



**CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY
CLIMATE CHANGE CENTRE**

Building Resilience. Securing Our Future.

Climate Actions for Building Resilience in Coastal Communities (CABRIC) in the Caribbean EDA Facility

Annex 11 – Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Date: July 2026

Last Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre

This report has been prepared for The Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) – as part of the work to finalise the Funding Proposal Package for submission to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) for an Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) Funding Proposal titled, 'Climate Actions for Building Resilience in Coastal Communities in the Caribbean (CABRIC Caribbean)'

Published by: E Co.

Team leader: Ellie La Trobe-Hogan, E Co. ellie@ecoltdgroup.com

Authors: Remus Bandacu

Last edited: 15 September 2026

Status: Final

Disclaimer: This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose. We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties. This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it. The views expressed in this report are those of E Co. staff and associates and they are not necessarily those of the commissioning party of anyone else.

Content

1.	Scope and objectives.....	3
2.	M&E Plan.....	4
2.1	Monitoring.....	4
2.2	Surveys	13
2.3	Evaluations	13
3.	Organisation of the M&E system.....	14
4.	Reporting	17

1. Scope and objectives

The Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC), in its role as the Accredited Entity (AE), will oversee and supervise the implementation of this project in accordance with the agreement signed between CCCCC and the GCF. CCCCC will be responsible for project-level monitoring and evaluation in compliance with CCCCC policies.

This Participatory Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (PMEL) Plan defines the framework for tracking, assessing, and learning from the implementation of CABRIC. It outlines key activities, processes, information flows, and resource allocation required for effective bottom-up project monitoring, evaluation and learning. The PMEL system is designed as a dynamic, flexible, participatory, and transparent mechanism that enables timely communication among stakeholders, executing entities, and project management teams. It serves as an adaptive management tool, providing real-time insights to inform decision-making, improve implementation strategies, and ensure accountability to donors and beneficiaries especially given the devolution of decision-making authority which CABRIC promotes.

Reporting should be simple and efficient at all levels, with a strong focus on usability for subgrantees. Priority will be given to key beneficiary indicators and impact stories for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL), rather than over excessive data collection and onerous reporting requirements. Gender-disaggregated data will be systematically collected to ensure equity and inclusivity in impact assessments. Moreover, the PMEL system offers communities to lead data collection by co-designing relevant templates and utilizing lived experiences to generate evidence grounded in local knowledge. This approach aims to balance accountability, efficiency, promote inclusivity and meaningful impact tracking, ensuring that reporting processes remain practical and insightful.

The PMEL system will be aligned with the reporting requirements of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), ensuring that progress is tracked against established outcomes and impact indicators.

Its objectives are to:

- be used as an annual planning tool;
- ensure participatory approaches are integrated throughout implementation of the CABRIC programme;
- Track progress against programme results in a way that is transparent and accessible to all stakeholders;
- Centre community voice in evidence generation and programme decision-making;
- Enable timely identification of risks, bottlenecks, and implementation challenges through community-level early warning;
- Assess the equity and effectiveness of programme interventions in reaching the most vulnerable;
- Build the permanent monitoring and learning capacity of participating CSOs, NGOs, and Local Authorities;
- Generate and systematise learning to drive adaptive management and continuous programme improvement;
- Produce credible, community-validated evidence for GCF and national reporting requirements;
- Capture and share good practices, innovations, and lessons learned across the CABRIC programme countries

2. PMEL Plan

2.1 Participatory Monitoring

Monitoring under the CABRIC programme is designed as a continuous, systematic, and participatory process that tracks the progress of programme implementation, measures key performance indicators, and generates real-time evidence to support adaptive management. Rather than functioning as a top-down compliance exercise, the CABRIC monitoring system actively engages CSOs, NGOs, Local Authorities, community organisations, and the coastal communities they serve as co-producers of monitoring data and co-interpreters of evidence. This participatory approach ensures that the communities most exposed to climate risk — including women, youth, indigenous groups, and other marginalised populations — have a direct voice in assessing whether the programme is working and for whom.

