

Annex 11 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Fiji CRR Project

1. Purpose and Objectives of the M&E Plan

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan outlines the work required for monitoring the project's progress towards the targets set in the project logical framework with the aim to aid decision-making, adaptive management and learning. A break-down of costs for monitoring, evaluation and learning is presented Tables 1-3 below. Overall, M&E accounts for 5% of the project budget when both internal and external monitoring is taken into account.

2. Roles and Responsibilities in Monitoring and Reporting

At the project level, the primary responsibility for day-to-day data collection, monitoring, and implementation of monitoring and evaluation processes will rest with the PMU, hosted by WWF-Fiji. The M&E Manager in the PMU will be responsible for overseeing monitoring and reporting of the Project with advisory support from the WWF Fiji M&E Unit.

Two full-time divisional M&E officers will directly report to the M&E Manager and will primarily be responsible for data collection tools and monitoring of provincial-level data. They will support the M&E Manager to build capacity of communities responsible for monitoring indicators specified in the logframe and budgeted under sub-activity 2.1.3.2.

The M&E Manager will report to the National Project Director (NPD) in the PMU. The M&E Manager will ensure project reports document progress against the indicators specified in the Logical Framework (Section E of this Funding Proposal), ESMF (Annex 6) and Gender Action Plan (Annex 8) and annual workplans and budgets.

The NPD, supported by Project M&E staff, EEs, ESS and Gender Focal Points, will compile monitoring reports twice per year — one at the mid-year and one at the end of the year (calendar year) to align with GCF Annual Performance Report (APR) requirements. These reports will be submitted to the WWF-Fiji Project Review Committee (PRC) who will provide quality assurance over these reports before they are submitted to the Execution Support team for review, before sending a final report to the AE.

3. Execution support

Six technical experts at WWF-US will provide direct execution support and capacity building to the PMU at WWF-Fiji. The Execution Support team will include a Technical Lead (50%), Project Coordinator (50%), NbS and Green Infrastructure Specialist (20%), Oceans Science Specialist (20%), Conservation Finance Manager (25%), and Blue Finance Specialist (30%). The team will meet with the PMU biweekly or monthly, depending on need, and will meet monthly with the AE, including the M&E Lead, to report on implementation challenges, updates, and support needs. The AE will provide guidance, as needed, to support compliance with and adherence to WWF and GCF standards and policies.

4. Capacity-building plan

WWF-Fiji has relevant institutional and technical capacity to carry out planning, monitoring, evaluation and learning, supported by prior experience implementing large, multi-partner donor-funded programmes and by WWF-Fiji's regional PMEL, ESSF and GEDSI systems. This

includes experience from the GEF-funded “Financial Tools for Small-Scale Fishers in Melanesia” project, implemented with partners in Fiji and PNG from April 2022 to March 2025, which included knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation, project steering committee oversight, annual work planning, beneficiary tracking and donor reporting. WWF-Pacific’s existing systems provide further support for ESSF screening, safeguards training, GEDSI analysis, disability inclusion, stakeholder engagement, FPIC, grievance management and adaptive learning, complemented by the Pacific PMEL function and Fiji-specific safeguards and GEDSI staffing. On this basis, WWF-Fiji is well positioned to support implementation of the project M&E plan and reporting requirements. At the same time, WWF-Fiji recognizes the scale and compliance requirements of GCF programming and will work closely with any dedicated GCF-funded M&E staff, including through onboarding, technical guidance, reporting quality review, safeguards/GEDSI coordination and ongoing PMEL support.

Capacity needs will be formally assessed annually by the AE. In addition, WWF-US Execution Support will meet with the team bi-weekly or monthly, depending on need, to assess support requirements on a more regular basis. If technical or capacity gaps arise, the WWF-US Execution Support team—two members of which will dedicate 50% of their time to the project—will provide technical support, backstopping, and additional capacity building to the MEL team and the broader PMU. The team also has budget to travel to Fiji if in-person capacity-building support is required.

