



KARAMOJA TUMAINI NETWORK

MONITORING · EVALUATION · ACCOUNTABILITY · LEARNING

MEAL Plan

2026 – 2030

How we will know whether the strategy is working

Companion to the Strategic Plan 2026–2030 · The SHIELD Framework

Adopted by the Board of Directors March 2026

Status Version 1.0 · www.karamojatumaini.org

WHY THIS PLAN EXISTS

Of roughly 1,000 children processed through one government programme, only 292 could later be traced. The other 700 are the gap KTN exists to close — and this plan is how we will know whether we are closing it.

Contents

A working system, not a reporting obligation

THE PLAN — 36 SECTIONS

1	Executive Summary	19	Data Quality Assurance Framework
2	Introduction and Organisational Context	20	Data Management and Storage
3	Purpose of the MEAL Plan	21	Data Analysis and Visualisation
4	MEAL Vision and Objectives	22	Reporting Framework
5	KTN Results Measurement Approach	23	Dashboard and Performance Tracking
6	Theory of Change and Results Chain	24	Community Accountability Framework
7	MEAL Principles	25	Feedback and Complaints Monitoring
8	MEAL Governance Structure	26	Participation and Inclusion Monitoring
9	Roles and Responsibilities Matrix	27	Learning Agenda
10	Strategic Results Framework	28	Reflection and Adaptive Management
11	Programme-Level Results Framework	29	Evaluation Framework
12	Indicator Development Framework	30	Research and Evidence Generation
13	Indicator Reference Sheets	31	Partnership and Capacity Strengthening
14	Baseline, Target and Milestone Framework	32	Risk Management in MEAL
15	Data Collection Framework	33	Safeguarding Considerations in MEAL
16	Data Sources and Verification Methods	34	Implementation Roadmap
17	Data Collection Tools and Systems	35	MEAL Budget Considerations
18	Digital Data Collection Approach	36	Review and Continuous Improvement

OPERATIONAL ANNEXES — A TO P

A	Strategic Results Framework	I	Evaluation Terms of Reference Template
B	Indicator Performance Tracking Table	J	Learning Agenda Template
C	Indicator Reference Sheet Template	K	Quarterly MEAL Reporting Template
D	MEAL Activity Calendar	L	Programme Monitoring Checklist
E	Data Collection Plan	M	Community Feedback Monitoring Tool
F	Data Collection Tool Matrix	N	Safeguarding-Sensitive Data Collection Checklist
G	Data Quality Assessment Checklist	O	MEAL Capacity Building Plan
H	Baseline and Endline Study Guidance	P	Power BI Dashboard Requirements

How to Read This Plan

What the shorthand means and where to start

This plan is built to be used, not filed. Board members and donors who want the logic and the results should read Sections 1, 5, 6, 10, and 29. Programme staff who want the day-to-day machinery should read Sections 15 to 23. Field teams will spend most of their time in the tools at the back: the indicator reference sheets, the data collection plan, the monitoring checklists, and the quarterly reporting template.

Abbreviations

Term	Meaning	Term	Meaning
CHS	Core Humanitarian Standard	MoV	Means of verification
CPC	Child Protection Committee	OECD-DAC	DAC evaluation criteria
DQA	Data Quality Assessment	PITT	Performance Indicator Tracking Table
DPIA	Data Protection Impact Assessment	PSEA	Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
FGD	Focus group discussion	RACI	Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed
IRS	Indicator Reference Sheet	SHIELD	Safeguard, Heal, Integrate, Empower, Lead, Data
KII	Key informant interview	TBE	To be established (Phase 1 baseline)
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning	ToC	Theory of Change
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender, Labour & Social Development	VfM	Value for money
MSC	Most Significant Change	VSLA	Village Savings and Loan Association

Key terms

Term	What it means in this plan
Outcome	A change in the situation of a child, family, or community — what actually changed. KTN judges its work by outcomes.
Output	What KTN produced or delivered: committees formed, children reached, sessions run. Tracked to manage the work, not to claim success.

Term	What it means in this plan
Baseline	The value of an indicator before the programme acts, against which later change is measured.
Disaggregation	Breaking a figure down — by sex as a minimum, and by age band, district, and disability status where the data allows.
Longitudinal tracking	Following the same children over time, at 6, 12, and 24 months after reintegration.
Indicator code	The reference for each indicator, e.g. SO-I-02 (Strategic Outcome, Integrate, no. 02) or OP-H-03 (Output, Heal).
KoboToolbox	The open-source, offline-capable mobile platform KTN uses to collect field data.
Power BI	The Microsoft tool KTN uses to build its three dashboard tiers (Section 23).
Washington Group questions	A short, internationally used set of questions for identifying disability, so inclusion can be measured.

1

PART ONE

STRATEGIC FOUNDATIONS

Why KTN measures, what it measures against, and who is responsible for the measuring — the logic a donor or board member reads first.

Section 1 · Executive Summary

Section 2 · Introduction and Organisational Context

Section 3 · Purpose of the MEAL Plan

Section 4 · MEAL Vision and Objectives

Section 5 · KTN Results Measurement Approach

Section 6 · Theory of Change and Results Chain

Section 7 · MEAL Principles

Section 8 · MEAL Governance Structure

Section 9 · Roles and Responsibilities Matrix



Executive Summary

KTN was built on a single uncomfortable finding: the sector working on Karamojong street-connected children has measured its activity for three decades while the children kept returning to the streets. The Auditor General put a number on it. Of roughly 1,000 children processed through one government programme, only 292 could later be traced. The other 700 are the gap this organisation exists to close, and this Plan is how we will know whether we are closing it.

This Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Plan turns the Strategic Plan 2026–2030 into something measurable. The Strategic Plan sets out six objectives under the SHIELD framework — Safeguard, Heal, Integrate, Empower, Lead, Data. This Plan attaches to each of them outcome indicators, baselines, targets, means of verification, data systems, and the named roles responsible for the measuring. It is the operational contract behind the strategy's promises.

KTN measures outcomes, not activity. The sector counts children rescued. We count children who, two years on, are still in school and still at home.

The plan rests on one methodological commitment that distinguishes it from sector practice: KTN measures children at the points where the sector loses them, at 6, 12, and 24 months after reintegration, through a longitudinal database in which every child carries a unique identifier. That single design choice converts the database from a reporting asset into a protection tool. A child whose 12-month follow-up is overdue appears on a list, and someone is accountable for clearing that list.

What this plan commits KTN to

- **A small, outcome-weighted indicator set.** A few things measured well rather than many measured badly — sustained school retention and return-to-street rate, not training counts.
- **Disaggregation by default.** Every child-level indicator is broken down by sex as a minimum, and by age band, district, and disability status where the data allows.
- **Honest reporting.** KTN publishes missed targets and findings that are not flattering. A donor report that hides a missed target buys short-term comfort at the cost of long-term trust.
- **Downward accountability as a core function.** Feedback in Nga'Karamojong, community scorecards, and a complaints procedure accessible to people who may not read or write — treated as constitutive of the model, not appended to it.
- **Independent evaluation at the gate.** The Phase 2-to-3 scaling decision is made on the evidence of an independent mid-term evaluation, not on the passage of time.

