

Annex 14 Monitoring and Evaluation plan (12092025)

1. Overview and Purpose of the M&E System

The BRAVE project includes a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system to track progress toward planned outcomes and outputs over implementation period. The M&E Plan forms an integral part of this Funding Proposal and is aligned with the GCF Monitoring and Accountability Framework (MAF) and Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF). Fund-level monitoring and evaluation will be based on:

- IRMF Core and Supplementary Indicators
- Project-specific outcome and output indicators
- GCF investment criteria and policy compliance requirements.

The M&E system will ensure- accountability for results, evidence-based adaptive management., compliance with fiduciary, ESS, and Gender Policy standards, transparent reporting to GCF and the NDA and learning and replication of best practices.

2. Institutional Arrangements and Responsibilities

2.1 Accredited Entity (Kemitraan)

Kemitraan, as the Direct Access Entity (AE), holds overall responsibility for compliance with the GCF Accreditation Master Agreement (AMA) and MAF requirements.

The AE will require adherence to this M&E Plan through Subsidiary Agreements with Executing Entities; maintain systems to monitor performance of executing entities.

- Submit Annual Performance Reports (APRs) and financial reports to GCF.
- Submit one independent one interim independent evaluation report and one final independent evaluation report.
- Conduct annual supervision missions.
- Submit annual self-assessment of compliance with fiduciary standards, ESS, and Gender Policy.
- Prepare formal management responses to evaluation findings.

The AE will share APRs with the NDA and submit them to the GCF in accordance with agreed timelines.

2.2 Executing Entity (Mercy Corps Indonesia – MCI)

Primary responsibility for day-to-day project M&E will rest with Mercy Corps Indonesia (MCI) through a dedicated M&E Manager within the Project Management Unit (PMU). The M&E Manager will:

- Serve as focal point for all project-level M&E information.

- Ensure compliance with GCF reporting standards.
- Oversee development and maintenance of a centralized M&E database.
- Consolidate data from provincial and site-level sources.
- Coordinate preparation of APRs with the Project Manager.

Supporting Structure

The M&E Manager will be supported by:

- M&E Officers responsible for site-level data collection and quarterly monitoring visits.
- ESS and Gender Specialists responsible for monitoring ESMF and Gender Action Plan implementation.
- GIS/technical staff for ecosystem and blue-green space monitoring.
- Independent consultants for mid-term and final evaluations.

The M&E Manager will be custodian of all project-level data and ensure secure storage, validation, and reporting.

2.3 Current Capacity Gaps and Capacity Building Plan

There is limited digital data management integration across partners along with inconsistent use of GIS and climate data for monitoring. In addition, there is limited experience in IRMF-aligned reporting and weak documentation of outcome-level evidence

2.4 Capacity Strengthening Measures

- Establishment of a centralized digital M&E database
- Training of PMU and community groups on GCF indicator tracking.
- GIS and satellite monitoring capacity enhancement.
- Periodic internal data quality audits.
- Dedicated M&E focal point embedded within PMU.
-

3. Existing M&E Systems and Enhancement Plan

Current systems include field monitoring forms; farmer group registers; training attendance sheets; GIS and watershed modelling tools. Enhancements will include:

- Standardized indicator tracking templates aligned with IRMF.
- Integration of GIS and satellite imagery for ecosystem indicators.
- Digital archiving of verification evidence.

- Automated data dashboards for internal performance review.

4. Multi-Level Monitoring System

The project will apply a three-tier monitoring structure:

First Level – Site-Level Monitoring: Field teams will collect data on site-specific activities using standardized tools aligned with the Logical Framework. Activities include:

- Household beneficiary verification.
- Training attendance tracking (gender-disaggregated);
- GIS mapping of restored hectares.
- Aquaculture and productivity records.
- Contingency plan validation.

M&E Officers will conduct quarterly monitoring visits and prepare internal site-level reports.