5. M&E Systems and Infrastructure

The project will utilize an M&E system based primarily on Microsoft tools already used by WWF-Fiji and project partners, including Excel for indicator tracking and SharePoint for document storage, evidence management and version control. Data will be collected through standardized surveys, monitoring forms, field assessments, GIS/spatial outputs, partner reports and relevant government data sources. The PMU M&E team will maintain the database with clear responsibilities for data entry, review, approval and reporting. The system will support a clear data flow from community monitors, executing entities, technical partners and government sources to PMU review, WWF-Fiji /Pacific PMEL quality assurance, and formal reporting to the AE and GCF. Supporting documentation will be stored in structured SharePoint folders with clear file naming, version control, access permissions and record retention arrangements. The system will build on existing government datasets, environmental monitoring systems, and sectoral information sources wherever possible to support alignment with national reporting processes and avoid duplication. Project monitoring investments will strengthen data collection tools, indicator tracking templates, quality assurance procedures, staff capacity, and basic monitoring equipment needed for baseline, midline, endline, and routine monitoring.

Data security and privacy will be managed through document access controls, secure document storage, and restricted access to sensitive information and appropriate handling of personal, safeguards, grievance, FPIC and GEDSI related data. Personally identifiable information will

only be collected where necessary and will be aggregated or anonymized for reporting wherever possible. These measures will help protect stakeholders and beneficiaries while maintaining the integrity, reliability and auditability of project monitoring data.

6. Quality Assurance and Data Quality

The project will apply a structured quality assurance and data quality approach to ensure that monitoring data is accurate, complete, timely, consistent, reliable, and useful for reporting, learning and adaptive management. Data quality assurance will be embedded across the monitoring cycle, including tool design, data collection and consolidation, analysis, reporting, and use of findings. The PMU M&E Manager will hold overall responsibility for data quality management, supported by M&E officers, relevant technical staff, community monitors, and government partners involved in data collection or verification. WWF-Fiji's M&E function, with support from the Pacific PMEL team where required, will review monitoring tools, datasets, evidence files and draft reports to check data quality, identify gaps or inconsistencies, and advise on corrective actions. This will include checks on key indicator data, safeguards/GEDSI records and supporting evidence required for GCF reporting. Data quality issues and adaptive measures will be discussed regularly with WWF-US Execution Support staff to support backstopping and alignment with WWF and GCF requirements. A formal data quality review will also be undertaken as part of the annual reflection workshop to assess the reliability, validity, integrity, completeness and usefulness of monitoring data, and to agree any improvements needed for the following reporting period.

Data quality will be supported using the following measures:

- **Standardized tools and definitions:** the PMU M&E team will have standard data collection tools, defined indicators, consistent templates and documented changes to support traceability and transparency. These tools will be used consistently across baseline, periodic monitoring, midline and endline data collection as applicable. Where multiple data sources are available, the PMU M&E team will triangulate evidence to strengthen the reliability of reported results. **Training and guidance for data collectors:** PMU M&E staff, EEs, technical partners, community monitors and other data collectors will receive role-appropriate orientation or refresher training on relevant tools, indicator definitions, data collection protocols, ethical considerations, gender and social inclusion requirements and data security procedures.
- **Routine data validation:** data submitted by EES, partners, communities and technical staff will be reviewed by the PMU M&E Manager and M&E officers for completeness, accuracy, consistency and plausibility before consolidation into formal databases or M&E systems. Where there are inconsistencies, gaps or outliers are identified, the PMU M&E team will follow up with data providers for clarification, correction or supporting evidence.
- **Source documentation and audit trail:** all reported results will be supported by appropriate source documentation, such as signed attendance sheets, survey datasets, GIS outputs, photographs, field reports, government records, meeting minutes,

completion of output reports, training records and other deliverables. Supporting evidence will be stored in a designated SharePoint filing system with clear file naming, version control and access permissions.

- **Periodic quality reviews:** The PMU M&E Manager will conduct periodic internal reviews of project monitoring data and the WWF-Fiji's M&E unit, with support of the Pacific PMEL team where needed, will review semiannual reports before submission to the AE, focusing on data quality, evidence, consistency with the M&E plan and alignment with WWF and GCF reporting requirements
- **Ethics, privacy, and safeguarding:** Data collection involving individuals, households, communities, or enterprises will follow appropriate ethical do-no-harm practices, including informed consent, confidentiality, secure data storage, and aggregation or anonymization of personally identifiable information where possible. Gender, ESSF, and stakeholder engagement considerations will be integrated into data collection and reporting processes.

