



Securing Permanent Forests to Combat Climate Change and Enhance Sustainable National and Local Economies in Cameroon

ANNEX 11

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Version Date: 27/05/26

1. Introduction and M&E Approach

This Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan outlines the comprehensive framework for tracking, assessing, and reporting on the performance and results of the SPEFOCE project (Securing Permanent Forests to Combat Climate Change and Enhance Sustainable National and Local Economies in Cameroon). The Plan has been developed in accordance with the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF) and serves as Annex 11 of the GCF Funding Proposal.

1.1 Purpose and Framework Alignment

The M&E Plan serves as the primary instrument for ensuring systematic collection, analysis, and use of data to measure the project's progress toward its stated objectives, outcomes, and outputs over the 7-year implementation period and the 20-year project lifespan. The Plan is designed to:

1. Align with the GCF Investment Criteria, specifically the requirements for monitoring paradigm shift potential, sustainable development, and the project's contribution to GCF-level results.
2. Comply with the GCF Monitoring and Accountability Framework (MAF), which mandates regular performance reporting against the IRMF core and supplementary indicators.
3. Conform to IUCN's Evaluation Policy and the GCF Evaluation Policy, ensuring independence, impartiality, and credibility of evaluation processes.
4. Support adaptive management by generating timely evidence to inform course corrections, resource reallocations, and strategy adjustments throughout the project lifecycle.

1.2 Theory of Change-Based M&E

The M&E system is anchored in the project's Theory of Change (ToC), which posits that strengthening sustainable forest management governance (Component 1), developing climate-resilient value chains (Component 2), building stakeholder capacities (Component 3), and establishing robust knowledge management systems (Component 4) will collectively lead to reduced deforestation, enhanced carbon sequestration, improved livelihoods for forest-dependent communities, and strengthened institutional frameworks across the three target landscapes: Waza (Sudano-Sahelian), Dja-Lobeke (Bimodal Rainforest), and Bakossi-Bamboutous (Western Highlands).

The M&E system tests the causal assumptions underlying the ToC by tracking intermediate results, assessing enabling conditions, and identifying bottlenecks. Monitoring data is systematically used in annual learning reviews and Project Steering Committee meetings to validate or adjust the implementation strategy.

1.3 Adaptive Management Approach

The M&E Plan is designed as a living document that supports adaptive management. Quarterly progress reports identify emerging risks and opportunities. Annual Performance Reports (APRs) provide comprehensive assessments against all IRMF indicators. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) at Year 3 provides an independent assessment of progress and recommends course corrections. Throughout the project lifecycle, M&E findings feed directly

into Project Steering Committee decision-making, ensuring that implementation strategies remain responsive to changing conditions in the three target landscapes.

2. M&E Objectives

The M&E Plan pursues the following specific objectives:

1. Track progress toward project outcomes and outputs: Systematically monitor the achievement of all four project components against their defined indicators, baselines, and targets as established in the GCF IRMF Logframe.
2. Ensure accountability and transparency: Provide reliable, timely, and comprehensive information to the GCF Secretariat, IUCN (as Accredited Entity), the Government of Cameroon (GoC), and project beneficiaries on the use of funds and achievement of results.
3. Generate evidence for adaptive management: Produce actionable analytical reports that inform project management decisions, resource allocation, and strategy adjustments at the landscape and national levels.
4. Assess contribution to GCF paradigm shift objectives: Evaluate the project's contribution to transformational change across three dimensions—scale (geographic and sectoral reach), replicability (potential for adoption in other contexts), and sustainability (durability of outcomes beyond the project period).
5. Document lessons learned and good practices: Capture and disseminate knowledge on effective approaches to sustainable forest management, REDD+ implementation, value chain development, and community-based natural resource management in the Congo Basin and Sudano-Sahelian contexts.
6. Monitor compliance with environmental and social safeguards: Track adherence to the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) framework, Gender Action Plan, Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) protocols, and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan throughout the project lifecycle.

3. GCF IRMF Results Architecture

The SPEFOCE project is structured to contribute to the GCF's three-level Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF), which provides a standardized architecture for measuring and reporting climate investment results.

