

Building the Climate Resilience of Children and Communities through the Education Sector (BRACE)

Annex 11: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Contents

Introduction	2
Monitoring	3
Evaluation	5
Monitoring Plan	7
Evaluation Plan	16

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 project M&E staff in all three countries (Cambodia, South Sudan, and Tonga), 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, IT and capacity building requirements, 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 and in compliance with the GCF evaluation policy). 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 Offices are 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 governments of Cambodia, Tonga and South Sudan's planning framework and national evaluation policies to ensure complementarity with existing government systems and reporting processes.

Monitoring

6. 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 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 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.
7. 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.

8. 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 (paradigm shift potential, core and supplementary indicators). 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: a) establishing baseline levels for fund-level core and supplementary indicators, as well as project level results and indicators; b) embedding paradigm shift and enabling environment indicators assessments in the interim and final external evaluations; c) ensuring timely (annual, interim, and final) measurement and reporting of core, supplementary, and project level results indicators; and d) encourage the use of M&E findings and recommendations in decision-making as well as in internal and external learning processes. The monitoring structure should allow adjustments and flexibility to accommodate any unforeseen incidents. Save the Children Australia may commission an external company to support an initial baseline, carried out at project inception phase, which will be used at mid-term and final evaluation.
9. The M&E plan also includes mechanisms to support continuous data-driven learning and adaptation in the BRACE program. Regular learning loops will be established, where monitoring data is reviewed to identify trends, risks and areas for improvement. Insights from this process can then feed directly into adaptive management approaches with senior leadership, providing valuable evidence to drive reflection and learning meetings, and supporting informed decision-making and adjustments based on real-time insights. The M&E team will play a key role in facilitating these reviews, identifying trends, risks, and opportunities for adaptation, and ensuring that data-driven insights are effectively communicated to project leadership. This process will occur at a country level, and also at the global program level. By embedding this process into the overall management framework, we will promote a culture of continuous learning and proactive adjustment.
10. Particular attention will be paid to including vulnerable populations, such as girls, children with disabilities, and marginalized communities, in the M&E process. Data will be disaggregated to ensure the monitoring of heterogenous effects by different segments of population. Specific indicators are also introduced as part of Co-Benefit 1, which track how these groups benefit from early warning systems, WASH facilities, and disaster risk management planning.
11. To ensure the integrity of our data, all indicators will be systematically tracked, verified, and analyzed through a robust quality assurance framework. Data verification processes will include cross-checks, field validation, and triangulation to confirm accuracy and reliability. Our M&E team oversee these processes, ensuring that data collection and reporting meet GCF standards for completeness, consistency, and timeliness. By adhering to these quality assurance mechanisms, we will maintain compliance with best practices and ensure the highest level of data integrity throughout the project lifecycle.
12. Details of M&E implementation will be negotiated and included in the agreements between the AE and the Co-Executing Entities. Annual reviews will be led by the PMU with the participation of Area Councils and other government ministries involved in the project.
13. The M&E plan will establish systems that support real-time monitoring, by leveraging existing school data systems with enhanced digital systems for improved data quality. Student and

teacher attendance, school-related injuries, and school closures, will be monitored in this way. This will be conducted in partnership with Waliku, our team at Save the Children who have supported projects in over 20 countries providing end-to-end support with digital data capture and analytics tools in schools. They will utilize user-centred approaches to design customised digital systems in each country, train school administrators on using the system, and develop data dashboards and visualisation tools to support real-time data analysis.

Evaluation

14. BRACE is designed to build a strong evidence base across contexts on climate and education. An evaluability assessment will be conducted during inception to ensure opportunities for evidence generation are maximised and built into the programme implementation.
15. The project's mid-term evaluation will include process and outcome 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 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.
16. The evaluations will rely on the key questions to answer the main overarching and forward and backward-looking questions and will include assessment against OECD-DAC and GCF evaluation criteria. These include the following: relevance; effectiveness of the project and processes; paradigm shift and enabling environment related indicators; 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 South Sudan, Cambodia and Tonga.
17. 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.
18. 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.