7. Adaptive Management Processes

The M&E Manager will convene at least one annual in-person reflection workshop with the PMU, executing entities and relevant technical project staff to review progress against the monitoring plan, workplan tracker, theory of change, logframe, risks and assumptions. The workshop will draw on monitoring data, implementation evidence, safeguards/GEDSI information, and feedback from technical staff, partners and beneficiaries. Execution Support may participate in person or virtually, as needed. The workshop will inform annual reporting, adaptive management decisions, and preparation of the annual workplan and budget. Additional internal assessments or reflection exercises may be organised as needed by the PMU and AMU. Proposed adaptive management measures will be reviewed with Execution Support and, where required, cleared by the AE before adoption in the annual workplan. Meeting outputs, agreed actions and any proposed or adopted adaptive management measures will be documented in minutes and reflected in the APR. **Monitoring Plan**

The project will implement a results-based monitoring system to track progress against GCF core indicators, project outcomes, outputs, and co-benefits. Monitoring will be led by the PMU M&E Manager, supported by divisional M&E Officers, implementing partners, government agencies, and community monitors. Data will be collected through household surveys, GIS analysis, field observations, document reviews, government records, key informant interviews, training records, and ecological assessments.

Routine monitoring will be conducted throughout implementation, with indicator frequency determined by the M&E plan and indicator protocols. Monitoring will track progress across ecosystem restoration, climate resilience interventions, governance and policy outcomes, community capacity development, livelihood and enterprise support, and biodiversity co-benefits, and relevant safeguards/GEDSI and stakeholder engagement information. Data will be consolidated by the PMU M&E team, and used for semi-annual and annual reporting, learning, and adaptive management.

Baseline, interim (midline), and final (endline) assessments will be undertaken to establish starting conditions, measure progress, and assess the project's contribution to expected results. The baseline assessment will establish indicator values using a combination of appropriate methods including household surveys, GIS mapping, environmental and ecological assessments, government data, document reviews, and institutional assessments, as specified in Table 1. For indicators designated for interim and final measurement, the same or comparable methodologies will be applied to assess changes in resilience, ecosystem condition, institutional capacity, governance, livelihoods, and other project results.

Monitoring findings will inform adaptive management, annual reporting, project completion reporting, knowledge sharing, and the independent interim and final evaluations.

8. Evaluation Plan

The monitoring plan will provide the evaluative data for which to perform continuing analysis and reflection on project performance and the soundness of the project theory of change. This data will also be inputs to the two external evaluations at midterm and project end.

Two external evaluations have been budgeted for this project: a formative interim and summative final evaluation. The interim evaluation will take place at the project midpoint to assess implementation progress and identify course corrections needed to keep the project on track to achieve its climate and other expected results. The final evaluation will take place at project completion, while staff and partners are still available to participate, and will provide an independent assessment of overall project performance, long-term impacts and sustainability. Both evaluations will support accountability, transparency and learning. The interim evaluation will primarily support adaptive management during implementation, while the final evaluation will contribute to institutional learning on climate finance programming, including lessons relevant to future investment, replication and scalability.

The M&E Lead at WWF-US AE, is responsible for recruiting evaluators, overseeing the evaluation process, and managing evaluation deliverables. The M&E Lead will coordinate with other AE team members, WWF-US Execution Support, the PMU, Executing Entities, and other relevant parties to promote ownership, support the successful achievement of evaluation objectives, and ensure that the evaluations adhere to GCF evaluation principles, ethics, and policies, as well as WWF Standards for Evaluations, consistent with Section 15.02(b) of the AMA.

The terms of reference, inception report, near-final evaluation report and draft Management Response will be shared with the GCF Secretariat for review and feedback.

These evaluations will be funded from the AE fee and together reflect approximately 1% of the total project budget, which is in line with typical evaluations of GCF projects of this size.

9. Monitoring of Project Logical Framework

The following indicators are the responsibility of the PMU MEL team to collect, consolidate and analyze. Where others are responsible, it will be indicated in the Data/Source column.