3.1 GCF Impact Level: Paradigm Shift Potential

At the highest level, SPEFOCE contributes to GCF's overarching goal of promoting a paradigm shift toward low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways. The project's paradigm shift potential is assessed across three dimensions:

1. Scale: The project operates across three ecologically distinct landscapes covering over 190,000 hectares, representing the major bioclimatic zones of Cameroon. Its interventions have the potential to influence national forest governance and land-use planning policies.
2. Replicability: The models for integrated SFM governance, REDD+ implementation, and climate-resilient value chain development are designed for replication across the Congo Basin and Sudano-Sahelian regions.

3. Sustainability: The project builds institutional capacity within MINFOF and local governance structures, establishing regulatory frameworks and financial mechanisms that will sustain results beyond the project period.

3.2 GCF Outcome Level: Core Indicators

The project contributes to six GCF Core Indicators spanning both Reduced Emissions/Increased Resilience and Enabling Environment outcomes:

CI1: GHG Emissions Reduced, Avoided, or Removed/Sequestered

SPEFOCE contributes to climate change mitigation through reduced deforestation in Permanent Forest Areas (PFAs), enhanced carbon sequestration through restoration of 190,330 hectares, and improved forest management practices. GHG emissions reductions will be measured using IPCC Tier 2 methodology with national emission factors, forest inventories, and satellite remote sensing.

CI2: Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries Reached

The project targets 197,979 direct beneficiaries (50% female) and 1,346,605 indirect beneficiaries across the three landscapes. Beneficiaries include forest-dependent communities, indigenous peoples, smallholder farmers, women's groups, and local government officials.

CI4: Hectares Under Improved Management

A total of 190,330 hectares of natural resource areas will be brought under improved low-emission and climate-resilient management practices, including PFAs under revised SFM plans, community forests, and restored degraded lands.

CI5: Institutional and Regulatory Frameworks

The project strengthens regulatory instruments for production forests and protected areas, builds institutional capacity on REDD+ results-based instruments, and enhances the enabling environment for climate-resilient forest governance at the national level.

CI7: Market Development and Transformation

SPEFOCE supports the structuring of micro-enterprises around NTFP value chains, creation of market platforms, and establishment of equitable supply agreements for forest-dependent communities, contributing to market transformation at the sub-national level.

CI8: Knowledge Generation and Learning

The project generates and disseminates knowledge products on sustainable forest management, REDD+ implementation, and climate-resilient value chains, contributing to improved practices at national, sub-regional, and local levels.

3.3 Project/Programme Level: Outputs and Activities

The project is organized into four components delivering specific outputs measured through project-level indicators. Component 1 focuses on climate-smart sustainable forest management and restoration. Component 2 addresses value chain development and market transformation. Component 3 strengthens stakeholder capacities on climate-resilient land-use practices. Component 4 ensures robust project oversight, monitoring, and knowledge management. The detailed results framework mapping each output to specific indicators, targets, and means of verification is presented in Section 4.

4. Results Framework and Monitoring Matrix

The following comprehensive monitoring matrix presents all indicators tracked under the SPEFOCE M&E Plan, organized by results level. The matrix maps each indicator to its baseline value, mid-term and end-of-project targets, means of verification, data collection methods, reporting frequency, responsible entities, and data sources. This table is the central reference for all project monitoring and reporting activities.

Results Level	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-Term Target (Yr 3.5)	End-of-Project Target (Yr 7)	Means of Verification	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Responsible Entity	Data Sources
GCF CORE INDICATORS									
Fund-level (Mitigation)	CI1: GHG emissions reduced, avoided, or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq)	0 tCO ₂ eq	604,946 tCO ₂ eq	2,467,777 tCO ₂ eq	National GHG inventory; Forest inventory reports; Remote sensing analysis	IPCC Tier 2 methodology; Forest inventory (permanent sample plots); Satellite remote sensing (Landsat/Sentinel-2); Allometric equations	Annual	PMU / WRI / ONACC	ONACC GHG accounting system; National forest inventory; Satellite imagery
Fund-level (Adaptation)	CI2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached (number of individuals; 50% female)	0	100,000 direct 700,000 indirect	197,979 direct (50% female) 1,346,605 indirect Total: 1,544,584	Beneficiary registration database; Household survey reports; Community monitoring reports	Household surveys (baseline, mid-term, final); Registration databases; Community-level FGDs	Annual	PMU	Project beneficiary database; National census data; Community registration
Fund-level (Cross-cutting)	CI4: Hectares of natural resource areas under improved low-emission / climate-resilient management (ha)	0 ha	95,165 ha	190,330 ha	GIS/remote sensing reports; Field verification reports; MINFOF monitoring data	Remote sensing / GIS monitoring; Field surveys and GPS mapping; MINFOF NFMS	Annual	PMU / WRI / MINFOF	WRI GIS platform; MINFOF NFMS; Satellite imagery; Field survey data
Fund-level (Enabling)	CI5: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to strengthening institutional and regulatory frameworks	Low	Medium	High	Policy review reports; Institutional capacity scorecards; Governance	Policy document review; Institutional capacity scorecards; SAGE and METT assessments	Mid-term and Final	PMU / MINFOF	MINFOF policy records; SAGE / METT reports; Capacity assessment data