The monitoring framework ensures that deliverables and outputs align with the Logical Framework and contribute to the achievement of intended climate resilience outcomes. Critically, it also creates the conditions for community-level monitoring findings to flow upward into programme decision-making — so that the experience of beneficiaries' shapes implementation, not only informs donor reports.

The specific objectives of the participatory monitoring process are to:

- track progress against programme indicators at output and outcome levels, as defined in the Logical Framework, using data generated by both the Regional Programme Coordination Unit (RPCU) and community-level monitoring actors;
- ensure timely identification of risks, bottlenecks, and challenges through regular community-level reflection sessions, grantee self-assessments, and participatory review processes that surface implementation issues before they escalate;
- assess the effectiveness and equity of all interventions/subprojects in reaching targeted beneficiaries — disaggregated by sex, age, readiness level, vulnerability category, and geography — with particular attention to whether the most marginalised community members are equitably accessing programme benefits;
- build the monitoring and learning capacity of CSOs, NGOs, and Local Authorities as a programme outcome in itself; ensuring that participating organisations can collect, interpret, and use data to manage their own projects and communicate results to their communities beyond the programme period;
- support learning and knowledge-sharing by capturing successes, best practices, and lessons learned through participatory tools including community scorecards, most significant change stories, and peer learning exchanges — producing evidence in formats that are meaningful and accessible to community audiences, not only to donors and technical reviewers; and
- enable compliance with the reporting requirements of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), national authorities, and programme stakeholders, grounded in community-validated data that strengthens the credibility and legitimacy of programme-level results.

The programme's monitoring system will integrate multiple data collection methods tailored to different types of interventions and adapted to the diverse coastal community contexts across the CABRIC programme countries. These methods will be implemented by the RPCU in genuine collaboration with implementing partners, community MEL champions, and local stakeholders — not administered to them.

At the community level, trained community MEL champions — selected from within participating CSOs, NGOs, and community groups — will lead routine data collection using simple, co-designed tools available in local languages and accessible in low-connectivity environments. Community scorecards will be administered quarterly to capture community members' own assessments of programme progress, equity of access, and quality of interventions. Most Significant Change stories will be collected semi-annually to generate qualitative evidence of outcome-level change that quantitative indicators alone cannot capture. All community-level data will be discussed in open community reflection meetings before being entered into the programme's monitoring system, ensuring that findings are validated by those who generated them and that communities are the first — not the last — to hear what the data says.

At the grantee level, participating CSOs, NGOs, and Local Authorities will complete periodic traffic-light self-assessments against their agreed implementation milestones and quarterly participatory review meetings that bring together project staff, community MEL champions, and community representatives to collectively interpret progress data, identify emerging risks, and agree any adjustments needed. Grantee self-assessment findings will be submitted through a shared digital platform and will trigger a support response — not a compliance notice — when amber or red flags are identified.

At the regional programme level, the RPCU will consolidate community-level and grantee-level monitoring data into semi-annual cross-country learning reviews, where patterns across countries are identified, assumptions in the programme theory of change are tested against emerging evidence, and agreed adaptations are documented in the programme's adaptive management log. An annual learning forum will bring together grantees, community representatives, national authorities, and the RPCU to collectively review the state of programme implementation and co-determine priorities for the following year.

Data collection tools will be developed based on the indicators at each level of results, co-designed with grantees and community stakeholders before the programme baseline is established. The table below shows data sources, types of tools, responsible parties — including community-level actors — and frequency of data collection based on the programme's Logical Framework. Every tool in the system will meet the following minimum standards: available in local language; usable on a basic smartphone offline or as a paper form; administrable by a trained community member without technical support; and designed to produce findings that the community generating the data can understand and act upon.

