2020)

The objectives and activities in AOP which include setting guidelines, policy; participate in conferences; produce report; mainstreaming indicator; submission of proposal are not considered for this study. Due to time constraint and limited human resources, this study only focused on the programmatic activities rather than organizational.

To be specific, following were the AOP activities and SPA indicators under the scope of the assessment:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Reference Points** |
| Annual Operating Plan (AOP) 2019 - CCP | **AOP Objective 3**: **To promote and mainstream "climate resilience" in 'climate change hotspots' through collaboration with appropriate BRAC programmes**   * **Activity 3.1.1:** Build 10 (ten) climate resilient housing and provide livelihood solutions to 200 ultra-poor vulnerable households * **Activity 3.2.1:** Distribute 65,000 saplings for social afforestation |
| SPA RF (Revised) | **Outcome Indicator 4.1**  Number of climate vulnerable HHs in selected districts strengthen their resilience through adoption of BRAC designed resilience package  **Output Indicator 3.1:** Number of people receiving support to better cope with the effects of climate change |

The activity 3.1.2 refers to installation of a desalinisation, which is not yet operational. Hence, it has not been included under the scope of this study.

Outcome Indicator 4.1 and output Indicator 3.1 are reported jointly with six other BRAC programmes as per their climate resilience framework and was be validated accordingly. (Please see annex-2 for the climate resilience framework and 2019 achievements reported in this regard)

# Key Questions

The study aimed to answer to the following key questions

1. Whether the reported MIS data is valid?
2. Whether the reported data is consistent at different level i.e. from field to HO?
3. Whether the data flow system/MIS is stable, consistent over different places, and providing timely data?
4. How the system can be improved?

# 

# CHAPTER 2- METHODOLOGY

## 

## 2.1 Research Approach

The annual data validation study used number of methods like discussion with HO staffs, review the relevant documents, MIS data, review MIS tools, procedures, data flow and field level sampled programme beneficiaries interview. Concurrently, this study employed mixed method where both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods used for field level verification**.** As six programme jointly work with CCP, this annual data validation study was conducted along with respective sectors.

### Understanding the Program & the MIS

Monitoring Department and CC programme personnel had several interactions, including formal meetings. This ensured that BMD and CCP have clear and common understanding regarding -

* CCP MIS dataflow and corresponding tools & procedures
* The process of MIS data validation
* Scope and reference period of the study
* Defining population/coverage for the indicator and the AOP activities
* Operational definitions for the indicators and activities

**CCP MIS**

CCP did not have any regular or structured MIS for reporting its field activities in 2019. Data were collected as and when required, during specific intervention, by the implementing staff or the partner program staff. Then they submitted the data to CCP through various channels as instructed by HO. CCP HO officials compile the data in spreadsheets and submit for periodic reporting (for AOP, Donor report, project completion report, etc.). However, when a project consisted large number of interventions or an intervention involved large number of participant/beneficiary, detail data (activity reports or beneficiary rosters) are not sent to HO/CCP, rather maintained by the implementing partner programs at the field offices.

**Operational definitions & standards**

Below are the operational definitions, major parameters & terminologies identified from document reviews, discussions with the program management and during the 2018 SPA RF validation.

| **Activity, Indicator, Terminology** | **Operational definitions, descriptions, reference documents etc.** |
| --- | --- |
| ***CCP AOP 2019 Activities*** | |
| **Activity 3.1.1:** Build 10 (ten) climate resilient housing and provide livelihood solutions to 200 ultra-poor vulnerable households | A resilient house is especially designed for vulnerable populations in order to respond to existing and emerging climatic hazards and natural disasters. These houses should be capable of withstanding climatic shocks without permanent deformation. The resilient houses are a product of human centered design for vulnerable communities affected by climate change induced extreme events, combining indigenous and modern architectural knowledge. Resilient housing models with livelihood solutions will be piloted in the most climate vulnerable areas which can be considered for possible replication and scale-up. |
| **Activity 3.2.1:** Distribute 195,000 saplings for social afforestation | BRAC Climate Change Programme will promote an ecosystem-based approach to adaptation through social afforestation initiatives. Social afforestation will support adaptation in six ways:   1. forests and trees providing goods to local communities facing climatic threats; 2. trees in agricultural fields regulating water, soil, and microclimate for more resilient production; 3. forested watersheds regulating water and protecting soils for reduced climate impacts; 4. forests protecting coastal areas from climate-related threats; 5. urban forests and trees regulating temperature and water for resilient cities and 6. the trees will serve as a carbon sink contributing to climate change mitigation at the same time, in small scale though. |
| ***SPA RF (Revised)*** | |
| **Outcome Indicator 4.1**  Number of climate vulnerable HHs in selected districts strengthen their resilience through adoption of BRAC designed resilience package | **Adaptation:** The adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities.  **Climate Change:**  (a) The Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) defies climate change as: “a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g. by using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and/or the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer. Climate change may be due to natural internal processes or external forces or to persistent anthropogenic changes in the composition of the atmosphere or in land use”.  (b) The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) defies climate change as “a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods”.  **Resilience Package:** BRAC’s resilience package includes arranged or used physical and financial assets during times of hardship, strengthening adaptive capacity, access to services, income, food and safety nets, livelihood viability, institutional capacity strengthening and governance, natural and built infrastructural context to which coping, adaptation and transformation is facilitated.  **Vulnerability:** The characteristics and circumstances of a community, system or asset that make it susceptible to the damaging effects of a hazard. |
| **Output Indicator 3.1**  Number of people receiving support to better cope with the effects of climate change | **Coping:** The ability of people, organizations and systems, using available skills and resources, to face and manage adverse conditions, emergencies or disasters.  **Climate Change:**  (a) The Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) defies climate change as: “a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g. by using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and/or the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer. Climate change may be due to natural internal processes or external forces or to persistent anthropogenic changes in the composition of the atmosphere or in land use”.  (b) The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) defies climate change as “a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods”. |

## 2.2 Sampling

This study followed sector wise separate sampling procedures for field level interview. The details of each sector sampling procedures are given bellow-

1. **Climate Change Programme (CCP)**

Sample survey was conducted in Sarankhola upazila of Bagerhat, Godagari upazila of Rajshahi and Manda upazila of Naogaon districts. From each upazila two villages were selected randomly. From the sampled area, in total 86 HHs, 8 Amar Bon beneficiaries, 9 institutions were visited. For climate resilient housing data verification, interview with five beneficiaries were conducted over phone.