Results Level	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-Term Target (Yr 3.5)	End-of-Project Target (Yr 7)	Means of Verification	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Responsible Entity	Data Sources
					assessment reports				
Fund-level (Enabling)	CI7: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to market development/transformation	Medium	Medium-High	High	Market assessment reports; Business surveys; Value chain analysis reports	Market surveys; Value chain analysis; Business performance tracking	Annual	PMU	Market survey data; Business registration records; Value chain reports
Fund-level (Enabling)	CI8: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to effective knowledge generation and learning	Medium	Medium-High	High	KM product inventory; Dissemination reports; Platform analytics	KM product tracking; Publication tracking; Website/platform analytics	Annual	PMU	Project KM database; Publication records; Platform analytics data
GCF SUPPLEMENTARY INDICATORS									
Fund-level	SI 2.1: Number of beneficiaries adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options	0	5,000 (30% women)	10,000 (30% women)	Household surveys; Livelihood assessment reports	Household surveys; FGDs; Field verification	Annual	PMU	Household survey data; Project database
Fund-level	SI 2.2: Number of beneficiaries with improved food security	0	3,000 (30% women)	8,000 (30% women)	Household food security surveys; Nutrition assessments	Food security surveys (HDDS/FCS); Household interviews	Annual	PMU	Food security survey data; FAO/WFP data
Fund-level	SI 4.1: Hectares of terrestrial forest brought under restoration and/or improved ecosystems	0 ha	95,165 ha	190,330 ha	GIS/remote sensing; Restoration monitoring reports; Field verification	Remote sensing; Field surveys; GPS mapping	Annual	PMU / WRI / MINFOF	WRI GIS platform; Restoration database; Field reports
COMPONENT 1: Climate-Smart Sustainable Forest Management and Restoration									
Output 1.1	Number of SFM policy instruments for PFAs revised or created (% women participation)	TBD	1 additional (30% women)	3 additional (30% women)	MINFOF records; Management plans; Project monitoring report	Policy document review; Stakeholder participation records	Annual	PMU / MINFOF	MINFOF regulatory archives; Project records

Results Level	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-Term Target (Yr 3.5)	End-of-Project Target (Yr 7)	Means of Verification	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Responsible Entity	Data Sources
Output 1.1	Deforestation rate in PFAs and rate of reduction of illegal logging	TBD	0.2% deforestation rate	0.1% deforestation rate	Remote sensing analysis; MINFOF enforcement data	Remote sensing / GIS; MINFOF field enforcement data	Annual	PMU / WRI / MINFOF	Satellite imagery; MINFOF enforcement records
Output 1.2	Hectares of degraded forests/lands restored (agroforestry, ANR, reforestation; % women)	0 ha	95,165 ha (30% women)	190,330 ha (30% women)	Tree planting records; Forest cover monitoring; Annual reports by PMU, WRI, MINFOF	Remote sensing; Field surveys; GPS mapping; Nursery records	Annual	PMU / WRI / MINFOF / MINEPDED	WRI GIS platform; Nursery production data; Field survey data
Output 1.3	Number of REDD+ instruments tested (% women participation)	0	1 (30% women)	3 (30% women)	REDD+ instrument documentation; Test reports	Document review; Stakeholder consultations	Annual	PMU / MINFOF	REDD+ Secretariat records; Project reports
COMPONENT 2: Value Chain Development and Transformation									
Output 2.1	Number of beneficiaries integrating into equitable supply agreements (% women)	0	5,000 producers (30% women)	10,000 producers (30% women)	Supply agreement records; Financial institution records; Project monitoring reports	Beneficiary registration; Agreement tracking; Field verification	Annual	PMU	Project beneficiary database; Supply agreement records
Output 2.1	Area of degraded landscape restored with climate-resilient practices (ha)	0 ha	15,000 ha	35,000 ha	Remote sensing; Forest restoration monitoring reports	GIS / remote sensing; Field verification	Annual	PMU / WRI	WRI GIS platform; Field survey data
Output 2.1	Number of beneficiaries trained on market, VCD and micro-enterprise development (% women)	0	300 (30% women)	1000 (30% women)	Training completion records; Project monitoring reports	Training attendance records; Post-training assessments	Annual	PMU	Training database; Assessment records
COMPONENT 3: Stakeholder Capacity Strengthening									
Output 3.1	Number of stakeholders with improved capacity on climate-resilient land management (% gender)	0	600 (30% women)	2,000 (30% women)	Training completion records; Knowledge assessments; Field verification visits	Pre/post-training assessments; Follow-up surveys; Field verification	Annual	PMU	Training database; Assessment records; Follow-up survey data