Indicative costs for measurement against project indicators and targets are presented in the table below. These indicative costs include the costs of routine monitoring (including equipment, capacity support/training and travel costs) by the PMU and any assessments at baseline, midline and endline. Other monitoring, evaluation and learning costs are outlined after in Tables 2 and 3.

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

Monitoring plan and costs							
No.	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Responsibilities	Intended Use	Indicator	Indicative Budget
E.4. GCF Outcome level: Reduced emissions and increased resilience (IRMF core indicators 1-4, quantitative indicators)							
ARA1	Household survey; Interventions completion reports; Government records; Post disaster needs assessments will be used to supplement the government records mentioned above, as necessary.	Survey/questionnaire Documents Review Surveys, Focus Group Discussions	Annual	PMU M&E Manager and divisional M&E Officers, with inputs from EEs, technical partners, government agencies and community monitors as applicable.	Support GCF core indicator reporting, APR preparation, adaptive management and evidence for evaluations.	Core 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached	Included under the costs for Outcomes 1 and 2 below.
ARA3	Government records (Infrastructure/asset inventories, economic loss assessments); Post disaster needs assessments will be used to supplement the	Document review, GIS data, Field observation visits (for verification if needed)	Annual	PMU M&E Manager and divisional M&E Officers, with inputs from EEs, technical partners, government agencies and community monitors as applicable.	Support GCF core indicator reporting, APR preparation, adaptive management and evidence for evaluations.	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	Included under the costs for Outcomes 1 and 2 below.

	government records mentioned above, as necessary; GIS maps; Intervention completion reports.						
ARA4	GIS maps, site surveys and photographs	GIS data Survey/Questionnaire Field observation visits GIS Data Key informant interviews Documents Review	Annual	PMU M&E Manager and divisional M&E Officers, with inputs from EEs, technical partners, government agencies and community monitors as applicable.	Support GCF core indicator reporting, APR preparation, adaptive management and evidence for evaluations.	Core 4: Hectares of natural resources brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practice Supplementary 4.1: Hectares of terrestrial forest, terrestrial non-forest, freshwater and coastal marine areas brought under restoration and/or improved ecosystems	Included under the costs for Outcome 3 below.
E.4. GCF Outcome level: Enabling environment (IRMF core indicators)							
No.	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Responsibilities	Intended Use	Indicator	Indicative Budget
C5	Assessment undertaken by the PMU or consultant (primary data)	Document review Government data/records	Interim and final	PMU M&E Manager, with support from a contracted consultant as needed.	Support GCF core indicator reporting, APR preparation, adaptive management and evidence for evaluations.	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	Included under the costs for Outcome 2 below.
C7	Details of businesses supported by Financial Institutions, business records	Documents Review Government data Key Informant Interviews	Interim and final	PMU M&E team, BDS/enterprise partners, financial institutions and relevant	Support GCF core indicator reporting, APR preparation, adaptive	Core Indicator 7: Degree to which GCF Investments contribute to market development/transformati	Included under the costs for Outcome 4 below.

				government counterparts.	management and evidence for evaluations.	on at the sectoral, local, or national level	
C8	GSR Management Plan, NAP, NBSAP and Provincial Adaptation Plans, FMPs, guidance documents, training manuals, business monitoring framework.	Documents Review Government Data/ Records Survey/ Questionnaire Document reviews	Interim and final	PMU M&E team, BDS/enterprise partners, financial institutions and relevant government counterparts.	Support GCF core indicator reporting, APR preparation, adaptive management and evidence for evaluations.	Core indicator 8: Degree to which GCF investments contribute to effective knowledge generation and learning processes, and use of good practices, methodologies and standards	Included under the costs for Outcome 1, 2, 3, and 4 below.
E.5. Project/programme specific indicators							
Outcomes/ Outputs	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Responsibilities	Intended Use	Indicator	Indicative Budget
Outcome 1: The resilience of reef-reliant communities in Fiji's GSR is enhanced through EbA and NbS solutions.	Government records; GIS Maps, Photographs Surveys Consolidated by PMU MEL team with support from communities.	GIS Data, Document Review, Other (photographs)	Baseline, Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Area (ha) of flood extent reduced	\$163,763
Outcome 1: The resilience of reef-reliant communities in Fiji's GSR is enhanced through EbA and NbS solutions.	Sedimentation analysis, GIS maps Surveys Consolidated by PMU MEL team with support from communities.	Field Observation Visit, GIS	Baseline, Interim and Final	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Assess progress at interim and final stages, support external evaluations, learning and results reporting.	Area (km2) of GSR reefs under reduced sediment exposure	\$225,000
Output 1.1: Reef-reliant communities and provincial	Design documents; GIS maps; Photographs	Field observation visit, Document review, GIS Data	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and	Track annual implementation progress, support	Area (ha) of mangroves restored	\$400,000