1. **Integrated development programme (IDP)**

128 sampled beneficiaries were interviweed from **8** IDP programme implementation areas under four districts namely- Hobiganj, Kishoreganj, Nethrokona and Sunamganj.

1. **BRAC Education Programme (BEP)**

5 districts were selected, of which 2 were climate vulnerable (Dhaka, Rajshahi) and 3 climate non-vulnerable (Manikganj, Mymensing and Gazipur) districts. From each district, 2 BRAC Primary Schools were selected i.e. 10 schools in total.

1. **WASH programme**

Sampling was done in 5 districts which are Satkhira, Patuakhali, Barguna, Sylhet, and Sunamganj. All of these are climate vulnerable districts situated in the climatic hotspots i.e. western coastal region (Satkhira), central coastal region (Patuakhali and Barguna) and haor, and flash flood areas (Sylhet and Sunamganj). In total, 114 sample was done for field level verification of which 49 samples for water source verification and 65 for sanitary latrines.

1. **Urban Development Programme (UDP)**

Data collected from 8 (5 city corporations and 3 municipalities) UDP programme implementation areas. Quantitative interviews respondents were selected based on programme activity. For instance, Climate change and DRR training related information collected from 7 beneficiaries in the Barishal, Dhaka South city, and Coxsbazar municipality, seed distribution 51 beneficiaries, seedling 54 beneficiaries and climate resilient housing 2 beneficiaries were interviewed. In terms of investigating the infrastructural supports the study conducted 4 FGDs with beneficiaries in respective four areas namely Dhaka south, Khulna, Rajshahi City Corporation and Syedpur municipality.

1. **Ultra poor Graduation Programme (UPGP)**

A total of 344 beneficiaries were interviweed from 9 climate vulnerable districts.

Figure 1. **BRAC Climate Resilient Framework**



## 2.3 Methodology Matrix

Methodology matrix specifying the scope of the study, study questions, and data collection methods according to the respondents is given below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities/Indicators** | | **Study questions** | **Data collection method** |
| CCP AOP Activities | | | |
| **Activity 3.1.1:** Build 10 (ten) climate resilient housing and provide livelihood solutions to 200 ultra-poor vulnerable households | | * Whether the supports reported match with the number of inhabitants? * Whether the intervention recipients being benefitted? | Intervention recipient  HH visit & Staff interview |
| **Activity 3.2.1:** Distribute 195,000 saplings for social afforestation | | * Were appropriate beneficiaries selected? * Whether the supports reported match with the items received? * How many of the plants survived? | Intervention recipient  HH visit & Staff interview |
| SPA RF (Revised) | | | |
| **Output Indicator 3.1**  Number of people receiving support to better cope with the effects of climate change | **Output indicator: (IDP)**   1. Number of people received enterprise/ IGA training by 2020 2. Number of project participants trained/ participated in climate resilience livelihoods interventions by 2020 3. Number of women participants actively involved in climate resilient homestead gardening by 2020 | * What is the selection criteria? * Did the members’ get enterprise according to the members’ preference? * Were the training given according to Enterprise? * Was the training held on the reported date and venue? * Did the members attend the full course of the training? * Are the HHs actually involved with the reported climate resilience agricultural livelihoods activities? | Intervention recipient  HH visit & Staff interview |
| **Output indicator: (BEP)**   1. Number of BEP primary students completed the lessons on CC & environment and passed the corresponding test | * Is there any overlap of districts with 41 climate change vulnerable districts of CCP with the concern programme? If yes, does the concern programme report those districts separately? OR report jointly/ combined with its total working area? * What was the lessons/ training materials? * What was the assessment criteria to pass the test? |
| **Output indicator: (WASH)**   1. No. of people provided with context specific improved (safe) water sources 2. No. of people provided with context specific sanitary latrines | * How the interventions are context specific? * What are the concerned climatic hazards? |
| **Output Indicators: (UDP)**   1. Number of people received training on climate change and DRR 2. Number of people received seed and seedling for plantation in their houses 3. Number of community action plan (CAP) prepared on climate change and DRR 4. (A) Number and/or length of infrastructure supports (drainage, footpath, community latrine and Sustainable Energy Solution) built/ provisioned   (B) Number of people living in those lower income settlements (population) for which the infrastructure supports have been provided   1. (A) Number of low cost climate resilient Houses constructed   (B) Number of people (population) for which the low cost climate resilient Houses have been constructed | * How many types of training provided? * Did the participants continued till the end of training session? * How many types of plants provided? * What was the distribution process? * What is the CAP formulation process? * What are the specifications/ details of the infrastructure supports provided? * How these infrastructures are maintained? * How many types of climate resilient house provided? Specify the numbers and locations? |
| **Output indicator: (UPGP)**  243,263 people in 33 climate vulnerable districts received grant and/or interest free loan, necessary inputs, technical training, hands on coaching and have savings account with UPG programme. | * How these inputs are climate resilient? * Is there any inbuilt resilience to CC among these inputs? |
| **Output indicator: (BHP)**  (2,489,488) Number of people in 41 climate vulnerable districts get access to weather forecast and early warning messages. | * How the weather forecast and early warning messages were disseminated? * What are the broadcast details? |

## 2.4 Tools and instruments

The study used semi-structured interview schedule for quantitative interview and checklist for focus group discussion. However, document checking was also conducted which includes programme’s AOP 2019 review, SPA RF review, MIS checking, etc.