Results Level	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-Term Target (Yr 3.5)	End-of-Project Target (Yr 7)	Means of Verification	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Responsible Entity	Data Sources
Output 3.1	% of trained stakeholders applying climate risk management practices within 1 year of training	0%	50%	70%	Follow-up survey reports; Field verification reports	Follow-up surveys (12 months post-training); Field verification visits	Annual	PMU	Follow-up survey data; Field observation data
Output 3.1	Number of operational multi-stakeholder coordination platforms	0	3 platforms	6 platforms	Meeting minutes; Platform governance documents; Platform activity reports	Document review; Stakeholder interviews; Platform activity tracking	Annual	PMU	Platform records; Meeting documentation
COMPONENT 4: Project Oversight and Knowledge Management									
Output 4.1	Number of effective MEL systems in place	0	1	2	Project monitoring report; MEL system documentation	System audit; Performance review	Annual	PMU / IUCN CO	MEL system records; Audit reports
Output 4.2	% of project results, knowledge, lessons learned, and best practices consolidated and disseminated	0%	25%	75%	Published knowledge products; Dissemination reports; Project monitoring report	KM product tracking; Dissemination records; Platform analytics	Annual	PMU	KM database; Publication records
CO-BENEFIT INDICATORS									
Co-benefit (Social)	Number of beneficiaries trained on SFM, restoration, market value chains through community groups (% women)	0	1,500 (30% women)	3,000 (30% women)	Training records; Community group records; Project monitoring reports	Training attendance; Community group assessment	Annual	PMU	Training database; Community group records
Co-benefit (Economic)	Number of beneficiaries with new or enhanced job/business opportunities (% women)	0	2,500 (30% women)	5,000 (30% women)	Business registration records; Employment surveys; Project monitoring reports	Business surveys; Employment tracking; Field verification	Annual	PMU	Business registration data; Employment surveys
Co-benefit (Environmental)	Hectares of natural resource areas under improved management and/or restored	0 ha	95,165 ha	190,330 ha	GIS/remote sensing reports; Restoration monitoring reports	Remote sensing / GIS; Field verification	Annual	PMU / WRI / MINFOF	WRI GIS platform; Field survey data

5. Data Collection and Management

This section details the methodologies, protocols, and systems for collecting, managing, and assuring the quality of data required to populate the M&E indicators defined in the Results Framework.

5.1 Data Collection Methods by Indicator Type

5.1.1 GHG Emissions (CI1)

GHG emissions monitoring employs a rigorous, multi-source approach aligned with international best practices:

- IPCC Tier 2 methodology with Cameroon-specific national emission factors and carbon stock data developed in collaboration with ONACC.
- Forest inventories conducted through a network of permanent sample plots (PSPs) established across the three project landscapes, following MINFOF protocols.
- Satellite remote sensing using Landsat and Sentinel-2 imagery for land cover/land use change detection, deforestation mapping, and forest degradation assessment.
- Allometric equations for above-ground biomass estimation, calibrated to Cameroon's forest types (dense humid forest, semi-deciduous forest, Sudano-Sahelian woodland).
- ONACC GHG accounting system for national-level reporting and verification of emission reduction claims.