GCF / Programme Results	Data / Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	M&E Personnel involved
<u>ARA1 Most vulnerable people and communities</u>	Annual progress reports	Document review Survey questionnaire /	Annual	<u>Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached</u>	72,692.5	Regional programme MEL officer
	Reports from national grant administrators			<u>Supplementary 2.4: Beneficiaries (female/male) covered by new or improved early warning systems</u>	72,692.5	5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant
	Reports from CANARI Beneficiary registration forms			<u>Supplementary 2.1: Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options</u>	72,692.5	Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
<u>ARA2 Health, well-being, food and water security</u>	Annual progress reports	Document review Survey questionnaire /	Annual	<u>Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached</u>	72,692.5	Regional programme MEL officer
	Reports from national grant administrators Reports from CANARI Beneficiary registration forms			<u>Supplementary 2.2: Beneficiaries (female/male) with improved food security</u>	72,692.5	5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
<u>ARA3 Infrastructure and built environment</u>	Annual progress reports Reports from national grant administrators	Document review	Annual	<u>Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached</u>	72,692.5	Regional programme MEL officer
		Survey questionnaire /		<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>	72,692.5	5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant
		Equipment inspection		<u>Supplementary 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>	72,692.5	Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
<u>ARA4 Ecosystems and ecosystem services</u>	Annual progress reports		Annual	<u>Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached</u>	72,692.5	

GCF / Programme Results	Data / Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	M&E Personnel involved
	Reports from national grant administrators	Document review Survey questionnaire /		<u>Core 4: Hectares of natural resources brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practice</u>	72,692.5	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional and operational capacity for inclusive climate responsive planning	CCCCC reporting Policy documents	Document review Survey questionnaire /	Baseline, midline, endline	Number of national and local institutions demonstrating strengthened operational capacity to implement inclusive climate-responsive planning.	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
	Completed institutional readiness and capacity assessment reports	Surveys/ Interviews/ Scoring rubric	Baseline, midline, endline	Extent to which institutional readiness and capacity assessments for inclusive climate response planning meet quality requirements		Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
	Training Reports	Document review	Quarterly	Number of trainings conducted (disaggregated by type of training, country, community, organizations, participants)		Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations

GCF / Programme Results	Data / Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	M&E Personnel involved
Output 1.1 Community-led coastal climate adaptation priorities and project pipelines developed	CCCCC reporting Assessment reports CANARI reports	Document review Post-training progress reports Readiness categorization records Mentorship session logs Training attendance and module completion records. Concept note quality scoring rubric completed by reviewers.	Annual	Number of participatory capacity assessments workshops completed for CSOs/NGOs and LAs (disaggregated by community/ country/participation) Number of outreach events conducted (disaggregated by country, community, participants) Number of decentralized entry-point workshops Number of community climate investment programmes inclusive of pCVRA informed eligibility criteria and community investment priorities developed and accepted by countries Number of targeted modular trainings conducted (disaggregated by readiness level categorization, country, type of organization) Extent to which modular trainings and mentorship programmes improve readiness progress of beneficiary groups/ organizations	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant

GCF / Programme Results	Data / Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	M&E Personnel involved
Output 1.2 Climate resilience and GEDSI mainstreamed national climate resilient coastal policy frameworks	CCCCC reporting Training records Reporting from national government ministries / agencies Independent mid-term and final evaluations	Document review	Annual	Number of gender-responsive national coastal policy frameworks and roadmaps officially adopted by the government and implemented. Number of CSO/NGO and LAs staff participating in community-led climate adaptation project development, climate data interpretation, and GEDSI integration (disaggregated by country, sex, type of training, type of institution) Number of government officials, policymakers and technical staff trained on climate data interpretation, GEDSI analysis, and coastal policy development (disaggregated by country, organization/department and sex) Regional guidance document and best practice toolkit for GEDSI-integrated coastal resilience policy produced Number of trainings conducted for policymakers and technical staff in gender responsive and socially inclusive coastal resilience policy implementation Regional Community of Practice established for coastal resilience policy implementation	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant

GCF / Programme Results	Data / Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	M&E Personnel involved
Output 1.3 Institutional capacity to implement and adaptively manage gender transformative climate resilient livelihood and social projects increased	Training records CANARI reports Knowledge exchange reports Video/documentary evidence	Document review Site visits Survey / questionnaire	Annual	CABRIC Community Resilience Support Centre (helpdesk) established and operational Number of institutions demonstrating improved capacity to implement and adaptively manage community-led, gender-responsive climate resilience interventions as a result of CABRIC Community Resilience Support Centre (disaggregated by country, type of institution) <u>Number of cross-country learning exchanges conducted (disaggregated by country, participation, organisations)</u>	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant
Outcome 2: Improved social and livelihood climate resilience through addressing multidimensional vulnerability to climate risks in coastal communities	CCCCC reporting CANARI reporting Subproject monitoring and evaluation reports quality assessed by AE	Document review	Baseline, midline, endline	Percentage of beneficiaries in vulnerable coastal communities affirming improved resilience as a result of sub-project interventions (disaggregated by country, sex) Percentage of sub-projects rated satisfactory or above in performance assessment (disaggregated by country/community, type of intervention, type of organisations)	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations

GCF / Programme Results	Data / Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	M&E Personnel involved
Output 2.1 Grants are provided to priority climate resilient livelihood and socially inclusive health & climate information projects	CCCCC reporting CANARI reporting Subproject monitoring and evaluation reports quality assessed by CCCCC Spatial analysis and GIS mapping Audit Reports Health clinic/mobile unit service records Sub-project annual performance reports submitted to the National EEs	Document review Site visits Survey / questionnaire Database of grantees	Annual	Number of sub-projects approved and funded cross the five CABRIC countries (disaggregated by country, type of project, type of organisation) Percentage of local grantees accessing finance that are women-led from all grant windows (disaggregated by country) Number of large grants awarded to women-led organizations or inclusion-based organisations (disaggregated by country) Number of climate-responsive mental health and support services mobilized (disaggregated by country) Percentage of targeted community members actively participating in the co-design and execution of the intervention through Locally Led Adaptation principles	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant
Outcome 3. Enhanced regional knowledge equity and transparent sharing of community-led climate risk information and adaptation lessons	CCCCC reporting Website analytics	Document review	Baseline, midline, endline	Number of knowledge products accessed / downloaded from CABRIC knowledge hub that enable two-way exchange of climate risk information and lessons learned between communities, institutions and countries with evidence of uptake by local actors.	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
Output 3.1 Strengthened ecosystems for sharing GEDSI-integrated climate risk data and community-led solutions	CCCCC reporting Website analytics	Document review	Annual	CABRIC knowledge hub operational with climate risk maps for all five countries Number of CSO/Community-driven learning engagements conducted (disaggregated by country, type of learning event) Number of formal knowledge sharing partnerships established with regional research institutions	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant

GCF / Programme Results	Data / Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Indicator	Indicative Budget (USD)	M&E Personnel involved
Output 3.2: Empowered community agency and inclusive awareness of climate-resilient and gender-transformative responses	CCCCC reporting Website analytics	Document review Survey	Annual	CABRIC public communication strategy developed and implemented Number of case studies and knowledge products produced documenting subprojects experiences	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant
Project/Programme Co-benefit Indicators						
Co-benefit 1: Enhanced livelihood diversification	CCCCC reporting Subproject monitoring and evaluation reports quality assessed by CCCCC	Document review Survey / questionnaire	Baseline, endline	Percentage of beneficiaries supported by the project with increased livelihood diversification	55,917.31	Regional programme MEL officer 5x in-country facilitator M&E assistant Contracted consultants for baseline, midline, and endline evaluations
Co-benefit 2: Improved Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GEDSI)	CCCCC reporting Subproject monitoring and evaluation reports quality assessed by CCCCC	Document review Survey / questionnaire	Baseline, endline	<u>Percentage of local grantees accessing finance that are women-led or women-focused organizations.</u> <u>Percentage of regional knowledge conference participants (moderators, speakers, attendees) who are women</u> <u>Percentage of sub-projects with GBV, SEAH, human trafficking, and child exploitation safeguard provisions</u>	55,917.31	
Co-benefit 3: Improved Ecological Condition and Biodiversity Protection	CCCCC reporting Subproject monitoring and evaluation reports quality assessed by CCCCC	Document review Survey / questionnaire	Baseline, endline	Hectares of degraded coastal/marine ecosystems under active restoration showing signs of ecological recovery	55,917.31	
Total M&E budget not covered by AE fee:					1,453,850.00	

2.2 Surveys

A baseline survey is planned during the first year of project implementation to establish initial conditions and gather essential data on e.g., women and youth inclusion, livelihood diversification, habitat health, food insecurity. The survey will incorporate the Food Consumption Score (FCS) and the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) methodology to assess household food security status and track changes throughout the project lifecycle.

