

Vanuatu Community-based Climate Resilience Project (VCCRP)

Annex 11: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Monitoring.....	3
Evaluation.....	5
Monitoring Plan.....	7
Evaluation Plan.....	13

Introduction

1. This initial monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan provides an overview of the monitoring and evaluation framework that will be applied to the GCF programming. The full M&E plan for this project will be developed during the project inception phase (within the first six months of project implementation). The plan will be developed with the new project M&E staff in collaboration with M&E staff from the Save the Children Australia support team, government agencies, and local partners. The full M&E plan will include detailed information on the roles and responsibilities for data collection and management, project components' impact chains, information flows and reporting systems, finalized indicators and means of verifications, monitoring protocols and tools, implementation plans and schedules, alignments and collaborations with existing national M&E systems. In this report, we have outlined some of the key features and skeleton of the M&E plan that will be further developed at the initial stage of the project implementation.
2. Result-based M&E is a management tool used to systematically track progress of project implementation, demonstrate results on the ground, and assess whether changes to the project design are needed to consider evolving circumstances. Designing the project results framework and using it adequately along with other management tools during implementation (for instance, the risk-assessment tool) is critical. Most of the decisions and proactive measures that can be taken to improve the likelihood of the project achieving the expected results will be derived from observations coming from these tools.
3. Monitoring and evaluation are two complementary but distinct processes. Setting goals, indicators, and targets for projects and programs is at the heart of a monitoring system. Monitoring consists of tracking inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and other aspects of the project on an ongoing and systematic basis during the implementation period, as an integral part of the project management function. By comparing project indicators with specific targets, monitoring can help project managers improve project design and implementation, as well as promote accountability and dialogue among project implementers, policy makers and stakeholders. In contrast, evaluation is a systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy and its design, implementation and results by the project. Projects are evaluated at discrete points in time (usually at the project's mid-point and completion) along some key dimensions. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability (in accordance with the OECD-DAC Criteria for Evaluation of Development Assistance). Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or merit of an activity, policy or program. Learning is another key element that goes in parallel with M&E. This refers to a regular review of M&E data to draw and document learning from the projects. Project reviews and evaluations and feedback from communities, are used to adapt and modify the implementation of the project. Save the Children documents and shares findings of monitoring and evaluations with children, communities and key stakeholders in an accessible manner including presenting findings in a variety of formats to suit different information needs and audiences.
4. Project-level M&E will be undertaken in compliance with the Save the Children Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Framework. Key principles of Save the Children approaches to MEAL include: the need to ensure project partners and beneficiaries, including children, are engaged in monitoring and evaluation through participatory processes; the need for a robust MEAL framework, developed prior to the commencement of project activities to ensure an outcomes focus is maintained throughout the life of the project; a focus on continuous learning and accountability; engaging with research partners to increase the focus on climate-related challenges and local solutions as well as developing innovative

methods of measuring the impact of adaptation actions. The M&E function that applies to international projects funded through Save the Children Australia and implemented by Save the Children Country Offices is a shared responsibility in accordance with the Master Programming Agreement. As the funding Member, Save the Children Australia is responsible for ensuring the project design complies with the required quality standards, and for providing oversight of planning and implementation of the MEAL framework for the project, including engagement of external project evaluation services. The Country Office is responsible for executing project measurement and monitoring in accordance with an agreed plan. Quality function resources assigned to projects have a line of accountability to both the Project Operations and to the Quality function. This dual line of reporting provides a degree of independence to the project quality function and an ability to escalate project quality issues through independent channels.