THE HEADLINE OF THIS PLAN

By 2030, KTN expects a longitudinal database covering at least 2,500 children with outcome data at 6, 12, and 24 months; sustained school retention above 80 percent for reintegrated children; and a return-to-street rate below 15 percent within 24 months. These are the numbers the whole system is built to produce — harder to generate and slower to report than rescue counts, and the only ones that matter.

Introduction and Organisational Context

The Karamoja Tumaini Network is a Karamojong-led child protection organisation working both ends of the migration corridor — the source communities in Karamoja that children leave, and the urban streets, principally in Kampala's Kisenyi, that they reach. Nine in ten of its staff and leaders are Karamojong, and the organisation works in Nga'Karamojong at every operational level. The Strategic Plan 2026–2030 sets out the full analysis of the crisis and the SHIELD response; this MEAL Plan should be read alongside it.

Three of KTN's founding assets shape how it measures. Cultural and linguistic legitimacy means data is collected in the language children actually speak, by people communities recognise. Corridor-wide presence means the same child can be tracked from the street where they were found to the household they return to. And practical fluency with KoboToolbox and Power BI — rare in this sector — means the longitudinal tracking infrastructure is buildable rather than aspirational.

KTN is also a young organisation with no operational track record, which raises the stakes for MEAL rather than lowering them. Donors and government partners will need convincing, and the evidence this plan generates is the instrument of that convincing. The plan is therefore written to be evaluation-ready from day one: outcome indicators with baselines and means of verification, sex and age disaggregation, and independent evaluation at mid-term and endline — the structure UNICEF, the EU, Irish Aid, FCDO, and Global Affairs Canada expect to see.

Purpose of the MEAL Plan

This plan exists to do four things, and it is worth being precise about each because MEAL plans often blur them.

Purpose	What it means in practice
Measure outcomes	Track whether KTN's work changes the situation of children, families, and communities — not merely whether activities happened.
Enable adaptation	Put evidence in front of the people who make decisions, at the altitude and frequency they need it, so the programme corrects course while there is still time to correct.
Discharge accountability	Meet obligations upward to donors and government and, equally, downward to the children and communities KTN serves.
Generate learning	Turn operational data into transferable knowledge for KTN and for a sector that has lacked it — including learning about what did not work.

The plan serves several audiences at once. For the Board it is the instrument of oversight. For donors it is the evidence of value for money. For programme staff it is the protocol for collection, quality, and reporting. For communities it is the guarantee that KTN remains answerable. And for the sector it is a contribution to the shared evidence base on pastoralist child protection that no organisation currently maintains.

MEAL Vision and Objectives

A MEAL system that any case manager, board member, or donor can trust — because it measures what actually happens to children, and says so even when the news is unwelcome.

That vision disaggregates into six MEAL objectives, each a quality the system as a whole must have.

#	MEAL objective	What success looks like
1	Measure outcomes, not activity	Every programme reports at outcome level; activity is tracked for management only.
2	Track children longitudinally	Every child in case management carries a unique ID; follow-up at 6, 12, and 24 months is the norm, not the exception.
3	Guarantee data quality	Routine data quality assessment; indicators defined before collection begins; figures a third party could verify.
4	Make data drive decisions	Three dashboard tiers, quarterly reflection, and an adaptive-management protocol that turns signals into action.
5	Be accountable in both directions	Upward reporting that meets donor standards; downward accountability in Nga'Karamojong that the sector neglects.
6	Protect every child in the data	Compliance with Uganda's Data Protection and Privacy Act; encryption, role-based access, and minimal collection.

KTN Results Measurement Approach

KTN's measurement approach is built on one distinction that the sector has blurred to its cost: the difference between an output and an outcome. An output is what KTN produced — committees formed, children reached, sessions run. An outcome is what changed for a child, a family, or a community. The sector has measured outputs for decades, and the children are still on the streets. KTN tracks outputs to manage the work, and judges the work by outcomes.

Where KTN measures — the points the sector skips

The defining feature of the approach is when it measures. Most reintegration measurement stops at the point of family handover, which is precisely where the failures begin. KTN measures at month 1, 3, 6, 12, and 24 after reintegration, because the 12-to-24-month window is when most children return to the streets. Measuring there is what converts reintegration from a presumed outcome into a measured one.



Outcome-weighted, equity-disaggregated, honestly reported

Three further commitments complete the approach. Outcome-weighting means the indicator set leans toward sustained retention and return-to-street rather than activity counts. Equity-disaggregation means every child-level indicator is broken down by sex as a minimum — KTN expects at least 55 percent of its caseload to be girls, reflecting the population's gender skew — and by age band, district, and disability status where the data supports it. Honest reporting means the means of verification is specified for every indicator, so that what is claimed can be checked, and single-source figures are flagged as such.

Theory of Change and Results Chain

The Strategic Plan sets out KTN's theory of change as six if-then pathways, one per SHIELD pillar. This plan adds the measurement layer: for each pathway, the result it predicts and the indicator that tests it. Surfacing the chain this way exposes where the model could fail, which is the prerequisite for measuring the right things rather than the convenient ones.

Read as a single chain, the logic runs: **inputs** (Nga'Karamojong-fluent staff, KoboToolbox, partnerships) produce **outputs** (committees, outreach contacts, reintegrations) which, if the assumptions hold, produce **outcomes** (children who stay in school and at home) which aggregate to the **impact** the Strategic Plan seeks: a weakened cycle of street migration for the children KTN reaches, and a shifted sector practice beyond them.

SHIELD pathway	The result it predicts	The indicator that tests it
Safeguard — prevention	Fewer children recruited; the cohort entering the corridor declines	Functional CPCs; recruitment incidents flagged; out-migration at sub-county level
Heal — response	Trust built with children existing services miss; voluntary engagement	Children engaged; drop-in attendance; share entering voluntary case management
Integrate — reintegration	Return-to-street falls; reintegration becomes measurable	School retention at 12/24 months; return-to-street rate; follow-up completeness
Empower — education	Street-return reduction associated with school enrolment is reproduced	Enrolment and retention; vocational completion and placement; earnings outcomes
Lead — advocacy	The legal and policy environment becomes more enabling	Reforms influenced; budget shifts year-on-year; documented conduct changes

SHIELD pathway	The result it predicts	The indicator that tests it
Data — evidence	The sector moves from activity-counting toward outcome measurement	Children in the database; partners using KTN standards; research published

TWO ASSUMPTIONS MONITORED MOST CLOSELY

The Strategic Plan flags two assumptions that the whole theory rests on, and MEAL watches both from the first operational quarter. First, that children will choose voluntary engagement when offered a credible alternative to forced removal — tested by the share of outreach contacts that convert to voluntary case management. Second, that source-community livelihoods can be strengthened enough to outweigh the pull of urban begging income — tested by household income change against out-migration in CPC-served areas. If either fails, the theory of change requires revision rather than scaled implementation.