The objectives of the baseline survey are to:

- Characterise the initial vulnerability status of populations
- Establish baseline values for all relevant outcome and impact indicators in the logical framework
- Validate assumptions used in the project design
- Refine targeting criteria to ensure the most vulnerable are reached
- Identify any necessary adjustments to the implementation workplan during the inception phase
- Highlight emerging themes that require prioritised monitoring
- Document initial lessons to inform early implementation

The surveys will be deployed to representative samples of intended project beneficiaries (treatment group) and non-beneficiaries (comparison group and non-eligible households) to enable robust impact assessment. The sample will reflect the geographical distribution across the six targeted parishes and relevant demographic characteristics, including:

- Gender (men, women, female-headed households)
- Age groups (youth, working-age adults, elderly)
- Climate vulnerability levels (based on exposure to identified risks)
- Socioeconomic status indicators

The FCS and FIES methodologies will be integrated into the survey to assess food security dimensions, providing standardised measurements that can be compared across time and against global benchmarks. Further, the surveys will include relevant questions enabling the construction of adaptation indicators, such as yields, crop losses, diversification of income, and other related to CRA and food loss and waste (FLW) practices and technologies. These will be discussed during the design phase of the impact evaluation.

Sample size will be determined during inception using standard power calculations, with stratified random sampling to ensure representative data collection.

2.3 Evaluations

An annual self-assessment process, supported by country facilitators, will serve as the foundation for annual reporting, learning, and adaptive management of sub-projects at the country level. This process will enable local implementing partners to systematically evaluate progress, identify challenges, and incorporate lessons learned to improve project delivery. The self-assessments will also contribute to ongoing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) efforts, ensuring that adaptation measures and resilience-building initiatives remain effective and responsive to changing conditions.

In addition to the annual assessments, a Mid-Term Review (MTR) and a Final Evaluation (FE) will be conducted by an independent evaluator, requiring a comprehensive assessment of project performance in each country's prioritized areas.

Evaluation of the CABRIC programme serves as a systematic assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of programme interventions. The evaluation framework will provide evidence-based insights on project performance, lessons learned, and recommendations for scaling up climate resilience initiatives. The evaluation process will be aligned with GCF and CCCCC guidelines, national policies, and global best practices.

3. Organisation of the Participatory MEL System

Project-level Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) will be undertaken in compliance with CCCCC and GCF policies and grounded in a participatory approach that places CSOs, NGOs, Local Authorities, and the coastal communities they serve at the centre of evidence generation, reflection, and adaptive decision-making. CCCCC will ensure the existence of a well-designed, operational, and effective participatory MEL system that goes beyond compliance reporting to build the monitoring and learning capacity of all project partners. Rather than treating MEL as an external measurement exercise, the system will engage grantees, community members, and local practitioners as active contributors to data collection, interpretation, and use. This means that evidence of change will be generated at community level — through participatory tools, community scorecards, and most significant change stories — and will flow upward into project-level reporting, not only downward from a central monitoring unit.

The participatory MEL system will include the following components:

(i) A participatory monitoring system that tracks project efficacy, targeting accuracy, and the assumptions underpinning the programme's theory of change. This system will combine quantitative indicators tracked through a shared digital platform with qualitative evidence generated by community MEL champions, grantee self-assessments, and regular participatory reflection sessions at community and country level. Monitoring will be disaggregated by sex, age, readiness level, and vulnerability category to ensure that the experience of the most marginalised groups is visible in the data. Community members and grantee staff will be trained and supported to collect, validate, and interpret their own data — building permanent local MEL capacity that survives the project period.

