

Annex 11 Monitoring and evaluation plan

Heritage Colombia (HECO): Maximizing the Contributions of Sustainably Managed Landscapes in Colombia for Achievement of Climate Goals

V.7

June 30, 2022

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan outlines the work required for monitoring the project's progress towards the targets set in the project logical framework. Also included in the M&E plan are the work required for the Interim and Final evaluation. A break-down of costs for each of these items is presented below.

At the project level, the primary responsibility for day-to-day data collection, monitoring, and implementation of monitoring and evaluation processes will rest with Patrimonio, through the PMU, led by a dedicated Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. Patrimonio, through the PMU, will manage the following participatory monitoring and evaluation systems at the project level, which will also serve as quality assurance measures. First, Patrimonio and WWF Colombia will conduct regular field monitoring activities with PNN, regional environmental authorities, IDEAM, and community organizations in each landscape where activities will take place to (a) review progress of the project; (b) review the validity and continuing relevance of implementation approaches and strategies; (c) review the adequacy of personnel and financial and institutional arrangements; and (d) make recommendations for adaptive management. Patrimonio, with support from the PMU, will be responsible for storing the information and data generated through project monitoring.

Monitoring of Project Logical Framework

Indicative costs for measurement against project indicators and targets are presented below in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Indicative measurement methodology and costs against the project logical framework.

Monitoring plan and costs					
No.	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget
E.3. GCF Outcome level: Reduced emissions and increased resilience (IRMF core indicators 1-4, quantitative indicators)					
C1	National MRV System and RENARE (National register of emissions reductions)	Government data/records	Interim and final	<i>Core 1: GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included under the costs of 3.2.a. and 3.2.b. below.
C2	Agreements between Ecohabitats and community members Project baseline, mid-term and end term surveys	Field observation visits Key informant interviews Survey/questionnaire Stakeholder map	Annual	<i>Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached (ARA1 Most Vulnerable People and Communities)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included under the costs of 3.2.c. and 3.2.d. below.

C3	Updated management plans (63 in total) Landscan data Project baseline, mid-term and end term surveys	Stakeholder map Survey/questionnaire	Interim and final	Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached (ARA 4 Ecosystems and Ecosystem Services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Included under the costs of 1.2.a, 3.2.a. and 3.2.b. below.
C4	Independent technical report generated by the PMU (primary data).	Government data/records	Interim and final	Core 4: Hectares of natural resources brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Included under the costs of 3.2.a. and 3.2.b. below.
C5	National report of the number and extension of Protected Areas registered in the Unique National register of Protected Areas (RUNAP is its Spanish acronym).	GIS data		Supplementary 4.1: Hectares of terrestrial forest, terrestrial non-forest, freshwater and coastal marine areas brought under resoration and/or improved ecosystems	
E.4. GCF Outcome level: Enabling environment (IRMF core indicators)					
No.	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget
C5	Assessment undertaken by the PMU (primary data)	Document review Government data/records	Interim and final	Core Indicator 5: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to strengthening institutional and regulatory frameworks for low emission climate-resilient development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Included under the costs of 1.2.b. below

				<i>pathways in a country-driven manner</i>	
C8	<p>Surveys of 90 public staff trained (Primary data)</p> <p>Household surveys of 150 community members benefitting from training (Primary data)</p> <p>Assessment undertaken by the PMU (primary data)</p>	<p>Independent change analysis reports incorporating ministerial staff surveys</p> <p>Independent change analysis reports incorporating household surveys</p> <p>Document reviews</p>	Interim and final	<p><i>Core indicator 8: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to effective knowledge generation and learning processes, and use of good practices, methodologies and standards</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included under costs of 1.1.b. below • Included under the costs of 3.2.c. below • Included under costs of 1.2.b. below
E.5. Project/programme specific indicators					
No.	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget
1.1.a.	Technical secretariats of the SIRAPs and NRCCs	Document reviews	Biannual	<i># of SIRAP's and NRCC incorporating climate data into the design and implementation of their action plans. (1.1/2.2)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ 141,615
1.1.b.	Municipalities	<p>Government data/records</p> <p>Document review</p>	Biannual	<i># of territorial plans incorporating climate data into design and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ 141,615
1.2.a.	Project Monitoring Unit	<p>Field observation visits</p> <p>Document review</p>	Biannual	<i># of institutional agreements within the 4 landscapes to improve water management and reduce deforestation.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$ 283,230

1.2.b.	Participating Communities	Document review Key informant interviews	Biannual	<i># of community planning instruments are improved including climate change strategies</i>	• \$ 283,230
1.3.a.	Investments/DNP	Government data/records Document review	Biannual	<i># of approved projects in the environment and sustainable development sector in HeCo municipalities</i>	• \$ 141,615
1.3.b	Investments/DNP	Government data/records Document review	Biannual	<i>% increase in investment of revenues from royalties allocated towards environmental and sustainable development projects in targeted landscapes by Year 10</i>	• \$ 283,230
2.1.	Project Monitoring Unit	Focus groups Document review	Annual	<i># of participatory initiatives incorporating data into relevant M&E frameworks and making use of it for territorial planning, implementation and adaptive management</i>	• \$ 141,615
2.2.	Project Monitoring Unit	Key informant interviews Document review	Annual	<i># of institutions/organizations tracking mitigations and adaptation impacts (benefits) with data collected by territorial teams</i>	• \$141,615