5.1.2 Beneficiaries (CI2)

Beneficiary tracking uses a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods:

- Beneficiary registration databases maintained at the landscape level, with unique identification codes and sex-disaggregated records.
- Household surveys at three points (baseline, mid-term, final) using standardized questionnaires covering participation in project activities, livelihood changes, and food security.
- Community-level focus group discussions (FGDs) to capture qualitative changes and beneficiary perceptions.
- Sex-disaggregated data collection as the default standard across all beneficiary monitoring activities.

5.1.3 Hectares Under Management/Restoration (CI4, SI 4.1)

The following methods ensure accurate and verifiable tracking of land management and restoration interventions:

- GIS/remote sensing monitoring system operated by WRI, using high-resolution satellite imagery and change detection algorithms.
- Field surveys and GPS mapping conducted by trained field teams for ground-truthing remote sensing data.
- MINFOF National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) for integration with national-level forest monitoring and reporting.
- Restoration monitoring protocols covering species survival rates, canopy cover progression, and biodiversity indicators.

5.1.4 Institutional Indicators (CI5)

Institutional and regulatory framework indicators are assessed through:

- Institutional capacity scorecards applied to MINFOF and relevant government agencies at baseline, mid-term, and project end.
- Policy document reviews tracking the adoption, revision, and implementation of SFM regulatory instruments.
- SAGE (Site-level Assessment of Governance and Equity) and METT (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) assessments for protected area governance.

5.1.5 Market Indicators (CI7)

Market development and transformation are tracked through:

- Market surveys conducted annually across the three landscapes.
- Value chain analysis documenting the structure, actors, and flows of key NTFP value chains.
- Business performance tracking for micro-enterprises supported by the project.

5.1.6 Knowledge Indicators (CI8)

Knowledge generation and dissemination are tracked through:

- Publication and dissemination tracking, including an inventory of all knowledge products produced.
- Website and platform analytics for the project's knowledge management system.
- Citation and download tracking for key publications.

5.2 Data Quality Assurance Procedures

Data quality is ensured through a comprehensive quality assurance framework:

1. Data validation protocols: All data undergoes double-entry verification, range checks, and consistency checks before entry into the M&E database.
2. Field supervision: The M&E Specialist conducts regular field supervision visits to verify data collection procedures and data accuracy.
3. Inter-rater reliability: For subjective assessments (e.g., institutional capacity scorecards), multiple assessors are used and inter-rater reliability is calculated.
4. External verification: GHG emissions data is subject to third-party verification in accordance with GCF requirements.
5. Annual data quality audits: The external auditor reviews M&E data as part of the annual financial and performance audit.

5.3 Data Management System

The project maintains an integrated data management system comprising:

- M&E database: A centralized digital database (using KoboToolbox or similar platform) for indicator tracking, beneficiary registration, and activity monitoring.
- GIS platforms: WRI-operated geospatial databases for land use/land cover change monitoring, restoration tracking, and spatial analysis.

- Document management system: Secure cloud-based storage for all M&E reports, datasets, and supporting documentation.

5.4 Data Disaggregation Requirements

All data is disaggregated along the following dimensions, where applicable: sex (female/male), age group (youth under 35, adults, elders), landscape (Waza, Dja-Lobeke, Bakossi-Bamboutous), indigenous peoples (IP) status, and results area. Sex disaggregation is mandatory for all beneficiary-level indicators. The Gender and Safeguards Specialist ensures that data collection tools and analysis incorporate these disaggregation requirements.

5.5 FPIC-Compliant Data Collection Protocols

In landscapes where indigenous peoples (Baka, Bagyeli) are present, all data collection activities follow FPIC-compliant protocols. These include: community-level consultations prior to data collection; culturally appropriate data collection methods; consent processes documented in local languages; community access to collected data; and feedback mechanisms ensuring that communities can verify and contest data about them. All data collectors working in IP communities receive specialized training on FPIC protocols.

6. Monitoring Plan

This section details the monitoring activities that will be implemented throughout the project lifecycle, including their frequency, responsible entities, and indicative budgets. Monitoring activities are designed to generate timely, accurate, and actionable data for project management and GCF reporting.