MEAL Principles

Seven principles govern how KTN does MEAL. They are operational commitments, not slogans: each one constrains a real decision the system makes.

- **Outcomes over activity.** The basis of performance assessment is outcome change. Activity is tracked to manage the work, never to claim success.
- **Utility first.** Data is collected because a named person will use it for a named decision. If no one will act on a number, KTN does not collect it.
- **Do no harm.** Measurement never exposes a child to risk. Safeguarding-sensitive data is collected under stricter protocols (Section 33) and minimised by design.
- **Rigour proportionate to stakes.** Methods are as rigorous as the decision requires — outcome claims that inform scaling get independent verification; routine monitoring does not.
- **Disaggregation by default.** Every child-level figure is sex-disaggregated at minimum; equity is visible, so the system can see when it is failing girls or boys differentially.
- **Honesty including failure.** KTN reports what did not work. An organisation that only publishes its successes is not learning; it is marketing.
- **Community ownership.** Communities are not only data subjects; they receive findings back, in Nga'Karamojong, and their feedback shapes what KTN measures.

MEAL Governance Structure

MEAL only works if someone owns it at every level, from the Board that sets the strategy to the case manager who records a follow-up visit. KTN's governance assigns a clear MEAL mandate at each tier, with decision rights that prevent data tasks from slipping between roles.

Level	Body / role	MEAL mandate
Govern	Board of Directors	Owens the MEAL Plan; approves it and major revisions; receives quarterly performance and safeguarding data; takes the Phase 2-to-3 scaling decision.
Oversee	Programmes Sub-Committee	Scrutinises outcome performance and evaluation findings each quarter; reviews the risk register; signs off evaluation terms of reference.
Oversee	Finance & Audit Sub-Committee	Oversees data-protection and information-security risk and value-for-money analysis; reviews the annual data quality assessment.
Own	Executive Director	Accountable owner of the Plan; ensures MEAL is resourced and acted on; presents results to the Board; final sign-off on external reports.
Run	MEAL Lead	Custodian of the Plan; runs the results framework, tools, database, quality assurance, analysis, dashboards, and reporting; convenes quarterly reflection.
Collect	Programme Manager & field teams	Own data collection in their areas; ensure timeliness and completeness; act on dashboard flags for their caseload.
Collect	Case & outreach workers, CPCs	Front-line collection against agreed tools; first point of accountability to children and families.
Support	Finance, IT/data, Safeguarding leads	Provide cost data for value-for-money, maintain the platform and its security, and govern safeguarding-sensitive data.

Decision rights

Routine course-correction sits with the MEAL Lead and Programme Manager through the quarterly reflection. Changes to indicators, targets, or the results framework require the Executive Director's approval and, if material, the Programmes Sub-Committee. Changes to the MEAL Plan itself require Board approval. The scaling gate between Phase 2 and Phase 3 is a Board decision, taken on the evidence of the mid-term evaluation.

Roles and Responsibilities Matrix

The matrix below assigns, for each core MEAL function, who is Responsible (does the work), Accountable (answerable for the result – one role only), Consulted, and Informed. It removes the ambiguity that lets data tasks slip.

R Responsible **A** Accountable **C** Consulted **I** Informed

MEAL function	Board / Sub-Cttee	Exec Director	MEAL Lead	Prog. Mgr	Field teams
Approve the MEAL Plan	A	R	C	I	I
Maintain results framework & indicators	I	A	R	C	I

MEAL function	Board / Sub-Cttee	Exec Director	MEAL Lead	Prog. Mgr	Field teams
Collect field data to agreed tools	—	I	C	A	R
Run data quality assessment	I	A	R	C	C
Manage the longitudinal database	—	I	A/R	C	C
Build & maintain dashboards	I	A	R	C	I
Quarterly reflection & adaptation	I	A	R	R	C
Commission evaluations	A	R	C	I	I
Community feedback & complaints	I	A	C	R	R
Upward / donor reporting	I	A	R	C	I
Safeguard MEAL data & privacy	A	R	C	C	I

2

PART TWO

THE RESULTS ARCHITECTURE

What KTN measures, the indicators that carry the measuring, and the milestone path from a standing start to the 2030 targets.

Section 10 · Strategic Results Framework

Section 11 · Programme-Level Results Framework

Section 12 · Indicator Development Framework

Section 13 · Indicator Reference Sheets

Section 14 · Baseline, Target and Milestone Framework



Strategic Results Framework

The Strategic Results Framework is the spine of this plan. It carries the six SHIELD objectives, each with the outcome indicators that test it, the 2030 target, and the means by which a third party could verify the figure. It reproduces and operationalises Annex A of the Strategic Plan. Targets are cumulative five-year figures unless stated. Baselines marked TBE are established during the Phase 1 baseline study.

A few indicators measured well, not many measured badly. Every one here is outcome-level, sex-disaggregated, and tied to a source a third party could check.

Objective 1 · Safeguard — prevention in Karamoja

Outcome indicator	Target 2030	Means of verification
Functional village-level Child Protection Committees across Napak, Moroto, Kotido	30	CPC reports; quarterly monitoring visits
Households with active livelihood support and documented income improvement	1,200	VSLA records; household income surveys
Reduction in trafficking recruitment incidents at monitored markets vs baseline	-40%	Market monitoring logs; COPTIP referral data

Objective 2 · Heal — response in urban areas

Outcome indicator	Target 2030	Means of verification
Children engaged through KTN street outreach	4,000	Outreach records; unique-ID database
Cumulative drop-in centre attendance (child-visits)	12,000+	Drop-in centre attendance logs
Street-engaged children entering voluntary case management	35%+	Case management database

Objective 3 · Integrate — reintegration with follow-up

Outcome indicator	Target 2030	Means of verification
Children in active reintegration case management (cumulative)	2,500	Child-tracking database
School retention at 12 months post-reintegration	80%+	Follow-up monitoring; school records
Return-to-street rate within 24 months of reintegration	<15%	24-month follow-up data

Objective 4 · Empower — education and livelihoods

Outcome indicator	Target 2030	Means of verification
Children enrolled in formal schooling or accelerated learning	2,200	School enrolment records; AL programme data
Youth (15–24) completing vocational training with documented outcomes	600	Training records; 6 & 12-month placement surveys
Young mothers and adolescent girls in dedicated support	400	Programme records

Objective 5 · Lead — advocacy and sector leadership

Outcome indicator	Target 2030	Means of verification
Policy or legislative reforms substantively influenced	3	Policy documents; coalition records
Legal aid or paralegal accompaniment cases	500	Legal aid case files
Sector coordination forums convened or co-convened	10	Forum reports; partner confirmations

Objective 6 · Data — evidence and accountability

Outcome indicator	Target 2030	Means of verification
Children in longitudinal database with 6, 12, 24-month outcome data	2,500	Child-tracking database
Research outputs published (peer-reviewed and grey literature)	5+	Publications; university partner records
Partner organisations adopting KTN-supported data standards	10+	Partner MOUs; adoption records

RESULTS-FRAMEWORK INTEGRITY

Each indicator is specific, measurable, and time-bound against a defined population and baseline year — the form institutional evaluators expect. The set is deliberately outcome-weighted: sustained school retention and return-to-street rate rather than activity counts. Every indicator is disaggregated by sex and, where relevant, by age band, district, and disability status. Baselines that do not yet exist are marked for establishment in the Phase 1 baseline study.