(ii) A learning plan through which monitoring findings feedback in real time into project implementation and planning. The learning plan will establish structured reflection cycles at community, country, and regional levels — including quarterly participatory review meetings with grantees and community representatives, semi-annual cross-country learning exchanges, and an annual learning forum bringing together all project partners to review evidence, surface emerging lessons, and agree on proposed adaptations to the programme approach. Learning will be documented in accessible formats — including brief case studies, visual summaries, and most significant change stories — that are meaningful to community audiences, not only to donors and evaluators. An adaptive management log will record all decisions made in response to monitoring findings, ensuring that learning visibly drives programme adjustments rather than informing reports that are not acted upon.

Together, these components will enable the project to analyse and account for the causal and attributable changes produced by its investments, while ensuring that the communities most affected by climate change are recognised as knowledge holders and active participants in understanding and communicating what is working, for whom, and under what conditions.

Project oversight will be carried out by the Regional Project Management Unit (PMU). Oversight will ensure that: (i) project outputs are produced in accordance with the project results framework and leading to the achievement of project outcomes; (ii) project outcomes are leading to the achievement of the project objective; (iii) risks are continuously identified and monitored and appropriate mitigation strategies are applied; and (iv) agreed project climate-related benefits are being delivered. The data collection tools will be made based on the indicators from the project's Results Framework (RF) and the Annual Work Plan and Budgets (AWPBs).

The following table describes the actors involved in the M&E system and their respective roles:

Level of Administration	Stakeholder	Role and responsibility in the M&E system
	CABRIC Programme Manager	Management of the overall programme. Reports to CCCCC Executive Director. Provides annual reports for approval to the board. Ensures Unit is upholding its responsibilities of the AMA and FAA, and contracts with Implementing Partners.
	CABRIC Programme Financial Officer	Supports the Programme Coordination in administration and accounting. Keeps records of all contracts and financial disbursements to Implementing Partners via Small Grants.
	CABRIC Programme GESDI Officer + SEAH and GRM Officer + ESS Officer	- Check reliability and provide final validation of the consolidated data in the M&E system for the ESMF and GAP - Conduct specific field supervisions - Participate in data analysis, - Contribute to activity reports and AWPB at national level
	MEL Officer	Indicator reporting and oversight: The M&E Officer ensures that Partners are reporting on indicators.

Level of Administration	Stakeholder	Role and responsibility in the M&E system
Regional Programme Coordination Unit		- Capacity building support: The M&E Officer works with external contractors to support both Partners and Grantees to ensure monitoring is conducted while building capacity. - Collaboration with other staff: The role involves working closely with the Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) Officer and Country Facilitators to provide support to Grantees in project development, implementation, and monitoring. - Data collection standardization: The officer's work supports the objective of establishing standardized data collection templates and monitoring tools for use by implementing partners and sub-grantees to ensure consistent knowledge capture. These tools include items such as survey forms and interview guides, and they mitigate the risk of ineffective implementation. - Performance monitoring: The M&E Officer is integral to the implementation of performance monitoring and learning systems. This includes supporting activities such as conducting performance assessments and implementing corrective action processes for underperforming projects, which is a collaborative effort between the Implementing Partner, the CCCCC, and the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI). - Integrating GEDSI and ESS: The role supports the institutional goal of ensuring internal processes are GEDSI and Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) integrated.
CCCCC staff embedded in national grant administrators	Country facilitators + M&E assistants	Liaison role: - They serve as the extension of the PMU in country. - It was concluded during NDA consultations that the appointed country facilitators should sit within the NDA offices. - They act as a liaison officer with the Partners and Grantees (CSOs/NGOs and LAs). - They are central to the PMU's structure for communication and organization with the national coordinator, the M&E officer embedded in the Implementing Partner country office, and the capacity building officer embedded in CANARI at a national level. Supporting capacity building and project development: - They are responsible for supporting Partners to launch biannual calls for attendees to information sessions and write shops - They ensure the capacity building support is received for project development. Implementation monitoring: - They are responsible for establishing regular project implementation reviews through quarterly site visits in which they assess progress and identify challenges. - They support the M&E and the GEDSI Officer to provide Grantee support in project implementation and monitoring. Public awareness and GRM support: - They work with Implementing Partners managing small grants to reach out through a diverse range of media. They ensure that the wider communication of the EDA facility and approved projects includes communication to communities where projects are based, specifically to ensure that the GRM is understood.
National grant administrators	Staff	- Collect, enter and transmit digital data - Monitor and collect disaggregated data - Supervise and collect data on FFS - Participate in coordination and follow-up meetings - Participate in diagnostics for the preparation of the AWPBs - Provide quarterly and annual reports - Facilitate annual project surveys (involving contact with sample persons) - Provide all necessary data for supervision missions and consultation meetings at the level of the branches - Ensure the follow-up of field activities in consultation with the project team - Provide information for knowledge generation, and identify possible intra-regional exchanges