6.1 Monitoring Activities Schedule

The following table summarizes all monitoring activities, their frequency, responsible entities, and indicative budgets:

M&E Activity	Frequency	Responsible
Inception workshop and report	One-time, Year 1	PMU / IUCN
Quarterly progress reports	Quarterly	PMU
Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Annual	PMU / IUCN CO
Risk monitoring and management	Quarterly / Annual	PMU / IUCN CO
GHG emissions monitoring (CI1)	Annual	PMU / WRI / ONACC
Beneficiaries monitoring (CI2)	Annual	PMU
Hectares under improved management monitoring (CI4)	Annual	PMU / WRI / MINFOF
Institutional frameworks monitoring (CI5)	Annual	PMU / MINFOF
Market development monitoring (CI7)	Annual	PMU
Knowledge generation monitoring (CI8)	Annual	PMU
Environmental and social safeguards monitoring	Ongoing / Quarterly	PMU / IUCN ESMS

M&E Activity	Frequency	Responsible
Gender Action Plan monitoring	Ongoing Quarterly	PMU / Gender Specialist
Stakeholder Engagement Plan monitoring	Ongoing Quarterly	PMU
FPIC and safeguards monitoring	Ongoing Quarterly	PMU / IUCN ESMS
Environmental and social grievance mechanism	Ongoing	PMU / IUCN
Project Steering Committee meetings	Annual	PMU / IUCN CO
Annual financial audit	Annual	External auditor

6.2 Indicator Monitoring Protocols

For each core and supplementary indicator, the PMU develops detailed monitoring protocols specifying: the precise definition of the indicator; the measurement methodology; the data collection instrument(s); the sampling strategy (where applicable); the responsible field staff; the timeline for data collection, entry, and validation; and the reporting template. These protocols are finalized during the inception phase and documented in the M&E Operations Manual.

6.3 Risk Monitoring

Risk monitoring is integrated into the quarterly and annual reporting cycle. The PMU maintains an updated risk register that tracks identified risks, their likelihood and impact ratings, mitigation measures, and residual risk levels. New and emerging risks are identified through quarterly landscape-level reviews and escalated to the IUCN Country Office and Project Steering Committee. The risk register is reviewed and updated at each PSC meeting.

7. Evaluation Plan

The project evaluation plan includes two independent evaluations, consistent with GCF and IUCN evaluation requirements. Both evaluations are conducted by independent external evaluators and follow international best practice standards.

7.1 Evaluation Schedule

Evaluation Type	Timing	Scope	Independent / Self
Mid-Term Review (MTR)	End of Year 3 / Beginning Year 4	Comprehensive assessment of progress, relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. Review all IRMF indicators. Assess paradigm shift potential. Evaluate ESS/Gender/FPIC compliance. Inform adaptive management decisions.	Independent (external evaluator)
Terminal Evaluation (TE)	3 months before operational closure	Full assessment of achievement of project objectives. Assess sustainability and paradigm shift contribution. Evaluate IRMF outcomes and outputs. Document lessons learned and best practices for replication.	Independent (external evaluator)

7.2 Evaluation Approach

Both evaluations follow a rigorous, mixed-methods approach consistent with IUCN and GCF evaluation standards:

Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference (ToR) for each evaluation are developed following IUCN and GCF standard templates. ToRs are reviewed by the Project Steering Committee and approved by IUCN Headquarters (PPME unit) to ensure compliance with institutional evaluation standards.

Methodology

The evaluations employ mixed methods combining:

- Quantitative methods: Analysis of monitoring data, indicator achievements, household survey results, and financial data.
- Qualitative methods: Key informant interviews with stakeholders at national, landscape, and community levels; focus group discussions; field observation visits; and document reviews.
- Case studies: In-depth analysis of selected interventions and landscapes to illustrate causal pathways and emergent outcomes.

Assessment Criteria

Evaluations assess the project against six standard evaluation criteria: Relevance (alignment with national priorities and GCF investment criteria), Coherence (internal consistency and complementarity with other interventions), Effectiveness (achievement of outcomes and outputs), Efficiency (cost-effectiveness and timeliness), Impact (contribution to higher-level changes in emissions, resilience, and livelihoods), and Sustainability (durability of results beyond the project period).