Programme-Level Results Framework

Beneath each strategic outcome sit the outputs KTN delivers to produce it, and beneath each output the indicators that track delivery. The output layer is how the programme is managed week to week; the outcome layer is how it is judged. The tables below give the output-level framework for the two pillars that carry the largest share of the budget and the largest share of the sector's gap: Safeguard and Integrate. The same structure governs the remaining four pillars in the working framework.

Safeguard – output indicators

Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target 2030	Frequency	Responsible
1.1 CPCs established and functional	CPCs meeting quarterly to terms of reference	0	30	Quarterly	Community Dev. Officers
	At-risk children identified by CPCs and referred within 30 days	0%	60%	Monthly	MEAL Lead
	Early-warning alerts triggered on IPC deterioration	0	80% within 2 weeks	Quarterly	Programme Manager
1.2 Norm change on trafficking	Community dialogues held in Nga'Karamojong	0	120 / year	Monthly	Social Workers
	Community members perceiving migration as exploitation	TBE	+50% from baseline	Annually	MEAL Lead
	Trafficking recruitment points under surveillance	0	6 markets	Monthly	Community Dev. Officers

Integrate — output indicators

Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target 2030	Frequency	Responsible
3.1 Tracing & assessment	Two-directional tracings completed to evidence standard	0	2,500	Monthly	Case managers
	Household safety & capacity assessments before reunification	0	100% of cases	Per case	Social Workers
3.2 Supported reunification	Voluntary supported reunifications with transition package	0	2,500	Monthly	Case managers
3.3 Long-term follow-up	Cases with complete 6/12/24-month follow-up records	0	85%+	Monthly	MEAL Lead
	Return-to-street risk flags raised and acted on	0	100% actioned	Monthly	Programme Manager

Indicator Development Framework

Every indicator in this plan follows a single naming convention, so that anyone reading a dashboard or report can place a number instantly. The code records the level, the pillar, and the sequence.

Element	Convention	Example
Level	SO = strategic outcome; OP = output; PR = process	SO-...
Pillar	S, H, I, E, L, D for the six SHIELD pillars	SO-I-...
Sequence	Two digits within level and pillar	SO-I-02
Read as	Strategic Outcome, Integrate pillar, indicator 02	SO-I-02 = return-to-street rate

What makes an indicator good enough to keep

KTN does not add indicators because they are measurable; it adds them because a decision depends on them. Each candidate indicator must pass four tests before it enters the framework: it measures something a named person will act on; it can be collected without exposing a child to risk; it can be defined precisely enough that two people measuring it get the same answer; and the cost of collecting it is proportionate to the value of knowing it. Indicators that fail any test are dropped, however appealing they look in a logframe.

Indicator Reference Sheets

Every indicator KTN tracks has a reference sheet completed before data collection begins. It is the contract that fixes what a number means, so that the figure is stable across collectors, sites, and years. The blank structure is at Annex C; one worked example appears below, for the indicator that matters most.

Field	Entry — worked example
Indicator code & title	SO-I-02 · Return-to-street rate within 24 months of reintegration
SHIELD pillar & objective	Integrate · Objective 3 — reintegration that holds
Definition	The share of reintegrated children who, at any point within 24 months of reunification, return to living or working on the street.
Unit & disaggregation	Percentage. Disaggregated by sex, age band, district, and disability status.
Calculation	Numerator: children with a documented street return within 24 months. Denominator: children reintegrated at least 24 months earlier in the cohort.
Means of verification	Case-manager follow-up records; CPC knowledge; urban outreach re-identification; database flags.
Collection method & tool	Follow-up form (M1–M24) in KoboToolbox, against the unique child identifier.
Frequency & responsible	Contact at months 1, 3, 6, 12, 24; rate computed quarterly by the MEAL Lead.
Baseline & target	Baseline 0 (no cohort yet); target below 15% by 2030.
Notes & limitations	Rates reported only for cohorts of 30+ to avoid misleading small-number percentages; multi-source triangulation flagged where a single source is used.

Baseline, Target and Milestone Framework

A 2030 target with no milestones is a wish. The framework below sets the milestone path — the year-on-year trajectory against which the Board and donors judge whether the programme is on course long before the deadline. It is the headline view; the full Performance Indicator Tracking Table the MEAL Lead updates each quarter is at Annex B.

Indicator	Baseline	Year 1	Year 3	Year 5 target	Means of verification
Children reached through outreach	0	400	1,800	4,000	Outreach contact log
Children in active case management	0	150	900	2,500	Case-management database
Children reintegrated with families	0	120	600	2,500	Reunification records
Children safe at 24 months	0	—	300	900	Follow-up; re-identification
Children retained in school	0	90	480	2,200	School registers
Households with livelihood support	0	50	600	1,200	Livelihood records
Functional CPCs	0	2	20	30	CPC checklist
Youth completing vocational training	0	0	250	600	Training records
Children with 6/12/24-month data	0	0	600	2,500	Database completeness report

THE PHASE-2 GATE, EXPRESSED AS NUMBERS

The milestone path is not just a reporting convenience; it carries the decision the whole roadmap turns on. If the Year-1 and early Year-2 cohort does not show the school-retention and return-to-street figures the model predicts, Phase 3 becomes a revision phase rather than a scaling phase. The discipline to not scale a model that is missing its milestones is itself a result this framework is built to enable.

3

PART THREE

THE DATA SYSTEM

How data is collected, checked, stored, analysed, reported, and turned into dashboards — the machinery that converts a child's situation into a number someone can act on.

Section 15 · Data Collection Framework

Section 16 · Data Sources and Verification Methods

Section 17 · Data Collection Tools and Systems

Section 18 · Digital Data Collection Approach

Section 19 · Data Quality Assurance Framework

Section 20 · Data Management and Storage

Section 21 · Data Analysis and Visualisation

Section 22 · Reporting Framework

Section 23 · Dashboard and Performance Tracking



Data Collection Framework

KTN collects data through routine monitoring, periodic surveys, qualitative inquiry, and the case-management records that form the longitudinal spine. The framework keeps the toolset deliberately small: a child is registered once, given a unique identifier, and every subsequent contact attaches to that identifier rather than generating a parallel record. This is what makes longitudinal tracking possible and double-counting visible.

Stream	What it captures	Cadence
Case-management records	Every child-level event from first contact to 24-month follow-up	Continuous, per contact
Routine programme monitoring	Outputs delivered: dialogues, drop-in attendance, CPC activity	Monthly
Periodic surveys	Household income; knowledge, attitudes and practices; vocational outcomes	Annual / 6–12 month
Qualitative inquiry	Most Significant Change stories, FGDs, key-informant interviews, case studies	Quarterly / as needed
Evaluation studies	Baseline, mid-term, endline against the results framework	Phased (Section 29)

Data Sources and Verification Methods

The credibility of an outcome figure rests on whether it can be verified against a source a third party could check. KTN therefore names a means of verification for every indicator, and triangulates the figures that carry the most weight.