Level of Administration	Stakeholder	Role and responsibility in the M&E system
		Contribute to data collection and field supervision
Programme Steering Committee		Revision of project monitoring and evaluation reports, results and outcomes

4. Reporting

Project outputs will be monitored separately as well as in relation to the achievement of higher-level project results and overall GCF goals. All grantees are required to report on the Universal Indicator and at least one thematic indicator relevant to their sub-project. The Cross-Cutting Indicators are mandatory for all applicants. The RPCU will aggregate sub-project-level results into the programme's Annual Performance Reports to the GCF. Reporting on results will be required as follows:

Project Inception Report

A project inception workshop will be conducted in order to: a) orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any change in the overall context that might influence implementation; b) discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines; c) review the results framework and discussion, present in detail the Theory of Change of the project, reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities, and to finalize the M&E plans; d) review financial reporting requirements; and e) planning and scheduling of M&E meetings; and f) finalize the first year work plan. The workshop will generate an inception report that will be submitted to the GCF.

Annual Performance Report (APR)

A reporting template for the Annual Performance Report (APR) will be provided by the GCF Secretariat within three months of the EDA project's approval. A dedicated M&ESpecialist within the Regional Programme Coordination Unit at CCCCC will coordinate data collection efforts across participating countries, ensuring that each country compiles and prepares the required information for the APR by collecting data through local implementation coordinators in each country. Once country reports are completed, they will be submitted to the AE for technical review and synthesis across the CABRIC countries.

The APR will include, at a minimum:

- A narrative report on implementation progress.
- A summary of project outputs delivered per project outcome on an annual basis.
- A qualitative assessment on lessons learnt including case studies.
- A work plan for the upcoming year, outlining key activities and milestones.
- Recommendations and any necessary corrective actions to improve project implementation and ensure continued alignment with GCF objectives.

Technical Reports

Will be prepared by consultants as part of project outputs (deliverables) and to document and share project outcomes and lessons learned. Reports will be submitted to CCCCC as required in their Terms of Reference. The Project Officer will be responsible for ensuring appropriate technical review and clearance of the reports. Copies of relevant technical reports will be distributed to project partners and the Steering Committee as appropriate

Annual Financial and Co-financing Reports:

All implementing partners, with support from the PMU, will be responsible for collecting the required information and reporting, on a semi-annual basis, on co-financing as indicated in the Funding Proposal.

Project Completion Report (Final APR)

Within two months before the end date of the project, and one month before the Final Evaluation, the PMU will submit to CCCCC a draft Completion Report (Final APR).

The main purpose of the Completion Report is to provide guidance at the ministerial or senior government level on the policy decisions required for the follow-up of the project and to provide the donor with information on how the funds were utilized. The Completion Report is accordingly a concise account of the main products, results, conclusions and recommendations of the project, without unnecessary background, narrative or technical details. The target readership consists of persons who are not necessarily technical specialists, but who need to understand the policy implications of technical findings and needs for insuring sustainability of project results. The final APR report will be submitted by the AE, with input from all implementing partners, to the GCF, no later than 6 months after technical completion of activities.