Revised MTT Monitoring Evaluation Learning Framework

Ver. 9 August 2025

Level Code	Result level	Result statement	Expected behavioural change (End of Program)	Indicator No.	Indicators	Indicator explanation	Baseline	Target and Rationale for Target Setting	Required Data/Relevant Metrics	Disaggregation	Data source	Data collector	Timing/Frequency
1	End of Program Outcome	**Water, energy and climate _research and policy interfaces_ are robust and more inclusive, resulting in more effective and equitable policies, which are cross-sectoral, informed by evidence, and are responding to the needs of socially marginalised groups**	Sub-national, national and regional KBPIOs support the formulation of national and regional policy agendas in the Mekong subregion on water security, energy security and climate change mitigation and adaptation through robust and inclusive research and effective policy engagement.	1-1a	Number of MTT funded flagship studies and rapid response grants contributed to subnational, national or regional research-policy interfaces on water security, energy security and climate change mitigation and adaptation in Mekong Subregion.	<u>Research-Policy Interface:</u> The research-policy interface refers to the dynamic interactions, processes, and mechanisms through which research informs policy and/or policy influences research. It encompasses the exchange, translation, and application of knowledge between researchers, policymakers, and other stakeholders to enhance evidence-based decision-making. Example of the evidence for research policy interfaces: · Stakeholder consultation meeting · Policy dialogue · Official policy document (action plan, strategy) · Interview · Joint working group/Taskforce/Committee · Joint Training · Policy-related publication and/or dissemination <u>Sub-national</u> includes all levels of government below the national or central level: · Province · City/district	0	At least 5 flagship studies and rapid response grants contributing to research-policy interface. (50% of total flagship studies and rapid response grants)	Number and list of research-policy interfaces (such as meeting minutes, proceedings of stakeholder consultation meeting, policy dialogue, and/or official policy document (action plan, strategy)) Project policy makers' interviews MSC stories from program/project teams and their boundary partners	Country/sub-national Sector	Project reports from Flagship and Rapid Response Studies MSC stories from program/project teams and boundary partners Program final evaluation report Synthesis of MTT Program Project's Policy Influencing Program interviews boundary partners Other available sources	Program Secretariat Subgrantee	Program Progress Reports
				1-1b	Evidence that research-policy interface contributed by MTT funded flagship studies and rapid response grants are robust and inclusive.	**Robustness:** refers to the strength, effectiveness, and resilience of the interactions and processes through which research evidence informs policy making, and how policies, in turn, shape research agendas. A robust research-policy interface ensures at least one of the following characteristics: · Cross-sectoral · High-Quality Evidence is Used · Effective Communication Exists · Institutional Structures Support Collaboration · Adaptability is Present · Outcomes are Impactful · Transparency and Accountability are ensured **Inclusiveness** in the research-policy interface refers to the extent to which diversed voices, perspectives, and stakeholders are actively involved in the process of connecting research to policy and vice versa. An inclusive research-policy interface ensures at least one of the following characteristics: · Diverse perspectives are Included (in research policy interfaces) · Gender equality · Disability inclusion · Social inclusion (engagement of marginalised or underrepresented groups/communities, such as ethnic minorities, poor, in the research-policy interfaces)	Robustness and inclusiveness of sub-national/national/regional level's policies, practices, plans and actions on water security, energy security and climate change mitigation and adaptation, are still limited* *"A Scoping Study of Knowledge-based Policy Influence Organizations that Address Water, Energy, and Climate Nexus Issues in the Mekong Region", funded by MTT Program, was completed in 16 August 2023. Its survey of 128 KBPIOs in the Mekong region, emphasized following key existing constraints: 1. Limited Robust Policy Influence: Nearly two-thirds of surveyed organizations indicated limited engagement or influence in policy processes. Organizations experienced varied responses from governments to their policy advice, suggesting inconsistent uptake. 2. Barriers to Inclusive Engagement: Key obstacles include insufficient funding, restricted access to information, and fear of repercussions from policy critiques. These barriers hinder robust and open participation in policy-making. 3. Need for Diverse Engagement Strategies: Organizations used varied strategies (e.g., meeting officials, broadcasting to the public, managing boundaries), but effectiveness varies. A more diverse and adaptive approach is needed to address complex nexus challenges.	Research-policy interface contributed by MTT funded flagship studies and rapid response grants are robust and inclusive	Qualitative Analysis on robustness and inclusiveness of research-policy interfaces supported by the investment				