Stakeholder Participation

All stakeholder groups—including government partners, local communities, indigenous peoples, women's groups, private sector actors, and civil society—participate in evaluation processes through interviews, focus groups, and validation workshops. Evaluation findings are presented in stakeholder validation workshops before finalization.

Management Response

Within 30 days of receiving evaluation reports, the PMU and IUCN CO prepare a formal management response to all evaluation recommendations. The management response includes an action plan with timelines, responsible parties, and resource requirements. Implementation of the management response is tracked through the quarterly reporting system.

Quality Assessment

All evaluation reports undergo quality assessment by IUCN's internal Independent Evaluation system at Headquarters. Reports are made available in English and submitted to the GCF Secretariat, IUCN, and the Project Steering Committee.

8. Roles and Responsibilities

Clear delineation of M&E roles and responsibilities across all project stakeholders is essential for effective implementation of the M&E Plan. The following table details the M&E role and key responsibilities of each entity involved in the project's M&E system.

Entity	M&E Role	Key Responsibilities
Project Coordinator (PC)	Day-to-day M&E implementation	Develop annual work plans incorporating M&E activities; ensure timely indicator monitoring; prepare Annual Performance Reports (PIRs); manage the M&E database; coordinate data collection across the three landscapes; liaise with M&E Specialist and Gender Specialist.
Project Management Unit (PMU)	Implement M&E Plan	Collect and analyse monitoring data; prepare quarterly progress reports; manage beneficiary registration databases; support field-level M&E; coordinate landscape-level data collection teams; ensure compliance with data quality standards.
M&E Specialist	Design and maintain M&E system	Design data collection tools and M&E protocols; train field staff on M&E methodologies; ensure data quality through validation and verification; prepare analytical reports; support IRMF reporting requirements; maintain the M&E database and GIS platforms.
Gender and Safeguards Specialist	Monitor cross-cutting commitments	Monitor Gender Action Plan implementation; track FPIC compliance across all three landscapes; monitor ESS commitments; ensure sex-disaggregated data collection; support the environmental and social grievance mechanism; prepare ESS monitoring reports.
IUCN Cameroon Country Office	M&E oversight and quality assurance	Conduct annual supervision missions; quality assurance of PIRs before GCF submission; coordinate NDA and stakeholder input into M&E processes; ensure compliance with IUCN and GCF M&E requirements; escalate M&E issues to HQ as needed.
IUCN HQ (PPME)	Technical M&E support	Provide technical M&E guidance; quality assurance of evaluation processes; coordinate independent evaluations (MTR, TE); IRMF compliance review; review and approve evaluation ToRs and reports.
MINFOF (Executing Entity)	Government monitoring data	Provide government forest monitoring data; participate in joint monitoring missions; validate restoration and forest management data; contribute to PIRs; facilitate access to national forest inventory and NFMS data.
Project Steering Committee (PSC)	Strategic M&E oversight	Validate annual work plans and M&E budgets; approve evaluation ToRs; review evaluation reports and management responses; approve adaptive management decisions based on M&E findings.
GCF Secretariat	Fund-level oversight	Receive and review Annual Performance Reports (APRs/PIRs); provide feedback on project performance; commission independent evaluations if

Entity	M&E Role	Key Responsibilities
		needed; review Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation reports.
NDA (MINEPDED)	National coordination	Participate in M&E processes and PSC meetings; provide policy context for results interpretation; validate country-level results; ensure alignment with national climate commitments.
WRI / ONACC	Technical partners	WRI: Operate GIS monitoring systems, conduct remote sensing analysis, support forest inventory. ONACC: Manage GHG accounting system, provide national emission factors, verify emissions data.
Independent Evaluators	Evaluation implementation	Conduct Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation following IUCN/GCF standards; produce evaluation reports with findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

9. Reporting Plan

The project follows a structured reporting plan that ensures timely and comprehensive information flows to all stakeholders. All reports are prepared in English and follow GCF and IUCN standard templates.