19. The overall assessment will bring to 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\$) ¹ ,
Baseline Study	<i>Survey/questionnaire, document review</i>	Baseline established before program implementation begins, Midline, Endline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of education authorities with disaster risk reduction plans in place • # of school days closed per year due to climate-related reasons • % of average annual school dropout rate in target schools • % of average annual absence of students and teachers in target schools • # school staff and community members with reported skills in climate-related school safety and educational continuity • # teachers and education managers with reported skills to deliver on pedagogy for climate change, disaster risk reduction and environmental education • % of target schools with gender-segregated, age appropriate and disability-accessible WASH facilities • # of south-south cooperations or initiatives enhancing climate actions in the education sector 	\$181,359 <i>(\$60,453 per country)</i>
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>
	<i>Focus groups</i>			
	<i>Document review</i>			

¹ 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\$) ¹ ,
	Key informant interviews			
Annual project reporting	Other (please specify)	Annual Based on surveys, stakeholder consultations and feedback, data collected during field work with communities and schools, ministry and other agency data files	Annual project reports will include assessment of progress towards paradigm shift	
E.3 – GCF Outcome Level				
Annual project reporting, including data from government statistics (national census, education data), activity progress and completion reports, program monitoring reports	Document review	Annual	Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached	Budgeted under output level monitoring
	Government data/records			
Annual project reporting, including data from government statistics (national census, education data), activity progress and completion reports, program monitoring reports	Document review	Annual	Supplementary 2.4: Beneficiaries (female/male) covered by new or improved early warning systems	

Monitoring					
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,	
	Government data/records				
Annual project reporting, including data from program budget spending, procurement reports, activity progress and completion reports, program monitoring reports	Document review	Annual	<u>Core 3: Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions</u>	Budgeted under output level monitoring	
	Government data/records				
E.4 – GCF Outcome level: Enabling environment					
Evaluation reports	Government data/records	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>	Budgeted under evaluations and output level monitoring	
	Document review				
	Survey/questionnaire				
	Key informant interviews				
Annual project reporting	Government data/records	Annual			
	Document review				
Evaluation reports	Document review	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>		
	Survey/questionnaire				
	Key informant interviews				

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,
Annual project reporting	Document review	Annual		
Evaluation Reports	Document review	Mid-term and end-term	Core indicator 8: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to effective knowledge generation and learning processes, and use of good practices, methodologies and standards	
	Survey/questionnaire			
	Key informant interviews			
Annual project reporting	Document review	Annual		
E.5 – Project/programme specific indicators				
Component 1				
Annual project reporting, including activity reports	Government data/records	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"># national and subnational education sector policy and planning documents drafted to include climate change adaptation or environmental sustainability measures (output 1.1)# MoEs that strengthen cross-sectoral and internal coordination on climate-related policy and programming (output 1.1).# children participating in climate change and education policy influencing activities (output 1.1)	
	Document review			

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,
Evaluation Reports: Key informant interviews to understand barriers and drivers of enabling environment and policy development, and review of public expenditure reports	<i>Field observation visits</i>	Mid-term and end-term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # national and subnational education sector policy and planning documents updated to include climate change adaptation or environmental sustainability measures (output 1.1) 	Budgeted under evaluations
	<i>Key informant interviews</i>			
	<i>Public expenditure reporting</i>			
Annual project reporting, including procurement and construction records	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # target schools retrofitted to improve climate resilience (output 1.2) % of target schools with gender-segregated, age appropriate and disability-accessible WASH facilities (Co-benefit 1) # of schools with solar photovoltaic systems installed (Co-benefit 2) # schools establishing tree planting and water-efficient irrigation systems for shading, windbreaking and cooling effects (Co-benefit 2) 	

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,
Annual project reporting, including training reports and pre-post tests	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # government staff with reported skills to act as master trainers in climate-related school safety (output 1.3) 	
Annual project reporting, including training reports and pre-post tests	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # government staff with reported skills to act as master trainers in climate-related school safety (output 1.3) # school staff and community members with reported skills in climate-related school safety and educational continuity (output 1.3) 	
Annual project reporting, including workshop reports and government reporting on emergency preparedness plans	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of education authorities with disaster risk reduction plans in place (output 1.1) % of new or updated risk assessments and disaster risk reduction plans including needs and recommendations on GESI (Co-benefit 1) 	
Annual project reporting, including workshop reports and review of school plans	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # schools with climate-related school safety plans in place (output 1.3) % school safety plans that have been informed by local school community to a high extent (BRACE engaged children, teachers, parents) (Co-benefit 3) % target schools that contribute to the NAP process through CSO and public dialogues (Co-benefit 3) # knowledge platforms that capture LLA initiatives/case studies within the climate and education space (Co-benefit 3) 	