# CHAPTER 3- FINDINGS

## 3.1 Climate Change Programme (CCP) Findings

The findings of the tree sapling distribution and resilience housing are given below:

### 3.1.1 Field Level Verification:

**Tree sapling distribution**

This activity is reported under **AOP’s Activity 3.2.1:** Distribute 65,000 saplings for social afforestation.

Sapling Received by Household

Among the sapling recipients 86 recipients were randomly selected for verification. Of these 86 recipients, 18 were male and 68 female. The age range varies mostly from 18 to 60 years.

It has been found that different recipients received different numbers of tree sapling and some received nothing (Figure). A household was found which received 38 saplings. However, among the sampled recipients most of the recipients received three tree saplings.

Figure 2: Percentages of sapling recipients with number of saplings received

The quality of the distributed saplings was assessed by observation and crosschecking with the recipients. In total 440 saplings were observed. It has been found that during distribution 18% saplings were in good/healthy condition and the height was 4-5 feet; 54% saplings were in good/healthy condition but height was less than 4 feet; and 28% saplings were partly dead/fragile.

The recipients planted 99% of the saplings. The respondents could not plant some of the saplings due to lack of space in their house. It has been found that respondents sold some of the saplings in their area. During the study 234 planted saplings were observed. Of these 234 saplings, 34% were found in good condition i.e. healthy and fresh, 57% were in moderate condition i.e. healthy but low growth, and 7% were in bad condition i.e. fragile and partly dead. While observing the nursing of the sapling, it was found that among 77 sampled saplings, base of 70% saplings was clear, 19% saplings had fences, 43% got water regularly, and 65% saplings got sufficient light and air.

Both the respondents and the program staff informed that no follow up was done with any sapling recipients.

Rajapur village of Dhansagar union is one of the sample villages of Sarankhola upazial of Bagerhat district. It has been reported that during the sapling distribution in this village, the weather was not good (due to rainfall) as a result the truck carrying the saplings could not reach to the selected spot. The distribution took place in a distant place where most of the selected beneficiaries could not go as they had to pay for travel. Few people took advantage of the incident and took saplings of other people saying that they will give those to the assigned person later which they did not. Moreover, the beneficiaries reported that, they were not informed about the day of distribution in advance. However, miking was done before distribution in the area.

In Chok Kanu village of Manda upazila of Naogaon, sapling distribution situation was chaotic. Even the recipients fight among themselves to collect saplings. Moreover, as the survey was not properly done before distribution, during distribution day people who needed saplings were present and the situation went out of control. Before the distribution, the saplings were not properly handled. From the truck which was carrying the saplings, saplings were thrown and became fragile.

During field verification about the sapling distribution the followings points came up:

* Volunteers did not follow the guideline to prepare the beneficiary list. Instead of HH survey, they prepared the list in one place asking people about potential beneficiary
* Some community leaders were non-cooperative
* Some people took away trees and sold them, as they did not have place to plant trees in their house
* Most community people do not know about "Gaach bondhu” committee
* Did not collect NID number in most cases
* Some people who did not receive any trees were listed in master roll. For example, in Manda upazila few beneficiaries were found whose names were in the master role and the got the slip from the programme. But they did not get any saplings due to not having enough saplings for distribution.
* Distribution registers (master-roll) were not properly filled in-
  + Volunteers did not complete the master roll properly due to lack of information
  + In many cases, sign or finger print was missing in the master roll
  + In some cases, sign/finger prints was present but name or personal information was not filled in the beneficiary’s column

Amar Bon

In total eight samples were observed for verifying Amar Bon data. During verification, seven beneficiaries were found who received saplings. As per master roll the total number of sapling distributed to these beneficiaries is 1407while field visit it has been found that 1358 saplings were planted of which 881 were alive.

In Godagari, as per programme’s report 12 beneficiaries received tree saplings for Amar Bon project. While checking the documents, six agreements were found with signatures and in the master roll only one beneficiary was listed. Of these, two agreements were found for one person but in two name i.e. one agreement with his first and middle name and another agreement with his last (nick name) name. This case was verified with the beneficiary as well. In Sarankhola, first party signatures were not in 10 agreements.

Overall, deviations were found in land and tree amount. In some cases, programme staff did not follow up with “Amar Bon” spots after tree sapling distribution. No one among the sampled beneficiaries received orientation about tree plantation. Few committee members (5/8) were not informed about “Gaach Bondhu”.

Tree Sapling Distribution in Institute

In total, seven institutes were sampled for verifying data. As per master roll, 277 saplings were distributed in the sampled seven institutes. In has been found that, in reality the institutes have received 199 saplings i.e. 72% of the reported number. The institutes have planted 173 saplings (87% of total received saplings) and during data collection 118 saplings were found alive i.e. 68% of the planted saplings.

In Godagari upazila of Rajshahi, according to MIS 15 saplings were distributed in Uttara Governemnt Primary School. However, the Head Master reported that the institute did not receive any sapling. Master role shows that Uttara Girl’s High School received 90 saplings where in reality it received 64 saplings. As per master roll it received medicinal plant but it was found that they did not receive any. In Godagari, the master roll shows that Bidirpur Governemnt Primary School received 60 saplings of three categories. During field verification it was observed that the school received 25 saplings of mango tree. Of these 25 saplings, 14 were planted in the school campus the rest of the saplings are planted in the houses of the teachers.

