**RESULTS FRAMEWORK PRODOC– {insert project code and name}**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | | **Targets (annual, or mid-term and close)** | | | | |
| **Indicator / unit** | **Definition (note if cumulative)** | **Method/ source** | | **Fre-quency** | | **Responsible** | | **Disaggre-gation** | | **Baseline** | **YR1** | **YR2** | **YR3** | **YR 4** | **YR 5** | **Notes/ Assumptions** | **Cost to monitor** |
| **Objective level indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Objective: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objective indicator 1: |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective indicator 2: |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Objective indicator 3: |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Component 1: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Outcome 1.1 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1.2 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1.3 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1.4 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Component 2:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Outcome 2.1 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2.2 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2.3 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2.4 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Component 3:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 3.1 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3.2 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3.3 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3.4 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Component 4:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 4.1 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 4.2 indicator |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**APPROVED (can share externally)**

**Commodities Demand Results Framework**

| **OBJECTIVE/**  **OUTCOME** | **INDICATOR/**  **UNIT** | **DEFINITION** | **DISAGGREGATION** | **METHOD** | **FREQUENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE** | **BASELINE**  **(Yr 0)** | **Targets (cumulative)** | | | | **Cost** | **Assumptions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Yr1** | **Yr2** | **Yr 3** | **Yr4** |  |  |
| **Objective level indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| To strengthen the enabling environment and public and private sector commitment to and demand for reduced deforestation commodities in priority markets | Number of companies engaged in project activities that are making new commitments to source reduced deforestation palm oil, soy, and/or beef | *Companies:* companies involved in project activities, engaged directly and reached through platforms  *New*: announced publicly during project period  *Commitment:* public*,* time-bound and specific description of sourcing decision to be implemented, e.g. only sourcing reduced deforestation or RSPO palm oil | By commodity (palm, soy, beef) when possible | Corporate data tracking tools, e.g. Forest 500, Supply Change, NCD; corporate websites, press releases, and sustainability reports | Midterm and close | M&E Officer (PMU) | 0 (“new” commitments = those made within project period) |  | 8 |  | 18 | $0  (M&E and project staff time covered by project funding) | Commitments that are made after company’s engagement in project activities are influenced by and at least partly attributable to project activities |
| Number of countries with improved policy frameworks in place to support reduced deforestation commodity markets, due to project activities |  | N/A | Track country progress against project-determined step changes through project-hosted workshops/ engagement; public information (e.g. NGO ratings of government capacity/ policy/ implementation, information gleaned from public policy documents) | Midterm and close | Proforest, UNDP | 0 (progress related to project will be measured) |  | 1 |  | 6 | $0  (M&E and project staff time covered by project funding) | Engagement and capacity building activities with government ultimately lead to policy change beyond the project term, and create the enabling environment to catalyze further change including increased demand due to reduced barriers |
| Percentage of consumers who state they are willing to change their purchasing habits to sustainable palm oil | *Consumers:* Members of the general public in the three Indonesian cities targeted by project activities | By city (3 target cities in project: Jakarta, Pontianak and Pekanbaru); by gender; by consumer typology | Public/focus group survey | Midterm and close | Hired communications firm | Baseline for each city TBD by Indonesian comms firm once hired. FYI: 14% respondents from RSPO-Daemeter study prioritize products with environmentally-friendly logo when shopping; 27% are ready to support and shift to sustainable palm oil products, if available |  | TBD after baseline known |  | TBD after baseline known | $0 (contract with Indonesian comms firm will include survey development and survey implementation in 2016, 2018, 2020) | Consumers act in accordance with their stated willingness to do so |
| Number of countries where supply chain transparency is increased using version three of the SEI-PCS method and made available to global supply chain actors through project activities | *Supply chain transparency:* when information about the companies, suppliers and sourcing locations for Brazilian soy and Paraguayan beef supply chains is readily available to end-users (traders, consumers, governments, investors) in the supply chain, based on version 3 of the SEI-PCS method  *Version three of the SEI-PCS method:* Version three improves previous accuracy by triangulating the information used in previous versions with additional datasets on supply chain logistics and taxation, linking international trade flows to specific production locations. *Made available:* publicly accessible through online portal | By commodity and country | SEI-PCS method commodity platform results put online by SEI & GCP  Measured as number of countries that access the information | Annual | SEI | 0 (to be measured during project implementation) | 5 | 30 | 45 | 60 | $0 (included as requirement in SEI contract) | - Platform data needs are met enabling supply chain mapping  - Users find value in the information presented and are able to use it for decision-making |
| **Outcome level indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Key buyers and traders make commitments and have increased capacity to implement commitments to source reduced deforestation commodities. | Number of companies that have increased capacity to make and implement commitments to source reduced deforestation commodities | *Companies*: companies (including traders/ cooperatives) involved in project activities, engaged directly and reached through platforms   *Capacity*: (self-reported) understanding and ability to implement activities on a given topic  *Commitment:* public, time-bound and specific description of sourcing decision to be implemented, e.g. only sourcing reduced deforestation or RSPO palm oil | By commodity | CDP analysis of corporate responses to CDP Forests Information Request; UNDP survey of cooperatives/traders engaged in Paraguay | Midterm and close | CDP | 0 (to be measured during project implementation) |  | 8 (at least 2 in PY) |  | 16 (at least 3 in PY) | $100k for survey development and implementation by CDP | - Corporate participants in project activities accurately respond to surveys  - Surveys are designed to ask questions that appropriately determine if capacity has been built |