Second Level – PMU Consolidation and Review

The M&E Manager will:

- Consolidate quarterly site reports.
- Present findings in quarterly progress review meetings.
- Facilitate reflection sessions with PMU, ESS, Gender staff, and technical teams.
- Conduct at least one annual learning workshop to review performance against the Theory of Change.

This level ensures adaptive management and cross-outcome coordination.

Third Level – AE Oversight and Reporting

The AE will conduct annual supervision missions, review APRs with stakeholders including the NDA, assess implementation challenges and compliance risks, submit consolidated APRs and financial reports to GCF and provide annual compliance self-assessments.

APR submissions will include:

- Progress against IRMF indicators.
- Safeguards and gender updates.
- GRM performance (including SEAH cases);
- Financial status.
- Risk management updates.

5. Monitoring of IRMF and Project specific Indicators

Monitoring will cover:

- Core Indicator 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached.
- Core indicator 3: Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions
- Supplementary Indicator 2.1.
- Supplementary Indicator 4.1
- Supplementary indicators 3.1
- Core Indicators 5–8 (Enabling environment).
- Project specific outcome and output indicators

Means of verification: Household surveys; Focus Group Discussions; Field observation; Satellite imagery and GIS; Training and attendance records and Policy documentation and KIIs.

Baseline data will be collected within the first six months of implementation. Midline and endline data collection will be aligned with evaluation timelines.

5. Periodic Reporting

Report Type	Frequency	Responsibility	Recipient
Site-level internal monitoring reports	Quarterly	M&E Officers	M&E Manager
Technical progress report	Semi-annual	PMU	AE
Financial report	Quarterly	PMU Finance Team	AE
(APR) Annual Progress Report	To be submitted in Q1 of Y2, Y3, Y4, and Y5	PM & M&E Manager	AE, NDA (AE submits to GCF)
IER (Interim Evaluation Report)	Q3 or Q4 of Y3	Independent Consultant	AE, GCF, NDA
FER (Final Independent Evaluation Report)	Q1 or Q2 of Y6	Independent Consultant	AE, GCF, NDA
PCR (Project completion report)	Q1 or Q2 of Y6	PM & M&E Manager	AE, GCF, NDA

6. Evaluation Plan

Mid-Term Evaluation

The purpose of Interim evaluation will be to assess implementation progress and recommend corrective actions. The criteria for evaluation will cover relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, gender responsiveness. The output of the evaluation will be independent report and AE management response

Final Evaluation

The purpose of the final independent evaluation will be to assess outcomes, sustainability, and paradigm shift potential. Criteria: for evaluation will cover OECD-DAC and GCF Investment Criteria. The Output: Independent evaluation and management response submitted to GCF

A Project Completion Report will be prepared within three months of completion and publicly disclosed.

7. Adaptive Management

Adaptive management will be ensured through quarterly progress reviews; annual reflection workshops; integration of monitoring data into work plan adjustments; risk analysis and mitigation review during AE supervision missions and incorporation of evaluation recommendations into second-phase implementation.

Monitoring				
E.3. GCF Outcome level: Reduced emissions and increased resilience (IRMF core indicators 1-4, quantitative indicators)				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget
<i>Project Annual and completion reports, Intervention progress reports</i>	Document review Focus groups Field observation visits	<i>Annual</i>	<u>Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached</u>	Included under the costs for outputs under Project specific Outcome 2
<i>Project Annual and completion reports, capacity development reports, Intervention progress reports</i>	Document review Focus groups Field observation visits	<i>Annual</i>	<u>Supplementary 2.1: Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options</u>	Included under the costs for outputs under Project specific Outcome 2
<i>Project Annual reports</i>	Procurement contracts and invoices for construction materials and professional services	<i>Mid-term and End-term</i>	<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>	Included on under the cost for outputs under Project specific outcome 2