Report	Content	Frequency	Responsible	Submitted To
Inception Report	Inception workshop results; revised M&E plan; finalized work plan and budget; baseline data compilation; updated risk register	Within 1 month of inception workshop	PC / PMU	PSC, IUCN CO, GCF
Quarterly Progress Report	Activities completed; issues and challenges; risk updates; expenditure summary; upcoming quarterly plan	Quarterly	PMU	IUCN CO
Annual Performance Report (APR/PIR)	Progress against all IRMF indicators; financial report; risk update; ESS/Gender monitoring results; lessons learned	Annual	PMU / IUCN CO	GCF Secretariat
Mid-Term Review Report	Independent assessment of progress against all objectives; evaluation of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency; recommendations for adaptive management	Year 3–4	Independent Evaluator	PSC, IUCN, GCF
Terminal Evaluation Report	Final assessment of outcomes and impact; sustainability assessment; paradigm shift contribution;	3 months before closure	Independent Evaluator	PSC, IUCN, GCF

Report	Content	Frequency	Responsible	Submitted To
	lessons learned and recommendations			
Project Completion Report	Final results against all indicators; financial closure; lessons learned; sustainability assessment; handover plan	Project closure	PMU / IUCN CO	GCF Secretariat
Ad-hoc Reports	As requested by PSC, IUCN, or GCF on specific topics or issues	As needed	PMU	Requestor

10. Adaptive Management Framework

The M&E system is designed to support adaptive management, ensuring that project implementation remains responsive to emerging evidence, changing conditions, and stakeholder feedback.

10.1 Feedback Loops

M&E data feeds back into project management through multiple, structured feedback loops:

1. Quarterly progress reports provide early warning of implementation delays, underperformance, or emerging risks, enabling the PMU to take corrective action within the reporting period.
2. Annual Performance Reports (PIRs) provide a comprehensive assessment of progress against all IRMF indicators, forming the basis for annual work plan adjustments.
3. The Mid-Term Review provides an independent, in-depth assessment at the project's midpoint, with actionable recommendations for strategic and operational adjustments.

10.2 Annual Learning Reviews

The PMU convenes annual learning reviews bringing together field staff, technical advisors, government partners, and community representatives to collectively analyse monitoring data, identify lessons learned, and develop recommendations for adaptive management. Learning review findings are documented and integrated into the subsequent year's work plan.

10.3 Role of the Project Steering Committee

The PSC serves as the decision-making authority for significant adaptive management actions, including: reallocation of resources between components or landscapes; revision of targets based on new evidence; changes to implementation strategy or partnerships; and responses to significant risks or changed circumstances. The PSC reviews M&E data at each meeting and approves proposed course corrections.

10.4 Risk-Responsive M&E Adjustments

The M&E Plan itself is subject to adaptive management. If monitoring data reveals that certain indicators are not capturing the intended change, or that data collection methods are not feasible, the M&E Specialist proposes adjustments through the quarterly reporting system. Significant changes to indicators or targets require PSC approval and notification to the GCF Secretariat.

11. Sustainability of M&E Systems

Ensuring the sustainability of M&E systems beyond the project period is essential for maintaining the long-term monitoring of forest management and climate change adaptation outcomes. The project adopts the following strategies:

11.1 Capacity Building of MINFOF

Throughout the project, MINFOF staff at national and regional levels receive structured training on M&E methodologies, GIS/remote sensing, data management, and results-based management. This capacity building ensures that government institutions can continue monitoring forest management outcomes after the project concludes.

11.2 Integration with the National Forest Monitoring System

The project's M&E data, methodologies, and GIS platforms are designed for integration with MINFOF's National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS). Remote sensing protocols, permanent sample plot networks, and data management systems are developed in collaboration with MINFOF to ensure compatibility and continuity.

11.3 Handover Plan for M&E Tools and Databases

During the final year of implementation, the PMU develops and implements a comprehensive handover plan that transfers all M&E tools, databases, GIS platforms, and documentation to MINFOF and other government partners. The handover plan includes: data migration and system transfer protocols; user training for all transferred systems; documentation of all methodologies, protocols, and standard operating procedures; and a maintenance plan for hardware, software, and databases.

11.4 Institutional Memory Through Knowledge Products

The project produces comprehensive knowledge products—including methodological guides, best practice documents, case studies, and analytical reports—that capture the institutional memory of M&E processes and findings. These products are disseminated through MINFOF, IUCN, and the GCF knowledge platforms, ensuring that lessons learned remain accessible for future climate investment programming.