2.1.	Objective	**National and regional _KBPIOs effectively engaging_ with sub-national, national and regional _policy processes_ on water and energy security and climate change mitigation and adaptation strengthened.**	National and regional KBPIOs influence the outcomes of targeted sub-national, national and regional policy processes.	2.1-1a	<u>Number of policy processes</u> wherein national and regional KBPIOs are part of, as members, advisers, researchers, supporters or resource persons.	Policy processes: national and regional KBPIOs engage with sub-national, national and regional policy processes through <u>at least one</u> of the following types of processes: · Collaborative Agenda Setting: Engaging stakeholders in identifying and prioritizing issues that require government action. · Policy Formulation: Developing potential solutions, analyzing options, and drafting policy proposals. · Decision-Making (Adoption): Formal approval of a policy by authorities (e.g., legislature, executive). · Implementation: Executing the policy through agencies, regulations, and resource allocation. · Evaluation & Improvement: Assessing effectiveness, impact, and potential need for adjustments. · Policy Capacity Enhancement: Training/awareness building of specific policy	0	<u>At least</u> 8 policy processes having KBPIOs as a part of members, advisers, researchers, or resource person (70% of total flagship studies and rapid response grants)	List of processes related to policy, plan, strategy or actions that the national and regional KBPIOs are part of	Country/<u>sub-national</u> Sector	Project reports from Flagship and Rapid Response Studies MSC stories from program/project teams and boundary partners Program final evaluation report Synthesis of MTT Program Project's Policy Influencing Program interviews boundary partners Other available sources	Program Secretariat Subgrantee	Program Progress Reports
				2.1-1b	Evidences that national or regional KBPIOs effectively contributed to policy processes on water and energy security and climate change mitigation and adaptation	Different metrics shall be employed to measure effectiveness. Key elements include: · Degree of Policy Influence · Timeliness of Engagement · KBPIOs' efforts to build the capacity of policymakers and stakeholders in understanding and addressing water and energy security and climate change issues: · Level of boundary partners' satisfaction · Degree of public awareness Policy processes include processes at sub-national (provincial/district), national, and regional levels.	National and regional KBPIOs have a variety of effectiveness of its contributions to engagement with policy processes, depending on how well connected with networks, receiving foreign funding and application of GESI policies. This claim is reinforced in the Scoping Study as: 1. Gaps in Policy Engagement Strategies: KBPIOs use different strategies to engage in policy processes: meeting government official, broadcasting to the public, and managing boundaries between science, policy, and practice. The effectiveness of these strategies varies depending on organizational attributes and contexts. 2. Gaps in Levels of Influence Linked to Organizational Characteristics: Larger organizations (50+ staff) had significantly higher policy influence scores than smaller ones. Organizations with more learning opportunities and those using the "meet government" strategy were more effective in influencing policy. 3. Network Connectivity and Foreign Funding Matter: Organizations well connected to networks and those receiving foreign funding were more likely to have their policy advice adopted. These factors contribute to greater visibility, credibility, and access to decision-making spaces. 4. GESI Practices Enhance Effectiveness: Organizations with gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) policies were significantly more likely to have their policy advice adopted. However, adoption of GESI practices varied widely across organizations.	National and regional KBPIOs have shown significant improvements on the effectiveness of its contributions to engagement with policy processes, through interactions/collaborations with networks, capacity building and application of GEDSI policies	Different metrics shall be employed, when appropriate, including at least one of the following elements: · Degree of Policy Influence · Timeliness of Engagement · KBPIOs' efforts to build the capacity of policymakers and stakeholders in understanding and addressing water and energy security and climate change issues · Level of boundary partners' satisfaction · Degree of public awareness	Country/sub-national Sector			