Return-to-street, the indicator most open to wishful reporting, is checked against three independent sources: case-manager contact, CPC knowledge in the home community, and urban outreach re-identification. Trafficking-recruitment trends combine market monitoring, COPTIP referral data, and CPC reports. Where a number rests on a single source, the reporting says so, so that readers can weigh it accordingly rather than treating every figure as equally solid.

*A figure that cannot be verified is an opinion with a decimal point.
KTN names the source for every number it reports.*

Data Collection Tools and Systems

Every form maps to indicators by their codes, carries the unique child identifier, and is built once in KoboToolbox rather than reinvented per project. The full tool-to-indicator matrix is at Annex F; the headline instruments are below.

Tool	Purpose	Feeds
Outreach engagement form	Record street contacts and presenting needs	Heal outputs; SO-H indicators
Case registration form	Open a case; assign unique ID; record consent / assent	All child-level indicators
Family tracing form	Document two-directional tracing to evidence standard	Integrate outputs
Household safety & capacity assessment	Assess the receiving home before reunification	Integrate; safeguarding
Reunification record	Record supported reunification and transition package	SO-I-01
Follow-up form (M1–M24)	Capture attendance, household economy, wellbeing, risk	SO-I-02, SO-I-03
CPC monitoring form	Community-level monitoring and out-migration signals	Safeguard; context
Community scorecard	Structured community feedback on KTN services	Accountability
Feedback & complaints form	Log, route, and track feedback and complaints	Accountability; safeguarding
Vocational outcome survey	6 and 12-month employment / enterprise outcomes	SO-E-02
Data quality assessment checklist	Quarterly check of validity, reliability, completeness	Process indicators

Forms are versioned. When a form changes, the version is recorded so that data collected under different versions can be read correctly. Old forms are retired, not edited in place, to protect the comparability the outcome indicators depend on.

Digital Data Collection Approach

KTN is, by design, more data-capable than most of the sector. Practical fluency with KoboToolbox and Power BI is one of the three assets the Strategic Plan rests on. The digital approach turns that fluency into a working system rather than a claim.

KoboToolbox for field collection

Field data is collected on KoboToolbox using mobile devices that work offline and sync when a connection is available — essential in Karamoja, where connectivity is intermittent. Forms carry skip logic and validation so that errors are caught at the point of entry rather than in the office weeks later. Every submission carries the unique child identifier, the collector, the date, and the GPS point where collection rules permit it.

From form to database to dashboard

Submissions feed the central child-tracking database, which is the single source of truth for every child-level indicator. Power BI reads from the database to build the three dashboard tiers in Section 23. The chain is deliberately short — collect once, store once, visualise many times — so that a case manager's follow-up visit on Monday is visible on the programme dashboard by midweek.

Data Quality Assurance Framework

Data that is wrong is worse than no data, because it invites confident bad decisions. KTN assesses data quality against five standard dimensions and acts on what the assessment finds.

Dimension	The question it asks
Validity	Does the data actually measure what the indicator claims to measure?
Reliability	Would the same measurement, repeated, give the same result?
Timeliness	Is the data available in time for the decision it is meant to inform?
Completeness	Are records present for all cases that should have them, with no silent gaps?
Integrity	Is the data protected from manipulation, accidental or deliberate?

A data quality assessment runs quarterly on a sample of records, tracing each from the field form to the database to the report, and confirming the figure survives the journey unchanged. Findings feed a short action log with named owners and deadlines. The annual assessment is reviewed by the Finance and Audit Sub-Committee, which treats data integrity as an audit matter, not a programme afterthought.

Data Management and Storage

KTN works with children who have experienced trafficking, exploitation, and violence. Their data is among the most sensitive an organisation can hold, and it is managed accordingly, in compliance with Uganda's Data Protection and Privacy Act (2019).

- **Minimal collection.** KTN collects the least data needed to protect and serve the child. Fields that are merely interesting are not collected.
- **Encryption and role-based access.** Data is encrypted in transit and at rest; staff see only the records their role requires; the child-identifiable layer is tightly restricted.
- **Consent and assent.** Collection records informed consent from the caregiver and age-appropriate assent from the child, in Nga'Karamojong.
- **Retention limits.** Records are kept only as long as the protection purpose requires, then securely archived or destroyed to schedule.
- **Breach protocol.** A defined response covers detection, containment, notification, and review — rehearsed, not improvised.

Data Analysis and Visualisation

Analysis turns records into the answers decisions need. KTN runs three layers of analysis, each at the altitude of a different decision-maker. Descriptive analysis tracks what is happening — how many children, retained at what rate, in which districts. Comparative analysis asks whether outcomes differ by sex, age, district, or pillar, surfacing equity gaps the headline figure hides. And explanatory analysis, drawing on the applied research programme in Section 30, asks the question the sector has never been able to answer: what predicts a reintegration that holds, versus one that fails?

Visualisation is built on Power BI and governed by one rule: every chart answers a question its viewer actually has. Vanity metrics are excluded. Targets are shown as targets and results as results, never blended; data freshness is shown so a stale figure is never mistaken for a current one; and small cells are suppressed so that no individual child is identifiable from an aggregate.

Reporting Framework

Reporting is layered so each audience gets what it needs at the cadence it needs, without parallel data collection. Donor-specific indicators are mapped to KTN's own indicators so that a single data system serves multiple reporting lines.

Report	Audience	Cadence	Drawn from
Case follow-up flags	Case managers	Weekly	Tier-1 dashboard
Programme monitoring report	Programme leadership	Monthly	Routine monitoring; Tier-2 dashboard
Quarterly MEAL report	Board; Programmes Sub-Committee	Quarterly	Results framework; PITT (Annex K)
Donor narrative & financial reports	Donors	Per grant	Mapped indicators; VfM analysis
Annual performance review	Board; public	Annual	Full results framework; evaluation findings
State of Pastoralist Child Protection Report	Sector; public	Annual from 2028	KTN data + shared partner data

A donor report that hides a missed target buys short-term comfort at the cost of the long-term trust KTN's whole model depends on. KTN reports what did not work, not only what did.

Dashboard and Performance Tracking

Dashboards are operational discipline, not novelty. They are the mechanism by which a case manager sees which children need a visit this week and the Board sees whether the strategy is on track. KTN runs three tiers, each showing the right altitude of detail for its user. Full specifications are at Annex P.

Tier	User	Shows	Refresh
1 • Case-manager view	Case managers	Individual case status; follow-ups due this week; risk flags	Near real time
2 • Programme view	Programme leadership; pillar leads	Cohort aggregates; output and outcome trends; exception flags; equity splits	Near real time
3 • Board & donor view	Board; donors	Headline outcomes; progress vs targets; value for money	Monthly / quarterly

What good looks like on a dashboard

- **Decision-first.** Each tier answers the question its user actually has, not every question that could be asked.
- **Honest.** Targets shown as targets, results as results; data freshness shown so a stale figure is not mistaken for current.
- **Confidential.** Tiers 2 and 3 show aggregates only; small cells are suppressed so no child is identifiable.
- **On-brand.** Clean and uncluttered, in KTN's palette, so the dashboard reads as the organisation's own.