During data checking, mismatch found between the master roll and the number of saplings received by the institutions. In the master roll, over writings were done in the number of saplings distribution column. Support staff of the schools received saplings but it was not documented in master roll. The institutes did not plant all the received saplings, instead those were distributed among the teachers. After the distribution no follow up was conducted by the programme staff and did not inform about Gaach Bondhu Committee.

Gach Bondhu

In Soronkhola, six “Gaach bondhu” committee have been formed as per report. But, documents of two were found in the office. Three “Gaach bondhu” committee members were verified none of them were informed about the function of the committee or their responsibilities.

**Climate resilient housing**

This activity is reported under **AOP’s Activity 3.1.1:** Build 10 (ten) climate resilient housing and provide livelihood solutions to 200 ultra-poor vulnerable households.

Programme installed 10 climate resilient housing in Patuakhali district. From beneficiary lelvel interview it has been found that, the selection process of the beneficiary was conducted following the guideline, all the houses have raised plinth, facility for livestock. Out of five samples house, four houses were reported to have boundary wall. The owner of the houses are informed about using the house as a shelter during disaster and all of them are willing to provide support to the community by providing shelter. No major issues were identified except that all the sample houses were hand over to the owner in January 2020. The HO programme staff explained that these houses were hand over in the first week of January hence, reported in the AOP of 2019.

### 

### 3.1.2 CCP MIS Data Flow

The MIS reporting is done basically in two levels - At field level Programme Organizers (PO) submit a report to Field Coordinator in (FC) in hard copy. FC then input the data from the hard copy in excel based MIS format. The filled up excel based MIS format is sent to the HO by FC.

Figure 3: MIS Flow of CCP
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### 

### 3.1.3 MIS Verification:

While checking the reported data at field level and Central MIS no deviation was found.

### 3.1.3 Discussion

It has been found that the list prepared from a survey for tree sapling distribution was not completed following the guidelines. Instead of visiting all households, the list was prepared in several spots by asking people about potential recipients. This incident was common in all the districts. Moreover, mismatch was found in all areas in different levels, i.e. number of sapling received, actual recipients, types of trees received, filling the master roll, etc.

Due to lack of proper planning and insufficient number of staff it was difficult in the field to manage the crowd during distribution. Moreover, due to not engaging local elites prior to distribution conflict raised in the field. The overall situation shows lack of proper planning was the main problem and due to these issues, the reported number was not accurate i.e. mismatch with master roll. The situation was different in climate resilient housing. No major issues were observed for this activity.

### 3.1.4 Recommendations

The following recommendations are given-

* In-depth planning and assigning staff accordingly for tree saplings distribution.
* Conduct proper and transparent survey for beneficiary selection.
* Increase the number of staff for smooth field operation.
* Arrange several distribution spots on distribution day for faster distribution.
* Engage other BRAC staff in the process of distribution e.g. microfinance.
* Engage the local leaders/elites and youth in the distribution process.
* Aware the community about the benefits of tree plantation.
* Follow up with the beneficiaries after sapling distribution.
* Follow up with the climate resilient housing recipient about boundary wall.

## 

## 3.2 Findings on CC indicator reported by other implementing programs

### 3.2.1 Integrated to climate change in the Integrated Development Programme (IDP)

The annual data validation study for IDP programme meassures ***SPA result framework output indicator 3.1*** for the IDP programme. The output indicators 3.1 are-number of people received enterprise/IGA training by 2020; number of project participants trained/participated in climate resilience livelihoods interventions by 2020; and number of women participants actively involved in climate resilient homestead gardening by 2020. The study examine 2019 programme reported MIS data for MIS level validation. For filed level verification a total 128 sampled beneficiaries were interviweed from **8** IDP programme implementation areas under four districts namely- Hobiganj, Kishoreganj, Nethrokona and Sunamganj.

#### Field level verification findings

1. **Number of people received enterprise/IGA training by 2020**

The study found that 100 percent of interviweed beneficiaries have received IGA training.

**Number of project participants trained/participated in climate resilience livelihoods interventions by 2020:**

In 2019, Program had this intervention only in Sunamganj area. The study asked respondendts wheather they received climate adaptive crop harvesing training, participation in the agricultural advisory group meeting, and climate ressilient crop variety induction meeting. All of the sampled respondents verified that they have received crop harvesting training, participated in the agricultural advisory group meeting, and climate ressilient crop variety meeting as reported.

1. **Number of women participants actively involved in climate resilient homestead gardening by 2020**

Findings illustrates in the figure (3) that 100 percent interviewed beneficiaries mentioned that they have received training for homestead gardening. In terms of seed receiving 3 percent interviewed respondents did not receive seed. 97% of seed receiver beneficiaries pointed that the program provided seed is climate adaptive and suitable for Haor area, while only 3% are disagree to provide seed is not suitable for Haor homestead gardening.

97% of seed receiver interviewed HHs agreed that the program provided seed is climate adaptive and suitable for Haor area. The homestead gardening is available in the 94% interviewed HHs, whilst 6% HHs are not practicing homestead gardening. The reason behind not to do homestead gardening are no homestead land and less interest of the HHs members about homestead gardening.

Figure 4. Households level homestead gardens status

Distribution of data shows on table-1 that out of 8 non homestead gardens households 5 are received both training and seeds, while the rest of 3 received training only. In addition 2 HHs who did not receive seed but motivated through programme training for homestead gardens in their household.

Table 1 Classification of household level homestead gardens availability

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Homestead gardens training | Seed received | Homestead gardens available | Number of participants |
| √ | **√** | **×** | **5** |
| √ | **×** | **×** | **3** |
| √ | **×** | **√** | **2** |

#### MIS level verification

The study found there is no deviation in the 2019 MIS data for output indicators 3.1 and all data mached with programmes reported data.