3.1.	PNN for national public areas and Regional Autonomous Corporations for regional public areas	Analysis of management effectiveness of public areas	Biannual	<p><i>Measure of the effectiveness index of protected areas in the prioritized variables:</i></p> <p>A1. Protected area health A2. Adaptation to a changing climate A3. Cultural values associated with conservation objectives A4. Benefits associated with nature's contributions B1. Opportunities in the territory for management B3. Socio-environmental conflicts B4. Pressures and threats C1. Coherence in the design of the protected area C3. Coherence and implementation of the management plan C4. Articulation with areas of SINAP and/or other areas of importance for conservation C6. Zoning compliance C7. Articulation of area management with land use plans C8. Knowledge management and use C9. Implementation of management lines C10. Evaluation, monitoring and feedback to management planning D1. Legitimacy of the instances for participation and coordination D3. Qualification of strategic actors D4. Conflict management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ 141,615
------	--	--	----------	--	--

				D6. Inclusion of intergenerational / gender elements for PA management E1. Financial sustainability E2. Human talent E3. Equipment and infrastructure F1. Implementation of value chains F2. Good practices F4. Articulation with the productive sector in the management of the PA	
3.1.b	Regional Environmental Authorities	Survey/questionnaire Document review Field observation visits	Biannual	<i># Households implementing climate adaptation and resilience practices in protected areas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ 283,230
3.2.a	Regional Environmental Authorities	GIS data Document review	Biannual	<i># Hectares under restoration and rehabilitation with focus in mitigation into protected areas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ 283,230
3.2.b	Regional Environmental Authorities	GIS data Document review	Biannual	<i># Hectares under restoration/rehabilitation for Ecosystem Based Adaptation and reduce Risk in vulnerable areas in protected areas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ 283,230
3.2.c	Regional Environmental Authorities	Survey/questionnaire Document review Field observation visits	Biannual	<i># Households implementing climate adaptation and resilience practices outside protected areas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$ 283,230

Project/programme co-benefit indicators					
No.	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget
CB1	Regional Environmental Authorities	Field observation visits Hydrological analysis	Interim and final	<i>Maintained volume of water supplied to downstream users as a result of sustainable land management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included in the costs of 1.2.a. above
CB2	Regional Environmental Authorities	GIS data	Biannual	<i># ha of newly gazetted protected area representing increased suitable habitat for fauna and flora</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included in the costs of 3.2a and 3.2.b. above
Total monitoring cost (A)					\$ 2,832,298
Technical support for monitoring and learning provided by WWF-US Staff: (B) 1 SPO, Area Based Conservation Planning and Finance, EFL [Time allocation (%) 15% Y1 - Y2, 10% Y3 - Y10] 1 WWF US Goal Team Project Manager [Time allocation (%) 50% Y1 - Y10] 1 SPO, Climate Risk Management [Time allocation (%) 20% Y1 - Y10] 1 Sr Dir, Forest Carbon Science [Time allocation (%) 10% Y1 - Y10] 1 SPO, Fresh Water [Time allocation (%) 25% Y1-Y10] 4 international trips with local, regional and national transport for staff [SPO: Area Based Conservation Planning and Finance, Climate Risk Management; Dir, Forest Carbon Science and WWF US Goal Team Project Manager]					\$ 2,558,220 (w/ \$425,840 co-finance)
Other evaluative costs within the project budget (C): (built in component costs as specified below)					\$ 597,149
Process evaluation (2023) (\$ 122,637 (co-finance))					

Commented [EAA1]: To consolidate all M&E and evaluative activities that will come out of the project budget and as detailed in Annex 4

Commented [LD2R1]: Thank you for the suggested edits. Included all three subtotals for new total cost as indicated.

Independent summative evaluation (Y3 and Y7) (\$ 237,256 (2.1.1; 2.2.1)) Independent summative evaluation (Y5 and Y9) (\$ 118,628 (2.1.2)) Independent summative evaluation (every 4 years) (\$ 118,628 (3.2.1))	
Total cost (A + B + C)	\$ 5,987,667

Project evaluation plan and costs

Evaluation			
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget
<i>Formative</i>	Interim	Independent	\$ 250,000(AE Fee)
<i>Ex-poste</i>	Final	Independent	\$ 250,000(AE Fee)
Total evaluation cost			\$ 500,000

Commented [EAA3]: Suggest to streamline this as this part has to tie with Annex 12

Commented [LD4R3]: Noted with thanks.