2.2.	Objective	Role and capabilities of national and regional KBPIOs in inclusive knowledge co-production processes strengthened.	National and regional KBPIOs use the insights from high quality and inclusive knowledge to inform policy discussions.	2.2-1a	Number of policy-oriented knowledge products developed by national and regional KBPIOs to inform policy processes.	**Policy-oriented knowledge products** are of one of the following types: · Policy briefs · Policy documents · Working papers · Case studies · Guidelines/toolkits · Technical reports · Policy promotional materials · Policy memos · Other policy-related documents	0	11 (At least 1 product for each of flagship study and rapid response grant)	Copy of products (final or draft final version)	Country/sub-national Sector	Project reports from Flagship and Rapid Response Studies Copy of products (final or draft final version) MSC stories Program interviews boundary partners Other available sources	Program Secretariat Subgrantee	Program Progress Reports
				2.2-1b	Evidence that knowledge co-production processes are cross-sectoral and/or cross-border	**Knowledge co-production:** collaborative process among researchers, policy-makers, and other relevant stakeholders that involves the joint development of knowledge and the integration of this knowledge into policy-making processes **Cross-border:** collaboration that crosses administrative borders, i.e., national borders, therefore involving stakeholders from different countries **Cross-sectoral:** collaboration that crosses sectoral borders, i.e., water, energy, climate and other sectors, therefore involving stakeholders from different sectors, breaking the silo thinking and actions	The degree to which knowledge co-production processes are cross-sectoral and/or cross-border is limited. The Scopy Study conducted by MTT Program came to realize: 1. Limited Cross-Border Engagement: 60% of surveyed organizations worked in only one country. Only 31% operated in all four Mekong countries, and very few worked in 2–3 countries. 2. Partial Nexus Integration: While many organizations work on water, energy, or climate, not all focus on the interactions between them. Comprehensive cross-sectoral (nexus) work is less common, limiting integrated knowledge co-production. 3. Knowledge Silos Persist: Organizations tend to rely on either science-based or experience-based knowledge, with limited integration of both. This reduces the potential for inclusive, cross-sectoral co-production of knowledge.	All knowledge co-production processes supported by MTT are cross-sectoral and/or cross-border.	Qualitative analysis of knowledge co-production processes supported by MTT on diversity of boundary partners engaged, including government agencies, NGOs, academic institutions, industry representatives, and local communities, and from two or more countries of the Mekong subregion.			
				2.2-2a	Number of policy-oriented knowledge products which mainstream and/or focus on GEDSI by national and regional KBPIOs	Inclusive knowledge co-production refers engaging with stakeholders across sectors, locations and countries on water, climate and energy issues and their interlinkages.	0	5 (At least 5 out of total 11 policy-oriented grants knowledge products that mainstream and/or focus on GEDSI)	Copy of products (final or draft final version)				

Revised MTT Monitoring Evaluation Learning Framework
Ver. 9 August 2025

Level Code	Result level	Result statement	Expected behavioural change (End of Program)	Indicator No.	Indicators	Indicator explanation	Baseline	Target and Rationale for Target Setting	Required Data/Relevant Metrics	Disaggregation	Data source	Data collector	Timing/Frequency
			National and regional KBPIOs use the insights from high quality and inclusive knowledge of mainstream and/or focus on GEDSI to inform policy discussions.	2.2-2b	Evidence that KBPIOs are able to mainstream GEDSI into knowledge co-production processes.	**Interdisciplinary:** a collaborative process between researchers, policy-makers, and stakeholders from different disciplines and backgrounds. **Inclusive:** a process that involves the meaningful engagement of diverse stakeholders, including those who are often marginalized or excluded from policy-making processes.	Capacity of KBPIOs to mainstream GEDSI into knowledge co-production processes is limited. In the same Scoping Study, it was found that: 1. Gaps in Evidence-based Knowledge: Standardized and quality-controlled data management practices are not widely adopted. Evidence-based knowledge is underutilized or undervalued in organizational learning. 