5. The M&E system of the project will ensure that the co-benefits will be monitored throughout implementation of the project and integrated with monitoring systems of the relevant Ministries and other public authorities. The project's overall governance and implementation approach, including M&E systems, is designed to align to the Government of Vanuatu's (GoV) National Planning Framework (NPF)¹ and National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (MEP)² to ensure complementarity with existing government systems and reporting processes.
6. The MEP is intended to emphasise monitoring and evaluation within the broader NPF, clarifying the role and responsibilities of government ministries, agencies, statutory bodies and aid coordination. The NPF is designed for use by decision makers involved in planning at the ministerial level, specifically including M&E focal points responsible for keeping ministries (including VCCRPs key government partners at MoCC, MoIA and MALFFB) compliant with national legal reporting requirements. Specifically, the project's M&E framework is designed to support government partners with mandatory reporting on progress against key targets in the country's National Sustainable Development Plan (NSDP) through publication of Annual Development Reports (ADR). Both the MEP and NPF are both applicable with all government entities on the national, provincial and local level. The project aligns to the MEP's overall principles, including being development oriented, undertaken ethically and with integrity, utilisation oriented, methodologically sound, and operationally effective.
7. The MEP calls for improving linkages between recurrent expenditures on government programmes and donor (or joint) expenditure on development programmes is critical to achieving value for money and development outcomes. The project further aligns to the MEP's guidance on 'aid coordination' (MEP, Section 6.7) whereby donor-funded projects (including through non-governmental organisations) are required to identify and secure a 'sponsoring' government department/agency with responsibility for reporting aligned to the MEP and NPF. Additionally, within the project's M&E plan are steps aligned to the MEP's requirement for using government systems (GoV's Financial Management Information System) to track and report against project activities and progress as they relate to key public policy (e.g. NSDP, sector policies).

Monitoring

8. Setting up the monitoring system of the project will involve different steps. The primary responsibility for day-to-day project monitoring and implementation rests with the Project Manager. The Project Manager in consultation with key stakeholders will develop annual work

¹ National Planning Framework available: [here](#).

² National M&E Policy available: [here](#).

plans to ensure the efficient implementation of the project. An organization of a project inception workshop is vital towards this end. A project inception workshop, involving the Save the Children Australia, the co-Executing Entities (MoCC & SCV) and other key stakeholders will be held within the first six months of the project. The overarching objective of the inception workshop is to: a) assist the Project team and stakeholders to understand and take ownership of the project strategy, objectives and outcomes and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation; b) discuss the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of the project team and the national government ministries including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms; c) review the results framework, re-assess baselines as needed, and discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E plan. This will be followed by a production of inception workshop report no later than one month after the inception workshop documenting all changes and decisions made during the inception workshop to the Project planned activities, budget, results framework, and any other key aspects of the Project.

9. The theory of change further developed and validated during the project inception workshop will be used to identify impact pathways and develop and identify key indicators for monitoring, data needs, prioritize data collection steps, and provide a structure for data analysis and reporting. A project results monitoring plan which is provided below following the GCF template will be further refined once the project has started to ensure that the project team understand and take ownership of the monitoring plan. The plan will be refined to ensure that it includes GCF-level impact and outcome indicators and project -level output and activity indicators, metrics to be collected for each indicator, methodology for data collection and analysis, baseline information, location of data gathering, frequency of data collection, responsible parties, and indicative resources needed to complete the plan.
10. The Project team will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually and will objectively report progress. Project components will be monitored separately as well as in relation to the achievement of higher-level projects results and overall GCF goals. As described in section E of the funding proposal, the Project M&E will each cover two levels of performance: GCF-level performance (expected performance against investment criteria) and project-level performance. Each level requires its own implementation arrangements and time frames. Working closely with technical advisers, the project M&E staff will be responsible for designing a study to: a) establish baseline levels for fund-level core indicators and outcomes; b) establish baseline levels for project level results and indicators; and c) permit tracking progress against the target indicators for climate resilience. This will involve conducting baseline surveys of key natural resources that support food security and livelihoods and household socioeconomic surveys to document resource dependence and important natural resources. Particular attention should be put in ensuring the monitoring of heterogenous effects by different segments of population such as sex, age, disability, status of household head as well as level of vulnerability. The monitoring structure should allow adjustments and flexibility to accommodate any unforeseen incidents.
11. Details of M&E implementation will be negotiated and included in the agreements between the AE, the Co-Executing Entities – the Ministry of Climate Change (MoCC) and Save the Children Vanuatu. Annual reviews will be led by the PMU with the participation of Area Councils and other government ministries involved in the project. With 29 Area Councils involved, the annual monitoring reviews may need to be organized at the provincial or sub-provincial levels.
12. The results of the Area Council/Provincial level reviews will be considered at an internal, annual, project-level summit event. Progress against outcomes, including GESI aspects, will be synthesized, and requirements for adaptive management will be identified using a

Collaborative Outcomes Reporting approach. The annual summit will be led by the PMU in conjunction with the Technical Working Group. Results will be reviewed and approved by the Project Steering Committee. The PMU Communications MEL and GESI managers/advisers will work closely together to ensure that summit findings and recommendations are shared with Area Councils, implementing entities and other key stakeholders. The Save the Children Country Office will coordinate the input of the NDA Focal Point and other stakeholders to the project review report. The findings and recommendations of these internal review activities will be also provided to the teams carrying out the midterm and final evaluations.