The case-manager tier is the one that earns its keep daily. It converts the longitudinal database from a reporting asset into a protection tool: a child whose 12-month follow-up is overdue appears on a list, and someone is responsible for clearing that list. That is how a tracking system stops being a promise and becomes the reason a child is not lost.

4

PART FOUR

ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEARNING

How KTN stays answerable to the children it serves, learns from what the data shows, and proves — through evaluation and research — whether the model works.

Section 24 · Community Accountability Framework

Section 25 · Feedback and Complaints Monitoring

Section 26 · Participation and Inclusion Monitoring

Section 27 · Learning Agenda

Section 28 · Reflection and Adaptive Management

Section 29 · Evaluation Framework

Section 30 · Research and Evidence Generation

KARAMOJA TUMAINI NETWORK · MEAL PLAN 2026–2030



Community Accountability Framework

Accountability runs in two directions. Upward accountability to donors and regulators is met through audited reporting against the results framework. Downward accountability to the children and communities KTN serves is the one the sector neglects, and the one KTN treats as constitutive of its model.

Downward accountability is built, not bolted on. It operates in Nga'Karamojong, through channels accessible to people who may not read or write, and it feeds operational decisions rather than sitting in a file.

Mechanism	How it works
Information sharing	Programme information shared proactively in Nga'Karamojong through community meetings, radio, and printed materials, so communities know what KTN does and does not do.
Community scorecards	Annual participatory scoring of KTN's performance by community members in target sub-counties, administered through the CPCs.
Child-voice documentation	What children say about services, recorded in their own language and fed into operational decisions and public reporting.
Complaints and response	A complaints procedure accessible regardless of literacy, with defined timelines and a response back to the complainant.

Downward accountability is the one the sector neglects, and the one KTN treats as constitutive of its model — not a courtesy, a design parameter.

Feedback and Complaints Monitoring

A feedback mechanism that no one monitors is theatre. KTN logs every piece of feedback and every complaint, categorises it, routes it, and tracks it to closure — and reports the pattern, because the aggregate of what communities complain about is itself programme intelligence.

Step	What happens	Standard
Receive	Feedback or complaint logged via suggestion box, community meeting, SMS line, or staff	Same day
Categorise	Sorted by type; safeguarding concerns flagged and escalated immediately	Within 24 hours
Route	Assigned to the responsible role with a due date	Within 48 hours
Resolve	Investigated and closed with a response to the complainant	Within 15 working days

Step	What happens	Standard
Learn	Patterns reviewed quarterly; recurring issues feed adaptation	Quarterly

SAFEGUARDING COMPLAINTS ARE DIFFERENT

Any complaint touching the safety of a child is removed from the routine flow and handled under the safeguarding protocol (Section 33): immediate escalation to the Board and to independent review, never managed internally to protect reputation. The complaints log records that such a complaint was received and escalated, but its substance is held in the restricted safeguarding system, not the general one.

Participation and Inclusion Monitoring

KTN measures not only what it achieves but who it reaches, because a programme can hit its headline targets while quietly missing the most vulnerable. Two equity commitments are monitored continuously.

On gender, the Karamojong street population is unusually skewed toward girls, and the trafficking economy specifically targets them. KTN commits that at least 55 percent of children in case management will be girls, and every child-level indicator is sex-disaggregated so the system can see, in real time, when programming is failing girls or boys differentially.

On disability, children with disabilities are over-represented among the most vulnerable and routinely invisible in street-children programming. KTN screens for disability during health assessment using the Washington Group questions and disaggregates programme data by disability status. This is the least developed of KTN's inclusion commitments at adoption, and the plan says so honestly; building it out is a Phase 2 priority, in partnership with disabled persons' organisations.

Learning Agenda

Learning is the point of the whole MEAL system. KTN's learning agenda is organised around the questions the sector has been unable to answer, because answering them is how KTN earns its claim to sector leadership.

- **What predicts a reintegration that holds?** Which child, family, and household factors separate the children who stay home from those who return — the single most valuable question in this field.
- **How cost-effective is prevention versus response?** What does a sustained outcome cost in Karamoja prevention compared with Kampala response — the evidence the budget-shift advocacy depends on.
- **How do trafficking networks adapt?** How recruitment patterns shift in response to interventions, so prevention stays a step closer rather than a step behind.
- **What are the gender-differentiated outcomes?** Where the trajectories of girls and boys diverge, and whether programming closes or widens the gap.
- **Does the integrated SHIELD model beat single-pillar approaches?** Whether addressing all six failure points together outperforms the fragmented responses that have dominated.

Reflection and Adaptive Management

Data only earns its cost if it changes what KTN does. The adaptive-management protocol turns monitoring signals into decisions through a defined sequence, so that course-correction is routine rather than heroic.

Step	What happens	Who
Detect	Monthly monitoring data scanned for off-track indicators and emerging risks	MEAL Lead
Investigate	Signals checked through data analysis, field verification, and stakeholder consultation	MEAL Lead; Programme Manager
Decide	Adaptations agreed within thresholds; larger changes escalated for approval	Programme Manager; Exec Director
Implement	Adaptation made, with rationale and expected effect documented	Field teams
Track	Adapted activity watched closely to confirm the change worked	MEAL Lead

Reflection rhythms

Three reflection moments anchor the year. Quarterly learning reviews are half-day sessions where the team reads the data, names what it is seeing, and agrees adaptations. The annual reflection workshop brings board, staff, partners, and community representatives together for two days. And peer-learning exchanges with S.A.L.V.E. International, Dwelling Places, and Hope for Justice keep KTN honest against how others solve the same problems.

Evaluation Framework

Monitoring tells KTN whether it is on track; evaluation tells it whether the model works. Three evaluation moments structure the five years, each with an independent external component so the findings carry weight beyond KTN's own account of itself. Evaluations apply the OECD-DAC criteria — relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

Evaluation	Timing	Purpose
Baseline study	Phase 1	Establishes the starting position against which all change is measured; sets the TBE baselines in the results framework.
Mid-term evaluation	End of Phase 2 (month 18)	Assesses whether the pilot has demonstrated the outcomes required to justify scaling; informs the Phase 2-to-3 gate. Independent external component.
Final evaluation	Year 5	Assesses achievement against the strategic objectives and informs the successor strategy. Independent external component.

THE MID-TERM EVALUATION IS A GATE, NOT A MILESTONE

The mid-term evaluation is the most consequential measurement event in the plan. It is the evidence on which the Board decides whether Phase 3 scales the model or revises it. If the pilot has not produced the school-retention and return-to-street results the model predicts, the honest response — and the one this framework is built to enable — is to revise before scaling. An evaluation that exists to rubber-stamp a scaling decision already taken is worthless; this one is built to be able to say no.