### 3.2.2 Integrated to climate change in the BRAC Education Programme (BEP)

From 2019, under **SPA RF Output indicator 3.1** (# of people receiving support to better cope with the effects of climate change), seven BRAC Programs (BEP, BHP, CCP, IDP, UDP, UPGP and WASH) report their achievements in delivering various services aimed to address the impacts of Climate Change. BEP, which is trying to deep root the awareness and knowledge about climate change and environment to the children through BRAC Primary Schools, reported following program output for the year 2019 –

*Students/adolescents of BRAC schools achieved awareness on climate change related issues.*

According to BEP, “achieved awareness on climate change related issues” refers that climate change related issues are introduced to the students through supplementary materials such as Workbook/ Flip chart/ Posters/Teachers guide. The contents of the materials consist of lessons on environment, weather, climate change, disaster & 3R, etc.

For data validation, 5 districts were selected, of which 2 were climate vulnerable (Dhaka, Rajshahi) and 3 climate non-vulnerable (Manikganj, Mymensingh and Gazipur) districts. From each district, 2 BRAC Primary Schools were selected i.e. 10 schools in total. Climate change and environment related 4 basic questions from their lessons were asked to the class. If any student of the class could answer any of the question the students of the schools were considered as ‘achieved awareness on climate change related issues’. Verification with parents were also conducted with 14 parents in Dhaka and Rajshahi districts.

#### Field Level Verification Findings

Out of 10 schools, students of 9 schools were able to answer minimum one question. Considering the schools located at climate vulnerable districts, students of 3 schools out of 4 were able to answer minimum one question. Students were asked about tree plantation, 3R (reduce, reuse and recycle), dos during thundering/earthquake and 3 colours of bins. Among the 10 schools, students of most of the schools were able to answer to the question regarding tree plantation (n=8), and dos during thundering/earthquake (n=6). On the other hand, in climate vulnerable districts i.e. Dhaka and Rajshahi, students of only one school were able to answer or say something relevant for all the questions whereas the others could not answer anything or able to answer to maximum two questions.

Students were also asked whether they inform the climate change and environment related messages to their parents or not. Students of most of the schools (9/10) reported that they deliver the messages to their parents. At parents’ level verification, 64% (9/14) parents of BRAC Primary School students could tell at least one information about climate change and environment. However, 100% reported climate change and environment related information as a discussion point of the SMC or parents meeting.

#### MIS Checking

BEP has reported the total number of students of BRAC Primary Schools in Bangladesh which is 74,973 (male 25,225 & female 30,296).

#### Recommendations

**BEP**

* Coordination between CCP and BEP needs to be improved for

-planning and designing programme activities

-measuring and reporting achievements in building climate change resilience.

* In database, a column can be added for climate vulnerable district or not so that climate change related data can be readily available.

**CCP**

* As the number reported by BEP is added with the number of people received support from different BRAC programmes to cope with effects of climate change in the 41 climate vulnerable districts; a note needs to be added while reporting this number stating that, this number shows the number of students in all BRAC Primary Schools of Bangladesh whereas, the number of students in 41 climate vulnerable districts is 60,930 (male 27,555 & female 33,375).

### 3.2.3 Integrated to climate change in the WASH

Along with Climate Change Programme of BRAC, some other programmes are also playing a vital role in contributing to BRAC’s efforts to build resilience to climate change. WASH by providing support for safe drinking water source and sanitary latrines to the community people in 35 climate vulnerable districts is building resilience to cope with the adverse effects of climate change.

Under ***Output Indicator 3.1***- number of people receiving support to better cope with the effects of climate change WASH reports the followings:

* Number of people provided with context specific improved (safe) water sources
* Number of people provided with Context specific sanitary latrine

Sampling was done in 5 districts which are Satkhira, Patuakhali, Barguna, Sylhet, and Sunamganj. All of these are climate vulnerable districts situated in the climatic hotspots i.e. western coastal region (Satkhira), central coastal region (Patuakhali and Barguna) and haor, and flash flood areas (Sylhet and Sunamganj). In total, 114 sample was done for field level verification of which 49 samples for water source verification and 65 for sanitary latrines.

#### Field level verification findings

1. **Safe Drinking Water**

Out of 49 sample, all of them received support for safe drinking water. Among them, 13 received support for rainwater harvesting system, 27 for tube well and rest for water plant, pond and filter. Out of the 27 tube well 20 (74%) were found with raised plinth. Support for safe water source was provided in these areas due to hazardous substance in the source of water. However, 8 (16%) participants were not aware about the presence of hazardous substance in the water sources of the area which shows lack of awareness about climate change effects in the area.

The study has also observed the knowledge of the participants about the hazardous substance in the water of the area. Among the 49 recipients, 31 mentioned about presence of iron in the water, 28 about salinity and 8 about arsenic. After receiving the support 18 HH experienced natural disaster of which 2 participants reported to be affected by the disaster after installation. Awareness about the preparedness during disaster was also observed, which shows most of the participants have no idea on how to prepare to remain safe during disaster (Figure 4).

Figure 5 Number of people about awareness during disaster [other includes raising awareness and go to the shelter]

1. **Sanitary Latrine**

Out of 65 HHs, all HHs were found with BRAC supported sanitary latrines whereas, 2 HHs in Kanaighat of Sylhet district were found where installation was not completed. Among the 65 respondents, 2 reported that their latrines were flooded during excessive rainfall/flood. Among the recipients of sanitary latrine, awareness about the preparedness during disaster is also low as most of the participants do not know how to prepare for natural disaster (Figure 5).