Evaluation

13. The project's mid-term evaluation process will include an internal impact evaluation and an independent process evaluation. The findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's duration. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final mid-term evaluation report will follow the standard templates and guidance of the Save the Children. An independent final impact evaluation will take place no later than three months prior to operational closure of the project. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final evaluation report will follow the standard templates and guidance of Save the Children. Save the Children Vanuatu will also commission to an external company to develop an initial baseline, carried out at project inception phase, which will be used at mid-term and final evaluation.
14. The evaluations will rely on the key questions to answer the main overarching and forward and backward-looking questions and may include assessment against OECD-DAC and GCF evaluation criteria. These may include the following: relevance; effectiveness of the project and processes; the efficiency of processes; sustained impact and coherence in climate finance delivery; gender equity and inclusiveness; innovation and potential for paradigm shift; country ownership; coherence of climate finance; and potential for building scale and unexpected results (positive and negative). The evaluation will analyze the criteria or use the relevant criteria customized to this evaluation. Overall, the evaluation will contribute to accountability and learning by reviewing emerging evidence on the performance and the impact and/or likelihood of the project. The mid-term evaluation will be instrumental in contributing – through operational and strategic recommendations – to improve implementation, setting out any necessary corrective measures for the remaining period of the project. 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 Vanuatu.
15. The evaluation will focus on the utility of both the evaluation process and products to key stakeholders, with the objectives of providing learning, informing decision making and improving overall performance. The evaluation will aim to clearly identify and engage primary users at the beginning of the evaluation – and use that input to guide the evaluation. It will also try to engage with GCF stakeholders and evaluation users throughout the evaluation process with the objective of a consultative and participatory process. Findings and conclusions will be written in an appropriately contextualized manner that promotes uptake and facilitates use by a diverse audience. Besides, the evidence base for each finding will be clearly and systematically presented, to ensure credibility.

16. The evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods approach involving both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, that can adapt to the information that is available or that the team can generate. The collection of information, data and opinions will be guided by, but not limited to, the evaluation matrix. Data will always be verified and validated, and it will be identified whether the data is confirmed by one or more sources so that it can be used appropriately in the analysis. The team will seek to triangulate the information and evidence taken from different sources and it will consider different perspectives. These sources include desk reviews and reviews of previous studies by other institutions; interviews with key stakeholders; as well as interviews with informed observers and field observations by evaluation team members. In addition to primary data collected by the evaluators and secondary national data, both mid-term 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, age and vulnerability groups, considering the compositions of peoples in the project area and the different level of vulnerability of project beneficiaries.
17. The overall assessment will bring to the Save the Children, stakeholders, GCF and all other involved partners, lessons and experiences on what is working, how and for whom, while identifying key bottlenecks in ensuring access and commitment to adaptation support.

Monitoring Plan

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ³
<i>Baseline Study</i>	<i>Baseline study</i>	Baseline establishment in year 1 before the start of the project	Baseline survey questionnaire administered to households and community and baseline report produced	100,000
E.2 – GCF Impact Level				
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term	Evaluation reports will include assessment of the project's contribution to paradigm shift by assessing its scale, replicability and sustainability	<i>Budgeted under evaluations and output level monitoring</i>
Annual project reporting (output level)	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	Annual project reports will include assessment of progress towards paradigm shift	
E.3 – GCF Outcome Level				
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term	<u>Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached</u>	<i>Budgeted under evaluations and output level monitoring</i>
Annual project reporting (output level), including data from government statistics (national census, HIES), NDMO reports, progress / completion reports, extension officers monitoring reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual		

³ Please note that the information presented in this table is approximated. The M&E plan will be further developed at the project inception phase involving all relevant stakeholders.

