

**GCF Project:  
“Climate change  
adaptation solutions  
for local authorities  
in the Federated  
States of Micronesia”**

**Monitoring and  
Evaluation Plan**



## Annex 11. Monitoring and evaluation plan

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget
<i>Output 1.1 Build technical expertise to identify and prioritize adaptation solutions</i>	<i>Document review</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y2</i>	No. of adaptation planning support tools developed	114,000
	<i>Government data/records</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y2</i>	No. of Local Authorities who integrate the adaptation planning support tools in their decision-making processes	0 <sup>1</sup>
<i>Output 1.2. Technical support on project preparation</i>	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	<i>Annual Y2-Y4</i>	Number of private sector actors with increased knowledge of challenges and opportunities in local adaptation planning	80,600
	<i>Document review</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y2</i>	Number of roadmaps / action plans developed for the recapitalization of the RCGF	15,000
<i>Output 1.3. Knowledge sharing mechanisms to develop and foster a network of local government authorities</i>	<i>Document review</i>	<i>Annual Y2-Y4</i>	Number of climate information products developed in line with identified local needs and priorities	265,840
<i>Output 2.1 Establishment of Resilient Communities Grant Facility (RCGF)</i>	<i>Document review</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y8</i>	Recapitalized funding volume for the RCGF	24,000
<i>Output 2.2 Grant award selection</i>	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y8</i>	Number of beneficiaries with enhanced knowledge and capacity to adapt to climate change, including vulnerable groups	43,750
	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y8</i>	Number of municipalities and State authorities' officials who report increased knowledge and capacity to prioritize adaptation solutions and implement them	15,000
<i>Output 2.3 Sub-grant award implementation</i>	<i>Field observation visits</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y8</i>	Number of hectares of agricultural land with salinity levels >1g/l	66,000
	<i>Key informant interviews</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y8</i>	Number of people who benefitted from food security sub-projects reporting increased income	40,000
	<i>Field observation visits</i>	<i>Annual Y1-Y8</i>	Share (%) of mangrove and seagrass surface area protected and/or restored	53,380

Evaluation			
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget
<i>Process</i>	Continuous as sub-projects are completed (carried out by ECU and SPC CFU)	<b>Self-Assessment</b>	<b>43,000</b>
<i>Process</i>	Mid-Term (Four years after the start of the project implementation)	<b>Independent</b>	<b>32,000</b>
<i>Impact</i>	Final (Within 6 months of the end of project implementation)	<b>Independent</b>	<b>44,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> To be confirmed at implementation (Y1)

## Brief description of the Monitoring and Evaluation System

In its role as Accredited Entity, the Pacific Community (SPC) will oversee and supervise the implementation of this project in accordance with the agreement signed between SPC and the Green Climate Fund (GCF). SPC will be responsible for project-level monitoring and evaluation in compliance with SPC policies through coordination between its Climate Finance Unit (CFU), Strategy, Performance and Learning (SPL) Team, Regional Office for Micronesia, the National Designated Authority (NDA) for the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and the EDA Coordination Unit (ECU), implementing the necessary tools and methods to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of the project.

The programme indicators described in the logical framework in the Funding Proposal will be jointly monitored by the NDA, ECU and SPC during program implementation via six-monthly supervision missions (or as needed) that will include results, reflection and planning meetings with project proponents and grantees. This will happen within the framework of regular monitoring and evaluation (M&E) procedures established during the project's inception phase.

The theory of change further developed and validated during the establishment and formalization of the Resilient Communities Grants Facility (RCGF) under output 2.1.1 will be used to identify impact pathways and develop key indicators for monitoring, data needs, prioritize data collection steps, and provide a structure for data analysis and reporting. Program-level baseline information, where possible, will draw on national statistical collections, including the upcoming national census, Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES, scheduled for 2021) and Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey (Scheduled for 2022) to avoid duplication of large-scale data collection exercises. Monitoring indicators will be published, as appropriate, on the Pacific Data Hub platform.

The project implementation team will procure various M&E and knowledge management specialists to support the monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) for the sub-projects under Outputs 2.3.3 and 2.3.4, by undertaking quarterly site visits to project sites. This M&E system will be aligned with the various policies and results frameworks of GCF, FSM NDA, SPC and the project itself. The M&E specialists will work with the ECU and Facilitating Agents (FAs) to develop MEL tools, approaches and reporting arrangements for the sub-grants. This will include annual performance reports and project closure reports. The training, coaching and support provided to grant recipients will include capacity development in MEL, with a focus on how this can be used to maximize grant outcomes while building the evidence base for the results and impact of the initiative.