2. Partial Inclusiveness: Only 31–80% of organizations had gender equality and social inclusion policies. Just half disaggregated research data by gender, indicating inconsistent inclusivity in practice. 3. Capacity Constraints: High demand for capacity building in project management, policy research, and stakeholder engagement. 90% of organizations saw capacity building as a key benefit of joining networks, reflecting current limitations.	National and regional KBPIOs have improved their capacity to conduct inclusive knowledge co-production and meaningfully engage with socially marginalised groups	Policy-oriented knowledge products on water, climate, and energy include strong GEDSI consideration	Country/sub-national Sector GEDSI incorporation			
		Capacity in networking with relevant stakeholder of national and regional KBPIOs enhanced	Network members coordinate and/or collaborate among themselves to influence policy processes.	2.3-1a	Number and evidence of collaborations of network members of national and regional KBPIOs to influence policy processes beyond MTT funded studies	Collaborations of network members of national and regional KBPIOs, include the following type of collaboration that are initiated by network members: · Joint proposal development · Joint event organisation (policy dialogue, conference, seminar, etc.) · Joint activity planning/implementation (such as, training workshop, research, etc.) Evidence of collaboration include, but not limited to: · Diversity of stakeholders involved · Quality of collaborative products · Boundary partners' satisfaction · Knowledge exchange and learning · Joint resource mobilization · Long-term sustainability	0	3 (1 collaboration in the second year (2024) and 2 additional collaborations (2025) in the final year)	List of initiatives or activities including descriptions/details	Country/sub-national Sector	Annual program Reports or interview from KBPIOs MSC stories Program interviews boundary partners Other available sources	Program Secretariat	Program Progress Reports
2.3.	Objective	**Capacity of entry- and mid-career professionals in delivering inclusive research and communicating and engaging with policy processes enhanced**	Entry- and mid-career professionals contribute to the influencing of policy processes.	2.3-2a	Number and evidence of MTT fellows contributing to research policy interfaces	MTT fellows contributions to activities that enhance research-policy interfaces (defined by indicator 1-1) at program and project levels. The contributions shall include at least one of the following characteristics: · Expertise Relevance: Evaluate the alignment of the professionals' expertise with the research policy interfaces they contribute to: o Quality of research and analysis o Communication and public engagement o Policy influence and impact · Innovative Ideas · Active contribution to capacity enhancement activitiy, regional policy platform · Collaboration and Networking	0	22 fellows to achieve this (70% of total number of MTT fellowship grants)	Fellowship progress report Program interviews/questionnaire (included MSCs)	Gender Country/sub-national	Fellow midterm and final progress reports Mentor midterm and final evaluation reports MSC stories Program interviews boundary partners Project reports from Flagship and Rapid Response Studies Responses to the survey by fellows and other early-mid career professional Other available sources	Program Secretariat Subgrantee	Program Progress Reports
				2.3-2b	Number of MTT funded Flagship Studies and Rapid Response Studies program where entry- and mid-career professionals, both fellows and non-fellows, contributing to research policy interfaces at regional, national and sub-national levels.	Research-Policy Interface: The research-policy interface refers to the dynamic interactions, processes, and mechanisms through which research informs policy and/or policy influences research. It encompasses the exchange, translation, and application of knowledge between researchers, policymakers, and other stakeholders to enhance evidence-based decision-making. Example of the evidence for research policy interfaces: · Stakeholder consultation meeting · Policy dialogue · Official policy document (action plan, strategy) · Interview · Joint working group/Taskforce/Committee · Joint Training · Policy-related publication and/or dissemination Sub-national includes all levels of government below the national or central level: · Province · City/district	0	8 flagship studies and rapid response studies programs contributed by entry- and mid-career professionals, with at least 6 contributed by fellows	List of Flagship Studies and Rapid Response Studies supported by fellows and other non-MTT fellow early-mid career professionals Program interviews	MTT fellow and non-MTT fellow early/mid-career professionals Gender Country/Sub-national			