Figure 6. Number of people about awareness during disaster

1. **Addressing climate vulnerabilities:**

BRAC’s WASH programme works in the 35 districts out of 41 climate vulnerable districts of Bangladesh. The sample districts of this study are climate vulnerable districts effected by high salinity in ground water and surface water, cyclone and storm surges, intense rainfall and flash flood. WASH programme provides context specific WASH support by raising the platform of the water sources or sanitary latrines to be used during disaster.

One of the components of BRAC’s Climate Resilience Framework is access to services. Providing context specific safe drinking water sources and sanitary latrines are increasing service accessibility of the community (Figure 6).

#### Recommendation:

There are some overlapping between the result of the safe water and sanitary latrine beneficiaries. Programme use percentage of overlapping from MIS to discount the total number

### 3.2.4 Integrated to climate change in the Urban Development Programme (UDP)

From 2019, under **SPA RF Output indicator 3.1** (# of people receiving support to better cope with the effects of climate change), seven BRAC Programs (BEP, BHP, CCP, IDP, UDP, UPGP and WASH) report their achievements in delivering various services aimed to address the impacts of Climate Change. Urban Development Programme (UDP), which is trying to ensure better access to climate resilient urban facilities and services for 20 cities. The reported following program output for the year 2019 –

* + Number of people received training on climate change and DRR
  + Number of people received seed and seedling for plantation in their houses
  + Number of people (population) for which the low cost climate resilient Houses have been constructed
  + Number of people living in lower income settlements (population) for which the infrastructure supports have been provided

According to UDP “**institutional and governance contexts”** of climate resilience cities refers to cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, and resilience to disasters in 12 cities. In 2019 UDP program reported the following activities under output indicators 3.1.

* Capacity building training on Urban Climate change and DRR;
* Prepare Community Action Plan (including climate change and DRR);
* Low cost affordable climate resilient housing;
* Distribute seeds, plants and seedlings for reducing heat and air pollution and Promoting urban agriculture; and
* Climate resilience infrastructure for the lower income settlement dweller

The study collected data from 8 (5 city corporations and 3 municipalities) UDP programme implementation areas. Distribution of sampled respondents of the study depict on table (5) that respondents for quantitative interviews were selected based on activity. For instance, Climate change and DRR training related information collected from 7 beneficiaries in the Barishal, Dhaka South city, and Coxsbazar municipality, seed distribution 51 beneficiaries, seedling 54 beneficiaries and climate resilient housing 2 beneficiaries were interviewed.

In terms of investigating the infrastructural supports the study conducted 4 FGDs with beneficiaries in respective four areas namely Dhaka south, Khulna, Rajshahi City Corporation and Syedpur municipality. Similarly, the investigators were also physically observed provided supports from UDP.

Table 2 Sample size distribution

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | Sampled respondents |
| Training on climate change and DRR | 7 |
| Seed distribution | 51 |
| Seedling for plantation | 54 |
| Low cost climate resilient housing | 2 |

#### Field level verification findings

1. **People received training on climate change and DRR**

The study interviewed 7 training recipients where 2 city corporation officer, 4 CDO members and 1 PG members. City corporation officer were asked whether they able to use their training knowledge for community development. Findings depict on table (6) that out of 2 interviewed training recipient 1 used training knowledge for community development. In terms of using training knowledge for problem identification and community action plan (CAP) 3 from 4 interviewed training recipients were contributed in the CAP. Those who are not able to use their training knowledge they have mentioned that training knowledge will be used when related activities taken place. Because after receiving the training such activities were not taken place in their areas.

Table 3. Use of training knowledge in community development and community action plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondents received training | n | Use of training knowledge for community development | Use of training knowledge for problem identification and community action plan |
| City corporation officer | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| Community development Organization member (CDO) | 4 | N/A | 3 |
| Primary group (PG) member | 1 | N/A | 1 |

1. **People received seed and seedling for plantation in their houses**

The study interviewed 51 seed receiver and asked them about space for seed plantation, quality seed and plantation status. Findings illustrates on figure (7) that out of 51 seed receiver 42 recipients households had enough space besides their housing and rest of 9 recipients had no place available besides their housing for plantation. It should be noted that, households which had no place for seed plantation, they also planted seed besides the cannel and public unused places. In terms of quality of seed only 2 respondents mentioned that the quality of seed is not good. In addition, 100 percent of respondents planted seed.

Figure 7. HHs level seed plantation status

In terms of seedling distribution and plantation the study interviweed 54 seedling receiver and asked them about available space for plantation, seedling quality and plantation status. Findings illustrates on figure (8) that 46 from 54 respondents mentioned their housing had available space for plantation and the rest of 8 had no place beside their housing for plantation. However, 100 percent respondents were mentioned that the quality of seedling was good and all respondents planted receiving saapling.

Figure 8. HHs level sapling plantation status

1. **Climate resilient housing**

The study investigated 2 low cost climate resilient housing under Rajshahi city corporation. In the physical observation and interview with the beneficiaries found that beneficiaries were satisfied about their housing. The study asked repondents about housing withstand against disaster in the reference year 2019. Findings reveals that one respondent housing faced storm in 2019, but there was no damage happened in provided housing.

1. **Climate resilience infrastructure for the lower income settlement dweller**

The study conducted 4 FGDs with infrastructure support receiver community in 4 programme implementation area. The summary of findings depict that community toilet were investigated in two city areas, where the community toilet in Dhaka South city corporation operated satisfactory. While 1 out of the 4 community toilet at Baje Kajla Slum under Rajshahi city corporation flooded if it rains. In terms of drainage quality FGD participants identified water stuck in Sreepur slum under Rajshahi city corporation even after constructing new drain in 2019. However, FGD participants in Khulna, Rajshahi, and Saidpur have showeed their satisfaction on men footpath constructions.