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ³
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term		
Annual project reporting (output level), including data from government statistics (national census, HIES), NDMO reports, progress / completion reports, extension officers monitoring reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	<u>Supplementary 2.1: Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options</u>	
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term		
Annual project reporting (output level), including data from government statistics (national census, HIES), NDMO reports, post-disaster surveys, progress / completion reports, extension officers monitoring reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	<u>Supplementary 2.2: Beneficiaries (female/male) with improved food security</u>	
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term		
Annual project reporting (output level), including data from government statistics (national census, HIES), progress / completion reports, extension officers monitoring reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	<u>Supplementary 2.5: Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting innovations that strengthen climate change resilience</u>	

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ³
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term	<u>Core 4: Hectares of natural resources brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practice</u>	
Annual project reporting (output level), including data from progress / completion reports, extension officers monitoring reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual		
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term	<u>Supplementary 4.1: Hectares of terrestrial forest, terrestrial non-forest, freshwater and coastal marine areas brought under restoration and/or improved ecosystems</u>	
Annual project reporting (output level), including data from progress / completion reports, extension officers monitoring reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual		
E.4 – GCF Outcome level: Enabling environment				
Evaluation reports	<i>Document review</i>	Mid-term and end-term	<u>Core Indicator 5: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to strengthening institutional and regulatory frameworks for low emission climate-resilient development pathways in a country-driven manner</u>	<i>Budgeted under evaluations and output level monitoring</i>
Annual project reporting (output level)	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual		
Evaluation reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term	<u>Core Indicator 6: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to technology deployment, dissemination, development or transfer and innovation</u>	
Annual project reporting (output level)	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual		

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ³
Review report	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Mid-term and end-term	<u>Core indicator 8: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to effective knowledge generation and learning processes, and use of good practices, methodologies and standards</u>	
Annual project reporting (output level)	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual		
<i>E.5 – Project/programme specific indicators</i>				
Annual project reporting (output level) drawing on government (NDMO) reporting on CDCCC operations	<i>Government data/records</i>	Annual	% target communities with functioning CDCCCs	6,654
Annual project reporting (output level), including government (NDMO) reporting on CDCCC operations	<i>Government data/records</i>	Annual	% target CDCCCs with gender balance	6,654
Annual project reporting (output level), including government (NDMO) reporting on CDCCC operations	<i>Government data/records</i>	Annual	% target CDCCCs with and child/youth engagement	6,654
Annual project reporting (output level), including training/workshop reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	% target women, men, children and youth with increased understanding of the implications of climate change	14,970
Annual project reporting (output level), including workshop reports and	<i>Government data/records</i>	Annual	% target communities with adaptation plans in place	6,654

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ³
government (MoCC) reporting on community adaptation plans				
Annual project reporting (output level), including government (NDMO) reporting on CDCCC operations	<i>Government data/records</i>	Annual	% target CDCCCs with internet connectivity for CIS/EWS delivery	6,654
<i>Annual project reporting (output level), including training/workshop reports</i>	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	# target community members with increased understanding of application of CIS to agriculture/fisheries	14,970
Annual project reporting (output level)	<i>GIS data</i>	Annual	# hectares of agricultural and fisheries sites under improved management using nature-based solutions	30,000
Annual project reporting (output level), including training/workshop reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	# target farmers with increased understanding of climate-resilient agriculture practices	14,970
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits	<i>Field observation visits</i>	Annual	# target farmers implementing climate resilient agriculture practices	29,940
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits and government statistical data	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	% target households in moderate or severe food insecurity (This indicator will also be used to assess progress against Output 2.3)	14,970
Annual project reporting (output level), including training/workshop reports	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	# target fishers with increased understanding of climate-resilient fisheries practices	14,970

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ³
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits	<i>Field observation visits</i>	Annual	# target fishers diversifying fisheries resources	29,940
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits	<i>Field observation visits</i>	Annual	# communities using food preservation technologies	29,940
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	# target women-led producer groups collaborating to access new markets	14,970
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits and government statistical data	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	% target households participating in producer groups that report increased incomes	14,970
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits	<i>Key informant interviews</i>	Annual	# partnerships facilitated between producer groups and private sector entities	39,920
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	# Area Council staff with increased capacity to integrate climate change into planning and budgeting	14,970
Annual project reporting (output level), including DFAT project annual reporting	<i>Government data/records</i>	Annual	Shock-responsive social protection system developed and tested (via DFAT co-finance)	6,654
Annual project reporting (output level)	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	# knowledge products disseminated nationally, regionally and globally	39,920

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ³
Annual project reporting (output level), including monitoring visits	<i>Field observation visits</i>	Annual	# local-provincial-national stakeholder forums convened	29,940

Evaluation Plan

Evaluation			
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget (in US\$)
<i>Impact</i>	Year 3	Self-Assessment	60,000
<i>Process</i>	Year 3	Independent	80,000
<i>Impact</i>	Year 6	Independent	100,000