Research and Evidence Generation

KTN's operational data allows questions that the sector has not been able to ask, because no one else holds longitudinal outcome records on this population. The applied research programme turns that data into transferable knowledge, in partnership with Makerere and Gulu Universities and the AfriChild Centre for methodological rigour and independent credibility.

Two research outputs are committed for 2028 and 2030 on the predictors of sustained reintegration — the question at the centre of the learning agenda. From 2028 an annual State of Pastoralist Child Protection Report brings together KTN data, partner data shared on agreed terms, and government sources, filling a reference role no organisation currently plays. All research carries ethics approval and follows the same minimal-collection and confidentiality rules as routine MEAL, because research on vulnerable children raises the ethical stakes, it does not lower them.

KTN holds longitudinal outcome data no peer holds. The obligation that comes with that is to turn it into knowledge the whole sector can use — including the findings that are not flattering.

5

PART FIVE

MAKING IT WORK

The partnerships, risks, safeguards, sequencing, and resources that decide whether this plan stays on a shelf or runs in the field.

Section 31 · Partnership and Capacity Strengthening

Section 32 · Risk Management in MEAL

Section 33 · Safeguarding Considerations in MEAL

Section 34 · Implementation Roadmap

Section 35 · MEAL Budget Considerations

Section 36 · Review and Continuous Improvement



Partnership and Capacity Strengthening

KTN's data ambition exceeds any single organisation's reach, and that is by design. The Data pillar's purpose is not a proprietary platform but a shared standard the sector can adopt, so MEAL is partly an exercise in building others' capacity alongside KTN's own.

Internally, capacity strengthening accepts a recruitment constraint deliberately: KTN hires for Nga'Karamojong fluency and builds technical MEAL skill on top, rather than hiring technicians and treating language as a trainable add-on — the model that has failed across the sector. Community volunteers and recovered former street youth are a structural part of the data workforce, with training, stipends, and a pathway toward formal roles.

Externally, KTN offers its MEAL capacity to peers as a paid service, and leads, with UCRNN and willing partners, a process to develop shared data standards: common indicator definitions and agreed identification methods that prevent double-counting while protecting confidentiality. Adoption is voluntary; the value proposition, not a mandate, is what carries it. The earned income this generates is targeted at 8 to 12 percent of revenue by 2030 and funds precisely the long-term follow-up that donors under-fund.

Risk Management in MEAL

The risks below are specific to the MEAL system; the programme-wide risk register sits in the Strategic Plan. Each is rated on likelihood and impact and paired with a mitigation that manages rather than pretends to eliminate it.

Risk	L	I	Mitigation
Follow-up data incomplete as cohorts grow and children move	H	H	Case-manager follow-up built into workload; dashboard flags overdue contacts; community volunteers and CPCs support re-location; realistic completeness target (85%) rather than an impossible 100%.
Data protection breach exposing confidential child information	L	H	Encryption and role-based access; compliance with the Data Protection and Privacy Act; staff training; minimal-collection principle; regular security review and a rehearsed breach protocol.
Outcome figures contested by donors or government	M	H	Means of verification named for every indicator; triangulation of the highest-stakes figures; independent external evaluation; honest flagging of single-source numbers.
Difficulty recruiting Nga'Karamojong-speaking MEAL staff	M	H	Train community members in MEAL skills rather than only hiring technicians; build a pipeline through university partnerships; competitive packages for scarce skills.
Data collection inconsistent across sites and form versions	M	M	Forms built once and versioned; quarterly data quality assessment; standard tools mapped to indicator codes; retraining where the DQA finds drift.
MEAL treated as reporting compliance rather than a management tool	M	M	Dashboards designed decision-first; quarterly reflection embedded; adaptive-management protocol with named owners; Board scrutiny of outcome performance each quarter.

L = Likelihood, I = Impact. H = High, M = Medium, L = Low. The first two risks are flagged for standing attention: follow-up completeness, because it is the variable the whole longitudinal model depends on, and data protection, because the cost of a breach is borne by a child.

Safeguarding Considerations in MEAL

Collecting data from children who have experienced trafficking, exploitation, and violence carries its own safeguarding risk: the act of measurement can re-traumatise, expose, or endanger. KTN's MEAL is governed by a do-no-harm standard that sits above the value of any data point.

- **Consent and assent, always.** No data is collected without informed caregiver consent and age-appropriate child assent, in Nga'Karamojong, with the right to decline any question.
- **Trained collectors only.** Staff collecting sensitive data are trained in trauma-informed approaches and PSEA; sensitive interviews are conducted by appropriately matched workers.
- **Minimise the sensitive.** Where a protection decision does not need a distressing detail, KTN does not collect it. The burden of proof is on collection, not omission.
- **Separate the safeguarding channel.** Safeguarding-relevant data is held in a restricted system with tighter access than routine MEAL, and disclosures of harm trigger the response protocol, not a database entry alone.
- **Confidentiality in outputs.** Small cells suppressed; no child identifiable from any published figure, dashboard, or research output.

THE STANDARD, STATED PLAINLY

If collecting a piece of data would put a child at risk, KTN does not collect it — however useful the number would be. A MEAL system that harms the children it measures has failed at the one thing that matters, regardless of how complete its dataset looks.

Implementation Roadmap

The MEAL system is built in step with the four programme phases, on the same discipline the Strategic Plan applies: build small and measurable before scaling. The system that tracks 100 children well in Phase 2 is the system that can track 2,500 in Phase 4.

Phase	MEAL build	Key deliverable
Phase 1 · Foundation (M1–6)	Finalise the MEAL framework; design and pilot KoboToolbox forms; stand up data-protection architecture; run the baseline study	Framework, tools, and baselines in place
Phase 2 · Pilot (M7–18)	Database operational with first dashboards; full longitudinal tracking on 100+ children; research questions set with academic partners; mid-term evaluation	6-month follow-up data; evidence for the scaling gate
Phase 3 · Scale (M19–36)	Publish first applied research; launch the sector data-standards process; first MEAL consulting; 12-month follow-up on the first cohort	Published outcomes; standards process live
Phase 4 · Lead (Yr 4–5+)	Establish the annual State of Pastoralist Child Protection Report; 24-month follow-up on the original cohort; data system adopted by 10+ peers	Sector reference role; full longitudinal dataset

MEAL Budget Considerations

MEAL is resourced at 8 to 12 percent of programme costs — the range institutional donors expect for a system of this ambition, and the level the longitudinal model genuinely requires. Under-resourcing MEAL is a false economy: the follow-up data is the asset that distinguishes KTN, and follow-up is the line most easily cut and most damaging to lose.

MEAL cost area	What it covers	Indicative share
Personnel	MEAL Lead; data support; a share of field-team collection time	~40%
Digital systems	KoboToolbox, the child-tracking database, Power BI, hosting, security	~12%
Evaluations	Baseline, mid-term, and final — with independent external components	~22%
Data collection	Surveys, qualitative inquiry, devices, field data-collection costs	~16%
Learning & research	Reflection workshops, applied research, the annual sector report	~10%

Unrestricted earned income funds the long-term follow-up that defines the Integrate pillar — which is why a modest 8-to-12 percent earned-income target matters out of proportion to its size.