### 3.2.5 Integrated to climate change in the Ultra poor Graduation Programme (UPGP)

The annual data validation study covers **SPA result framework output indicator 3.1** and **outcome indicator 4.1** for the UPGP program. The study examine 2018 MIS data for outcome indicator and 2019 cohort data for output indicators. In the filed level data validation 344 beneficiaries were interviweed from 9 climate vulnerable districts. We examined beneficiaries disaster preparedness knowledge leve. We also asked beneficiaries disaster experiences in the reference study period 2019.

#### Field level verification findings

**a. Beneficiaries perception on disaster preparedness**

The study asked respondents about their knowledge on household level disaster preparedness. Findings illustrates in the figure (9) that 5 percent respondents have no idea about disaster preparedness. The highest 32 percent have mentioned that sustainable dewlling place is necessary for household withstand aginst climate induced disaster like flood and cyclone. Wheares 22 percent have mentioned shelter center, 19 percent dry food and 14 percent livestock shelter center necessary for disaster preparedness.

Figure 9. Beneficiaries’ perception on disaster preparedness

**b. Beneficiaries disaster experiences in the refference study period**

The study asked respondents wheather they were experienced disaster in the year of 2019. Findings reveal that out of 344 respondents 171 (50%) have experienced 5 types of natural disaster in the reference study period. Data illustrates in the figure (10) that the highest 69 percent have faced cyclone and 23 percent flood and 5 percent heavy rain respectively.

In addition, a total 12 beneficiaries (7%) from 171 have experienced damage BRAC property for disaster. The average value of damage property is 3818 BDT where minimum loss is 600 BDT and maximum is 12000 BDT.

Figure 10. Types disaster faced by the beneficiaries in 2019

#### MIS level verification

The study found there is no deviation in the 2019 cohort data for output indicators 3.1 and all data mached with programmes reported data. Similarly, 2018 cohort data for outcome indicator 4.1 mached with program reported data.

# CHAPTER 4- Data Quality Assessment

To assess the data quality of CCP, study interviewed programme staffs as per data quality standard. Following are the findings of data quality assessment.

## 4.1 Validity

During measuring the validity of the data the study considered three major point those are (1) face validity (2) Attribution (3) Measurements Error. Validity also measured where’s the activities are performed accordingly.

In sector of validity, 10% or more error was found at field level verification for tree plantation’. Also few transcription error was found for sapling distribution data.

## 4.2 Reliability

Reliability indicates the process of data collection & reporting is mostly stable and consistent over different stages. It also assess their proper guideline and instruction in all level for maintaining the aligned process.

While exploring the reliability of CCP it was found that specific data collection format is followed which is supplied from HO but there is no written guideline for data collection and MIS reporting. Missing data was found in MIS verification in both hard copy and soft copy.

## 4.3 Precession

Precession is mainly associated with data segregations (Sufficient level of detail), methods for detecting duplicate data, and method for detecting missing data.

The study found CCP collected detailed data from the field in specific format where data is segregated by different aspects of the beneficiaries which is available at different level. But Duplicate and missing data is checked manually and during the beneficiary selection multiple support recipients (if any) are marked and reported accordingly. The MIS validation found few duplication as well as missing data for sapling distribution

## 4.4 Integrity

The data quality standard indicate the data security which protected data from the unauthorized changed in case of computerized data it assess its security measure and logic system for minimizing the error and manipulation.

In case of integrity the study found that there is “room for improvement” at all layer. Manual check is done in both field and HO level. Field staffs rectify the issue (if any) identified by the HO and send revised data to HO.

## 4.5 Timeliness

Timeliness is associated with timely submission and collection of data. The study found programme reporting is done mostly on time.

## 4.6 Use of data

These study also tried to assess the use of data from the different five layer of the programme. This would help programme to understand their staff understanding about significance of the data they are producing. The program staff from stated that they use the data for the following purposes.

**Field level (FC, PO)**

* To understand program demand
* To know the achievement of the target
* To prepare work plan
* To know the progress of the work
* To ensure accountability of program

**HO Level**

* To take field level decisions
* Prepare programme planning and budget formulation
* Donor Reporting

# CHAPTER 5- Data Management System Ranking

Below is the scores obtained by CCP MIS according to the assessment:

Table 8: Data Management System Ranking

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | Program obtained score (1-5) | | |
| Parameter-wise score | Relative weight of parameters | Total Score |
| 1. Data flow | 2.3 | 20% | 2.5 |
| 2. System Integrity | 2.0 | 20% |
| 3. Data Precision | 2.5 | 15% |
| 4. Reliability of process & tools | 2.7 | 25% |
| 5. Timeliness of data | 4.0 | 10% |
| 6. Validity of data found in MIS verification | 2.0 | 10% |

***1. Data flow:***

Computerized MIS system is not present in the field, as CCP had only three field staffs in 2019. Field staffs (Field Coordinator) send reports through e-mail for the validation of documents (muster roll/ attendance sheet etc.) from field to HO. So E-mail and Paper based data flow exists in CCP. Through the upward reporting chain compiled data is available to every level. Also, analyzed data with proper meaning is not sent back to field coordinator - For each activity an “Activity Completion” report is prepared and shared with the FCs. Thus the system obtained 2.3 out of 5 for the data flow.

***2. System Integrity:***

In HO MIS file is password protected and shared with the team members through shared drive. Also, submitted data in the Central MIS can be changed only through proper authorization. Field staffs rectify the issue (if any) identified by the HO and send revised data to HO. Field Coordinators preserve their documents/reports under lock & key. However, paper based formats at the field level is prone to unauthorized changes and there is a significant risk of transcription error while manually compiling data from registers and entering data into the spreadsheets. Also manual checking of data at HO level poses a risk of error. Thus the system obtained 2.0 out of 5 for the system integrity in MIS verification.