governments engaged in the implementation of EbA interventions.	Consolidated by MEL team of PMU with support from communities.			relevant technical partners.	APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.		
Output 1.1: Reef-reliant communities and provincial governments engaged in the implementation of EbA interventions.	Design documents; GIS maps; Photographs Consolidated by MEL team of PMU with support from communities.	Field observation visit, Document review, GIS Data	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Area (ha) of riparian forests restored	\$400,000
Output 1.2: Living shorelines constructed and operational.	Engineering design documents; Engineering completion reports; Photographs; Government monitoring reports 5 Surveys PMU MEL team consolidates with support of communities	Field observation visits, Government data/records Document review Surveys	Annual	PMU M&E team, engineering/technical partners, relevant government agencies and communities.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Length of living shorelines developed to reduce coastal erosion and flooding	\$229,231
Output 1.3: Locally Led Adaptation initiatives are supported and implemented to enhance climate resilience of reef-reliant	Signed copy of agreements Photographs Surveys Consolidated by PMU MEL team with support from communities	Document Review Observation Interviews	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Number of adaptation projects implemented with LLA Fund resources	\$28,467

communities in the GSR.							
Output 1.3: Locally Led Adaptation initiatives are supported and implemented to enhance climate resilience of reef-reliant communities in the GSR.	Training records, surveys and interviews Consolidated by PMU MEL team with support from communities	Document Review, Survey/ Questionnaire Key Informant Interview	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	# of people with new capacity to develop and implement community-based climate adaptation projects through LLAFF funding	\$28,467
Outcome 2: An enabling environment and R2R ecosystem planning frameworks are conducive to the effective management and implementation of EbA, NbS, and living shorelines interventions within the GSR.	GIS maps, photographs, site visits/surveys, management plans Consolidated by PMU MEL team with support from communities.	GIS Data, Surveys/Questionnaires, Key Informant Interviews, Document Review, field observation, Other (photographs)	Annual	PMU M&E team, engineering/technical partners, relevant government agencies and communities.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Area (ha) of the GSR and connected watersheds under improved management for climate resilience because of the implementation of the 10-Year Ridge to Reef (R2R) Land and Marine Use Management Plan and Fisheries Management Plans	\$160,479
Output 2.1. New management arrangements to reduce climate change vulnerability developed for the GSR	Scorecard, Review of staffing lists, signed agreements, other documents	Document Review, Key Informant Interview	Annual	PMU M&E Manager and divisional M&E Officers, with inputs from EEs, technical partners, government agencies and community monitors as applicable.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Degree to which GSR Management Unit is set up and operational.	\$14,000

Output 2.1. New management arrangements to reduce climate change vulnerability developed for the GSR	Signed agreements	Document Review	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	# of operating agreements in place with communities, provincial governments, and national agencies to define roles and responsibilities related to management, enforcement, and monitoring of the GSR.	\$14,000
	GIS maps, photographs, site visits/surveys, management plans Consolidated by PMU MEL team with support from communities.	GIS Data, Surveys/Questionnaires, Key Informant Interviews, Document Review, field observation, Other (photographs)	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Area (ha) of the GSR under improved management because of the implementation of the 10-Year Ridge to Reef (R2R) Land and Marine Use Management Plan and Fisheries Management Plans	\$160,479
Output 2.2: Evidence base to support the adoption of EbA and NbS interventions by the GoF.	Scorecard Evidence report, interviews	Document Review, Key Informant Interviews	Annual	PMU M&E Manager and divisional M&E Officers, with inputs from EEs, technical partners, government agencies and community monitors as applicable.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Degree to which evidence base demonstrates that EbA and NBS interventions in Fiji improve coastal flooding, sedimentation reduction and economic, social and other environmental benefits.	\$16,388
Output 2.3: Updated procedures for implementing EbA and NbS in Fiji.	Revised NAP, NBSAP, and Provincial Adaptation Plans List of recommendations; Supporting documents of implementation	Documents review	Annual	PMU M&E Manager and divisional M&E Officers, with inputs from EEs, technical partners, government agencies and community monitors as applicable.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	# of plans with procedures integrating EbA and NbS interventions	\$2,455