Review and Continuous Improvement

This plan is a living document, not a fixed artefact. It is reviewed annually by the MEAL Lead and Executive Director and approved by the Board, and sooner when KTN's strategy, programmes, donor requirements, or operating environment change materially. The annual review asks a short, honest set of questions: Are we measuring the right things? Is the data we collect actually being used? What did we learn that should change how we measure? And where did the system fail, and why?

The review is itself an act of the learning the plan is built to enable. An organisation that cannot improve its own measurement system has no business claiming to lead a sector toward better measurement. KTN will revise this plan against what the data, the field teams, and the communities tell it — and will record what it changed and why, so the next version is accountable to this one.

WHAT SUCCESS LOOKS LIKE IN 2030

The measure will not be how many children we counted. It will be how many children, five years on, are still in school, still with their families, and no longer at risk of the streets — and whether we can prove it. That is a harder number to produce and a slower one to report. It is the only one that matters.

ADAPTED FROM THE STRATEGIC PLAN 2026–2030 · CONCLUSION

A-P

ANNEXES

OPERATIONAL TOOLS

The instruments field teams use day to day: the results framework, the tracking table, the reference-sheet and reporting templates, the calendar, the checklists, and the dashboard specification.



Annex A · Strategic Results Framework

The consolidated outcome-indicator framework across all six SHIELD objectives. Baselines marked TBE are established in the Phase 1 baseline study. Targets are cumulative five-year figures. All indicators are disaggregated by sex; most additionally by age band, district, and disability status.

Obj.	Outcome indicator	Target 2030	Means of verification
S	Functional village-level CPCs (Napak, Moroto, Kotido)	30	CPC reports; quarterly visits
S	Households with livelihood support & income improvement	1,200	VSLA records; income surveys
S	Trafficking recruitment incidents at monitored markets	-40%	Market logs; COPTIP data
H	Children engaged through outreach	4,000	Outreach records; database
H	Drop-in attendance (child-visits)	12,000+	Attendance logs
H	Voluntary case-management entry from outreach	35%+	Case-management database
I	Children in active reintegration case management	2,500	Child-tracking database
I	School retention at 12 months post-reintegration	80%+	Follow-up; school records
I	Return-to-street rate within 24 months	<15%	24-month follow-up data
E	Children in formal schooling or accelerated learning	2,200	Enrolment records; AL data
E	Youth (15–24) completing vocational training	600	Training; placement surveys
E	Young mothers / adolescent girls in dedicated support	400	Programme records
L	Policy or legislative reforms substantively influenced	3	Policy docs; coalition records
L	Legal aid / paralegal accompaniment cases	500	Legal aid case files
L	Sector coordination forums convened or co-convened	10	Forum reports; confirmations
D	Children in longitudinal database (6/12/24-month data)	2,500	Child-tracking database
D	Research outputs published	5+	Publications; partner records
D	Partners adopting KTN data standards	10+	Partner MOUs; adoption records

Annex B · Indicator Performance Tracking Table

The PITT is the live instrument the MEAL Lead updates each quarter: actuals against milestones, for every indicator, in one place. The structure below shows the milestone path; the working file holds the quarterly actuals.

Indicator	Baseline	Y1	Y3	Y5	Means of verification
Children reached through outreach	0	400	1,800	4,000	Outreach contact log
Children in active case management	0	150	900	2,500	Case-management database
Children reintegrated with families	0	120	600	2,500	Reunification records
Children safe at 24 months	0	—	300	900	Follow-up; re-identification
Children retained in school	0	90	480	2,200	School registers
Households with livelihood support	0	50	600	1,200	Livelihood records
Functional CPCs	0	2	20	30	CPC checklist
Youth completing vocational training	0	0	250	600	Training records
Children with 6/12/24-month data	0	0	600	2,500	Completeness report

Annex C · Indicator Reference Sheet Template

Completed for every indicator before data collection begins. It fixes what a number means so that two people measuring it get the same answer.

Field	What it records
Indicator code & title	Reference number and full indicator name.
SHIELD pillar & objective	Which pillar and strategic objective it serves.
Definition	Exactly what is being measured, in plain words.
Unit & disaggregation	Unit of measure; required breakdowns (sex, age band, district, disability).
Calculation	Formula, including numerator and denominator for any rate.
Means of verification	The specific source a third party would check.
Collection method & tool	How and with which instrument it is collected.
Frequency & responsible	How often, and the named role accountable.
Baseline & target	Starting value and milestone path to the 2030 target.
Notes & limitations	Known caveats, including minimum cohort size for rates.

Annex D • MEAL Activity Calendar

The recurring MEAL rhythm across a programme year. A filled marker shows the cadence at which each activity runs.

MEAL activity	Monthly	Quarterly	Bi-annual	Annual
Routine data collection & entry	•			
Dashboard refresh & review	•			
Case follow-up flag clearing	•			
Quarterly MEAL report		•		
Reflection / learning review		•		
Data quality assessment		•		
Donor reporting		•	•	
KAP / income surveys				•
Community scorecards				•
Annual performance review				•
Evaluation (per phase)				•

Annexes E to P · Tool Register

The remaining annexes are operational tools held in the MEAL working file and issued to field teams. Each is listed here with its purpose; the live versions are maintained by the MEAL Lead and versioned as in Section 17.

Annex	Tool	Purpose
E	Data Collection Plan	Maps every indicator to its source, method, tool, frequency, and responsible role.
F	Data Collection Tool Matrix	Lists every form against the indicators it feeds.
G	Data Quality Assessment Checklist	The quarterly DQA instrument across the five quality dimensions.
H	Baseline and Endline Study Guidance	Method, sampling, ethics, and limitations for the phased studies.
I	Evaluation Terms of Reference Template	Standard ToR for commissioning independent evaluation.
J	Learning Agenda Template	Structure for documenting a learning question through to recommendation.
K	Quarterly MEAL Reporting Template	The standard quarterly report against the results framework.
L	Programme Monitoring Checklist	Field checklist for routine monitoring visits.
M	Community Feedback Monitoring Tool	Logs, categorises, and tracks feedback and complaints to closure.
N	Safeguarding-Sensitive Data Collection Checklist	Do-no-harm checks before collecting sensitive data from children.
O	MEAL Capacity Building Plan	Training pathway for staff, volunteers, and community collectors.
P	Power BI Dashboard Requirements	Specification for the three dashboard tiers in Section 23.



KARAMOJA TUMAINI NETWORK

MONITOR · MEASURE · LEARN · IMPROVE

**Behind every number
is a child with a name.**

KARAMOJA TUMAINI NETWORK

HOPE · HEAL · EMPOWER

INFO@KARAMOJATUMAINI.ORG · WWW.KARAMOJATUMAINI.ORG

KAMPALA & NAPAK, UGANDA

MEAL PLAN 2026–2030 · VERSION 1.0