<i>Project Annual reports</i>	CRIA reports and economic loss modelling - Updated flood and hydrological modelling conducted during implementation	<i>Mid-term and End-term</i>	<u>Supplementary indicator 3.1: Change in expected losses of economic assets due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention</u>	Included on under the cost for outputs under Project specific outcome 2
<i>Project Annual and completion reports, Landscape assessment; conservation implementation plans; satellite images</i>	Document review Focus groups Field observation visits GIS Data	<i>Annual</i>	<u>Supplementary 4.1: Hectares of terrestrial forest, terrestrial non-forest, freshwater and coastal marine areas brought under resoration and/or improved ecosystems</u>	Included under the costs for outputs under project specific Outcome 1 below.

Monitoring				
GCF Outcome level: Enabling environment (IRMF core indicators 5-8 as applicable)				
Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget
<i>Assessment and Policy Analyses by PMIU under Outcome 3 of Project</i>	Document review Government data/records	<i>Interim and Final</i>	<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>	Included under the costs for Outcome 3 below.
<i>Lessons learnt documentation by PMIU under outcome 3 of Project</i> <i>CIS development and application under</i>	Document review (including CIS reports) Key Informant Interviews	<i>Interim and Final</i>	<u>Core Indicator 6: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to technology deployment, dissemination,</u>	Included under the costs for Outcome 3 below.

<i>outcome 2 and 3 of Project</i>			<u>development or transfer and innovation</u>	
<i>Lessons learnt documentation by PMU under outcome 3 of Project</i>	Document review Key Informant Interviews	<i>Interim and Final</i>	<u>Core indicator 7: Degree to which GCF Investments contribute to market development/transformation at the sectoral, local, or national level</u>	Included under the costs for Outcome 3 below.
<i>Lessons learnt documentation by PMU under outcome 3 of Project</i>	Document review Key Informant Interviews	<i>Interim and Final</i>	<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>	Included under the costs for Outcome 3 below.

Monitoring						
Project/programme specific indicators (project outcomes and outputs)						
Outcomes/Outputs		Indicator	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicative Budget (USD)
	Outcome 1: The Development planning processes in Sengkarang and Kupang watersheds are participatory and climate-informed	Number of watersheds adopting use of CIS information for decision-making processes	Project records, CIS reports	Document review, validation sessions with the community	Annual	
	Output 1.1: Climate-based evidence is available to targeted communities and project stakeholders for climate-resilient planning	Number of Climate risk impact assessments completed for 2 watersheds	Assessment reports	Technical review	Annual	3.701
4.607		Ecosystem Valuation Study completed	Assessment reports	Technical review	Annual	3.701
	Output 1.2: Community-based climate change adaptive management plans	Number of climate resilient community participatory groups formed	Documentation of community groups formation	Monitoring visits	Annual	4.414

	and designs have been developed to enhance community resilience					
		Number of community group members reporting increased knowledge in relevant training areas	Training workshops Participant attendance list	Monitoring visits	Annual	4.414
		Number of integrated community resilience action plans developed	Planning docs, validation reports	Document review	Annual	4.414
		Number of Blue green spaces sites approved	approved permission letters	consultations record	Annual	4.414
	Subtotal Outcome 1					25.060
	Outcome 2 Communities in the targeted watersheds implement climate-resilient livelihoods and integrated watershed/runoff management practices that reduce climate-related risks	Average agricultural productivity (tonnes per hectare)	Number of people by household list yield records and survey data	FGDs with community End-line evaluation	Endline	
		Average aquaculture productivity (tonnes per hectare)	Number of people by household list yield records and survey data	FGDs with community End-line evaluation	Endline	