Output 2.3: Updated procedures for implementing EbA and NbS in Fiji.	Training records Surveys	Document review Surveys, Key Informant Interviews	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs and verification from communities and relevant technical partners.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	# national and sub-national decision makers, planners, and communities trained and resourced to implement the R2R management plan and sustain the EbA and NbS interventions	\$22,455
Outcome 3: Businesses that reduce threats to the GSR have improved access to commercial capital	Training records Surveys Interviews	Document review Survey Key Informant Interviews	Annual	PMU M&E team, BDS/enterprise partners, financial institutions and relevant government counterparts.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	# of reef-positive enterprises reporting increased capacity and access to financing	\$160,479
Output 3.1: Business development support providers and relevant national and provincial institutions have enhanced capacity to support reef-positive businesses the GSR.	Project reports, training reports, interviews	Key informant interviews, document review	Annual	PMU M&E team, BDS/enterprise partners, financial institutions and relevant government counterparts.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	# of BDS service providers with increased institutional capacity and defined processes to provide support to reef-positive enterprises	\$75,659
Output 3.2: Coordination between reef-positive enterprises, business development	Project reports, meeting minutes	Documents review	Annual	PMU M&E team, BDS/enterprise partners, financial institutions and relevant government counterparts.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting,	# meetings of multi stakeholder working group # coordination mechanisms and tools developed	\$24,856

support providers, financial institutions and government is strengthened, improving enterprise visibility to capital providers.					adaptive management and work planning.		
Output 3.2: Coordination between reef-positive enterprises, business development support providers, financial institutions and government is strengthened, improving enterprise visibility to capital providers.	Project reports, meeting minutes	Documents review	Annual	PMU M&E team, BDS/enterprise partners, financial institutions and relevant government counterparts.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	# common resources developed towards enabling access to capital for reef-positive enterprises	\$24,856
Project/programme co-benefit indicators							
No.	Data/Source	Collection Tool	Frequency	Responsibilities	Intended Use	Indicator	Indicative Budget
Co-benefit 1: Increased carbon capture from healthy well-functioning ecosystems	GHG assessment: National Forest Monitoring Systems and Greenhouse Gas Inventory Reports	Government Data/Records, Document Review	Baseline, Interim, Final	PMU M&E team, with inputs from government data holders and technical specialists.	Establish baseline, assess mid-course progress and verify final results and evaluation evidence.	# Estimated GHG emissions reduced/avoided (metric tons)	Included under the costs for Outcome 1.

Co-benefit 2: Improved biodiversity as a result of the project's EbA and green infrastructure interventions.	Population surveys	Government Data/Records, Field Observation Visits	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs from ecological monitoring partners and relevant government agencies.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Percentage increase in shark populations	Included under the costs for Outcome 3.
Co-benefit 2: Improved biodiversity as a result of the project's EbA and green infrastructure interventions.	Population surveys	Government Data/Records, Field Observation visits	Annual	PMU M&E team, with inputs from ecological monitoring partners and relevant government agencies.	Track annual implementation progress, support APR/semi-annual reporting, adaptive management and work planning.	Percentage increase in ray populations	Included under the costs for Outcome 3.
Total Routine Monitoring Costs (A):							\$869,492.00

10. Budget

Table 2. Project Monitoring Costs

Monitoring costs for data collection against logframe (A)	\$869,492.00
PMU monitoring, evaluation and learning staff costs (B)	\$838,427
Costs for Annual Pause and Reflect sessions and other internal reviews (C)	\$10,000
Total cost (A + B + C):	\$1,717,909

Table 3: Project external evaluation plan and costs (AE Fee)

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