***3. Data Precision:***

Detailed data is collected from the field and summary data segregated by different aspects of the beneficiaries is available at different levels. However, Duplicate and missing data is checked manually and during the beneficiary selection multiple support recipients (if any) are marked and reported accordingly. MIS validation found few duplication as well as missing data for sapling distribution. Thus the system obtained 2.5 out of 5 due to lack of precision and for the risk of duplication or missing data.

***4. Reliability of process & tools:***

Data collection format is supplied from the HO with proper orientation to the field staffs. Supportive supervision during data collection is also ensured in few cases. But there was no written guideline for data collection or MIS reporting in 2019. However, Program has developed M&E guideline which has some instructions related to data collection & reporting. Depending on the activity, same data collection format is used in all locations. As the data collection system is manual, so there is flexibility to collect addition information based on the programme requirement Thus the CCP MIS obtained 2.7 out of 5 in MIS scoring for Reliability of process & tools.

***5. Timeliness of data:***

Though the system is partly manual, current and up to date data is available at every layer of data flow. Besides data is reported monthly, which is frequent enough given the program context. So the system obtained 4.0 out of 5 for it’s due to timely and frequent data at large.

***6. Validity of data found in MIS verification:***

Program doesn’t have sufficient resources staffs for data collection, management and analysis. However, more resources are needed for regular data verification. Field staff (PO) conducting activities are responsible to record relevant data and report back to respective supervisors. Basic orientation is given to the field staffs before the data collection. But supervision is lacking in the field level. In validation Error found in the field verification for ‘tree plantation’ was 10% or more. No error found in ‘CC resilient housing’ data. Thus the system obtained 2.0 out of 5 for the Validity of data found in MIS verification.

**Total rank score** combining the parameter-wise scores for CCP is 2.5; which indicates weak MIS with lots of rooms for improvement like -

* Employing a real-time fully automated MIS
* Simplifying data collection and reporting system (an well designed automated MIS will take care of it automatically)
* Reviewing/revising few field documents for accommodating detailed and precise data – unique identification of HHs or service recipients
* Develop detailed guideline for data collection, cleaning, analyzing and reporting
* Above all intensify supportive supervision at the field level

# Annex

Annex 1: Detailed MIS Ranking

| **Parameters** | **Standard for an ideal MIS** | **Program MIS status & Study findings** | **Score** | Relative weight for standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Data flow | 1. Real-time, computerized MIS up to field or Branch level | **Computerized MIS system is not present in the field, as CCP had only 3 field staffs in 2019. Field staff (Field Coordinator) send report through e-mail based on the validation documents (muster roll/ attendance sheet etc.)** | 1 | 25% |
| 2. Efficient data flow followed for program | **E-mail and Paper based data flow exist. Field staff (Field Coordinator) send the copy of the background documents (muster roll/ attendance sheet etc.) to HO for validation** | 2 | 25% |
| 3. Data is available to all concerned upward the flow | **Both data and validation documents are available in field and HO level** | 3 | 25% |
| 4. Processed data comes back to all concerned with proper meaning | **Processed data and report is shared with the Field Coordinator – For each activity an “Activity Completion” report is prepared and shared with the FCs** | 3 | 25% |
| 2. System Integrity | 1. There are security measures in the system to restrict unauthorized changes in the data | **The HO based MIS file is password protected and shared with the team members through shared drive, no one can change the data rather than the authorized person. FCs preserve their documents/reports under lock & key. However, as the system is completely manual, and there is not much supervision/checking mechanism in place, there is significant risk of improper manipulation.** | 2 | 50% |
| 2. There are sufficient safeguards to minimize transcription error | **Manual check is done in both field and HO level. Field staffs rectify the issue (if any) identified by the HO and send revised data to HO MIS validation found few transcription error for sapling distribution data** | 2 | 50% |
| 3. Data Precision | 1. Data is collected & available in sufficient level of detail | **Depending on the activity sufficient level of detail information is ensured during data collection (if available)** | 3 | 50% |
| 2. There are methods for detecting duplicate and/or missing data | **Duplicate and missing data is checked manually and during the beneficiary selection multiple support recipients (if any) are marked and reported accordingly. MIS validation found few duplication as well as missing data for sapling distribution.** | 2 | 50% |
| 4. Reliability of process & tools | 1. Written procedures/instructions in place for data collection, cleaning, analysis and reporting | **Data collection format is supplied from the HO with proper orientation to the field staffs. Supportive supervision during data collection is also ensured in few cases. There was no written guideline for data collection or MIS reporting in 2019. However, Program has developed M&E guideline in 2020 which has some instructions related to data collection & reporting.** | 2 | 33% |
| 2. Consistent procedure used over different time and places | **Depending on the activity, same data collection format is used in all locations.** | 3 | 33% |
| 3. Flexibility of the system to align with changes in program requirement | **As the data collection system is manual, so there is flexibility to collect addition information based on the programme requirement** | 3 | 33% |
| 5. Timeliness of data | 1. Current and frequent data is available | **Up to date is available in both field and HO level** | 4 | 100% |
| 6. Validity of data found in MIS verification | 1. There are sufficient resources allocated for collecting data | **In 2019 the amount of field staffs were low, but volunteers were engaged during the participant selection of plantation with the supervision of the field staffs** | 2 | 33% |
| 2. People collecting data are properly trained and supervised to minimize “personal bias” | **Basic orientation is given to the field staffs before the data collection. But supervision is lacking in the field level.** | 2 | 33% |
| 3. Error found in MIS checking is negligible (less than 5%) | **Error found in the field verification for ‘tree plantation’ was 10% or more. No error found in ‘CC resilient housing’ data** | 2 | 33% |