		Water infiltration rate in blue green spaces for runoff management	Water infiltration rate tests at baseline and endline level	End line report Baseline report Technical feasibility reports		
		Soil organic carbon (SOC) content rate in blue green spaces for improved land management	Soil organic carbon content tests at baseline and endline level	End line report Baseline report Technical feasibility reports		
	Output 2.1 Communities in the targeted watersheds are supported to implement the climate-informed and climate-resilient livelihood options	Number of climate smart agriculture field schools implemented for agriculture and aquaculture farmer groups	Training reports, FFS records	Document review, attendance sheets	Annual	13.868
		Number of trained farmers reporting increased knowledge of CSA practices (disaggregated by farmer group and gender)	Training reports	Attendance sheets	Annual	13.868

		Number of demonstration plots established for agriculture and aquaculture practices	GIS data, Demo plot records	GIS mapping, field verification	Annual	13.868
		Number of gender inclusive farmer groups strengthened in financial literacy and business management skills	Farmer group records, Capacity building session records	MIS verification	Annual	13.868
		Number of participatory climate resilient conservation plans developed	Conservation plans	FGDs with farmers	Annual	13.868
17.333		Number of trained woman farmers reporting increased knowledge of implementing value added scheme	Capacity building session reports, attendance records	FGD s/field verifications, Attendance sheet	Annual	13.868
	Output 2.2: Integrated runoff management and flood preparedness systems established in	Number of blue-green space designs validated with local stakeholders	Consultation records, GIS maps, approval letters	Meeting minutes, GIS survey	Annual	6.697

1	targeted sub districts	Number of blue-green spaces established through management working groups	Project/blue-green space development reports	Field verification	Annual	6.697
		Number of contingency plans developed	Plan documents ,	Document review,	Final	1.339
		Number of trained individuals reporting increased knowledge of contingency plans	training reports	Attendance sheet	Final	1.339
	Subtotal Outcome 2					99.283
	Outcome 3: Enabling environment to replicate and scale-up climate-resilient IWRM exists	Government adopts enabling framework for replication & scale-up of climate-resilient IWRM	Policy documents	Policy tracking, Key Informant Interview	Final	
		Total value (USD) of climate-resilient financial products	Beneficiaries' details and record of	Signed agreements on financial products		

		accessed by farmers/fish farmers	financial products			
	Output 3.1. Government stakeholders, academia, private sector, community and media are informed of best practices of climate-resilient and climate-informed livelihood options, and policy recommendations	Number of policy recommendation summaries shared with policymakers	SPM, dialogue reports	Document review, minutes	Annual	15.976
		Number of local/provincial policy frameworks integrating IWRM principles	Policy docs	Document review, FGD with local governments	Final	3.195
	Output 3.2: Communities in the targeted watersheds have access to supports with climate-resilient livelihood business models and finance	Number of farmers/fish farmer groups adopting business models	Farmer/fish farmer group records, documentation of bundled services provided, business model documents	Document review, Field Verification, FGD s with farmers/fish farmer	Annual	10.683
		Number of farmers/fish farmers accessing technical advisory, financial products	List of farmers//fish farmers accessing financial services, list of farmer/fish	Field Verification, FGDs with farmers/fish farmers	Annual	10.683

			farmer groups receiving advisory service			
	Subtotal Outcome 3					40.538
	<p>Evaluative data collections (baseline, midline and endline data collection, including alignment of MEL Tech and system): USD 52.480</p> <p>Regular monitoring and data collection against log-frame indicators and annual assessment: USD 112.400</p> <p>Assessment and build capacity of the project team in monitoring, reporting and evaluation to support project improvement: USD 95.400</p> <p>Cost to support evaluations that consisted of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CARM Sensitization Workshop with integrated beneficiary feedback mechanisms for evaluation purposes, : USD 56.200 - CARM and MEL visibility: 37.898 - Stakeholder consultations for evaluation purposes: USD 50.000 <p>MEL Staff: 64.555</p> <p>Total Monitoring Cost: USD 469.433</p>					USD 469.433

Evaluation Type	Timing	Independent / Self-evaluation	Indicative Budget (USD)
Interim Independent Evaluation			21,875
Final Independent Evaluation			21,875
Total Evaluation cost			43.750