As part of the sub-grant application process, the baseline assessments for each proposed adaptation measure will be included in the sub-grant proposal package. Where necessary, capacity support for this will be provided to grantees by FAs. Projects components will be monitored separately as well as in relation to the achievement of higher-level projects results and overall GCF goals. The project will ensure the monitoring of differential impacts by sex, age and vulnerability.

The monitoring structure should allow adjustments and will rely on the following building blocks: a database including a list of households defined by multiple criteria (such as level of vulnerability, cultural group, income level, female-headed households, climate change adaptation practices records, on-farm production, etc.), adaptation and resilience measures, and training. Likewise, to ensure that the actions in the field are being implemented, sub-project sites will be geo-referenced.

Other reporting informed by the project monitoring system will include among others quarterly reports, the annual work plans of the ECU and grantees, *ad hoc* reports (e.g. at the request of the EDA Programme Board), Annual Performance Reports for the EDA Programme Board and SPC.

## Evaluation process

The CFU and SPL Team will be jointly responsible for coordinating the independent interim and final evaluations. The evaluations will be conducted using a question-driven approach, and may include assessments against the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability, among others. The Mid-Term Evaluation will be instrumental in contributing – through operational and strategic recommendations – to improve implementation, setting out any necessary corrective and adaptive management measures for the remaining period of the project, and identifying relevant lessons learned for stakeholders in FSM as well as the broader Pacific region. The final evaluation will assess the relevance of the intervention, its overall performance, as well as sustainability and scalability of results, differential impacts and lessons learned. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the intervention has contributed to the Fund's higher-level goal of achieving a paradigm shift in adaptation to climate change in FSM. Both evaluations will contribute to the evidence base for adaptation to climate change in FSM and across the Pacific region, and will be published on the SPC website and other relevant platforms.

The evaluation will draw on mixed-methods, using qualitative methods (e.g. participatory rural appraisal) in combination with counterfactual analysis, depending on the existence of reliable control group data from the project's baseline and end-line surveys. In addition to primary data collected by the evaluators and secondary national data, both interim and final evaluations will draw on the monitoring reports and activities prepared by project staff. Careful attention will be paid to the disaggregation of data, results and outcomes by gender. The interim evaluation will be undertaken when delivery reaches 50% of the initial total budget and/or mid-point of scheduled project duration. The independent Final Evaluation will be launched within six months prior to the actual completion date of the project.

The costs of monitoring and evaluation including Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations are shown in the table below.

Output	Activity	Financing source	Budget account description	Notes	Amount Year 1 (USD)	Amount Year 2 (USD)	Amount Year 3 (USD)	Amount Year 4 (USD)	Amount Year 5 (USD)	Amount Year 6 (USD)	Amount Year 7 (USD)	Total (USD)
Monitoring and evaluation	Project M&E and reporting system implemented, and Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management and Mitigation Plan in place	GCF	International consultant	International consultant team for developing M&E system	6,000							6,000
			National consultant	National M&E Consultant for developing M&E system	3,000							3,000
			Equipment	Materials and computer equipment for the development of the M&E system	5,000							5,000
			Training, workshops, and conference	Expenses for food, lodging, room rental and event facilitation for annual M&E	5,000							5,000
			Travel	Travel for meetings to establish M&E system	10,000							10,000
				Annual field monitoring travels	1,400	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100	14,000
Independent evaluation (mid-term and final evaluations)	Independent evaluation (mid-term and final evaluations)	GCF	International Consultant	International specialized consultants for mid-term evaluation				18,000				18,000
				International specialized consultants for final evaluation							24,000	24,000
			National Consultant	National specialized consultants for mid-term evaluation				6,000				6,000
				National specialized consultants for final evaluation							12,000	12,000
			Training, workshops, and conference	Expenses for food, lodging, room rental and event facilitation for mid-term and final evaluation				3000			3000	6,000
			Travel	National and international travels for mid-term and final evaluation				5000			5000	10,000
Total M&E Component					30,400	2,100	2,100	34,100	2,100	2,100	46,100	119,000