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of climate-related school safety plans addressing GESI specific needs (Co-benefit 1) 	
Annual project reporting, including Project procurement and distribution reports and follow-up surveys	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # schools receiving teaching and learning materials on climate change, disaster risk reduction and the environment (output 1.4) 	
Annual project reporting, including training reports and pre-post tests	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # teachers and education managers with reported skills to deliver on pedagogy for climate change, disaster risk reduction and environmental education (output 1.4) 	
Annual project reporting, including activity reports	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # child groups mobilized to engage in education on climate change, risk, reduction and the environment (output 1.4) 	
Waliku school data system measuring dropouts, absenteeism, child injury, climate events and school closures in target and control schools. We will develop digitized systems for schools	<i>Survey/questionnaire</i>	Collected on ongoing basis, reported quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of education authorities with disaster risk reduction plans in place # of school days closed per year due to climate-related reasons % of average annual school dropout rate in target schools 	\$165,819 (\$55,273 per country)

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,
to routinely submit required data			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• % of average annual absence of students and teachers in target schools• # school staff and community members with reported skills in climate-related school safety and educational continuity• # teachers and education managers with reported skills to deliver on pedagogy for climate change, disaster risk reduction and environmental education	
Evaluation Reports: Qualitative study of selected schools exploring factors driving and moderating impact of climate change on dropout, absenteeism, child injury, and school closures / educational continuity	Field observation visits	Mid-term and end-term	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• % of target schools with gender-segregated, age appropriate and disability-accessible WASH facilities• # of south-south cooperations or initiatives enhancing climate actions in the education sector	Budgeted under evaluations
	Key informant interviews			
Evaluation Reports	Field observation visits	Mid-term and end-term	Qualitative study of selected schools exploring factors driving and moderating impact of climate change on learning loss and effectiveness of climate change pedagogy	Budgeted under evaluations
	Key informant interviews			
Component 2				
Evaluation Reports: Review of government documents	Document review	Mid-term and end-term	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• # of concept note/Project funding proposals on climate change adaptation for education sector submitted to GCF and other climate financiers (Component 2 outcome)• # of MoEs that conduct climate risk assessments for the education sector (output 2.1)• # of climate change policy frameworks that have integrated the education sector	Budgeted under evaluations

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of MoEs that have developed a climate finance roadmap that identifies funding sources and includes strategies to access them (output 2.2) # random reviews per country of early warning information dissemination to ensure inclusion of age, 	
Component 3				
Annual project reporting (output level), including meeting reports	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # Education and climate finance steering committee adopting best practices in governance, accountability and communications (output 3.1) 	
Annual project reporting (output level), including activity reports and document review of guidance documents produced	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of guidance documents produced for education and climate stakeholders on programming, policy influencing and climate finance (output 3.2) 	
Annual project reporting (output level), including activity reports and analytics from global map	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of countries represented in global map tracking climate finance investments directed to education (output 3.1) 	
Annual project reporting (output level), including activity reports and analytics from knowledge management platform	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of people who participate in online education sector stakeholder consultations on how to access climate finance (output 3.2) 	
Annual project reporting (output level), including activity reports and document review of guidance documents produced	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of guidance documents produced for education and climate stakeholders on programming, policy influencing and climate finance (output 3.2) 	

Monitoring				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (in US\$) ¹ ,
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of people who access the climate change and education knowledge management platform 	
Annual project reporting (output level), including meeting reports and minutes	<i>Document review</i>	Annual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of countries represented in face-to-face meetings on roadmap for implementation of the Declaration on the Common Agenda for Education and Climate Change 	

Evaluation Plan

Evaluation				
Type	Timing	Independent/Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget (in US\$)	
<i>Formative</i>	Year 3 (Interim)	Independent	\$268,000	AE budget plus FP M&E budget for data collection
<i>Summative</i>	Year 5 (Final)	Independent	\$348,000	AE budget plus FP M&E budget for data collection