| 1.2 Increased investor capacity to incentivize fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) companies towards reduced deforestation sourcing | Number of investors that have increased capacity to engage companies on reduced deforestation sourcing and disclosure | *Investors*: financial institutions (including investment arms of regional banks) that invest money in regional FMCG groups, corporations or directly into production, and that are involved in project activities (workshops, trainings, 1:1 meetings) *Capacity:*(self-reported) understanding and ability to implement activities on a given topic  *Sourcing:* Processes of supply chain management and company purchasing/procurement practices, e.g. ensuring palm oil is sourced from reduced deforestation origins.  *Disclosure:* Releasing information on company sourcing practices and business activity to investors | By type of investor, if applicable | Survey (what # of FI respondents feel they have increased capacity to engage companies on reduced deforestation sourcing and disclosure, e.g. feel or can demonstrate that they are more informed than before engaged through the project?) | Collect info after each workshop, training, 1:1 meeting, platform; report annually | WWF-Singapore | 0 (to be measured during project implementation) | 4 | 8 | 12 | 16 | $10k for survey development (addressing this indicator and the other 1.2 indicators)  Implementation included in project activities (no extra budget needed) | - Investor participants in project activities accurately respond to surveys  - Surveys are designed to ask questions that appropriately determine if capacity has been built |
| Number of investors who disclose in their annual/ sustainability reports/ corporate webpage the consideration of ESG factors in their client or credit approval processes | *Investors*: financial institutions (including investment arms of regional banks) that invest money in regional FMCG groups, corporations or directly into production, and that are involved in project activities (engaged directly or through platforms)  *ESG:* Environmental Social Governance | By type of investor, if applicable | Tracked through scorecards (see Output 1.2.3) | Collect and report at project midterm and close | WWF-Singapore | 0 (to be measured during project implementation) |  | 3 |  | 6 | (Survey development covered under previous investor indicators)  $10k for post-workshop survey implementation and analysis | - Progress with corporate disclosure and transparency that occurs after investor’s engagement in project activities is influenced by and at least partly attributable to project activities |
| 2.1 Capacity strengthened to inform policy dialogue around reduced deforestation in project demand markets | Number of step changes in policy frameworks to incentivize demand or remove barriers for reduced deforestation commodities in project countries | *Step changes*: Sequentially increasing stages of government awareness, capacity, and implementation on relevant issues   (steps to be adapted from PPA Commitment and Action Tool (see Appendix 5b to follow) and agreed by PMU and executing partners) | By country | Track country progress against project-determined step changes through project-hosted workshops/ engagement; public information (e.g. NGO ratings of government capacity/ policy/ implementation, information gleaned from public policy documents) | Midterm and close | Proforest, UNDP | 0 |  | 4 (3 in SL and 1 in PY) |  | 5 (+1 new in SL) | $0  (M&E and project staff time covered by project funding) | - Engagement and capacity building activities with government ultimately lead to policy change beyond the project term, and create the enabling environment to catalyze further change including increased demand due to reduced barriers |
| 3.1 Increased consumer awareness to drive demand for reduced deforestation products in key demand markets. | Percentage of consumers who associate palm oil with negative environmental impacts related to deforestation | *Consumers:* Members of the general public in the three Indonesian cities targeted by project activities | By city (Jakarta, Pontianak and Pekanbaru); by gender; by consumer typology | Public/focus group survey | Midterm and close | Hired communications firm (TBD) | Baselines TBD for each city (measured by Indonesian comms firm once hired). FYI: RSPO-Daemeter study of 700 female and 100 male respondents in Indonesia found:  20% consumers think palm oil has negative environmental impacts (19% think it destroys the forest and 10% think it decreases forest area). |  | TBD after baseline known |  | TBD after baseline known | $0 additional (included in objective level indicator on consumer campaign) | - Consumers consider deforestation to be a negative impact  - Consumers understand the presence of palm oil in their products |
| 4.1. Increased supply chain transparency to facilitate verification of sustainably produced commodities. | Number of companies with increased capacity to use decision-relevant information developed by the Transparency portal to inform their strategies | *Transparency portal:* Transformative Transparency Portal, an online database and mapping platform developed and made public through the project | Disaggregate by commodity (beef, soy) and country | Track number of companies engaged and with increased capacity (capacity assessed through survey post engagement); track any additional companies siting the data in their sustainability strategies and reporting | Annual | SEI | 0 (v3 portal not yet developed) | 3 (1+ each of beef and soy) | 6 | 12 (3+ each of beef and soy) | 20 | $0 (included as requirement in SEI contract) | - Platform users understand the information presented  - Users find value in the information presented and are able to use it for decision-making |
| Number of jurisdictions of origin where exported beef and soy are mapped from origin to destination using version three of the SEI-PCS method | *Jurisdiction: Municipality in Brazil and province in Paraguay*  *Origin:* Geography of raw commodity production at the jurisdiction of production level  *Destination:* Importing country (based on port of entry) and consumer country (accounting for re-exports)  *Version three of the SEI-PCS method:* Version three improves the accuracy of the model by adding new information on the tax domicile of the exporter that links trade flows to specific production sheds and verifies municipalities of origin listed in the bills of landing. | Disaggregate by commodity (beef, soy) and country; disaggregate production project sites if relevant | SEI & GCP to quantify jurisdictions mapped using the SEI-PCS method | Midterm and close | SEI | 2016: 0  (5550 jurisdictions where soy is mapped from origin to destination using previous v2 model, and 0 jurisdictions where beef is mapped from origin to destination) |  | 5,570 (soy)  17 (beef) |  |  | $0 (included as requirement in SEI contract) | - Platform data needs are met enabling supply chain mapping  - Users find value in the information presented and are able to use it for decision-making |
| 4.2. Global demand and finance projections for palm, soy, and beef support project and program knowledge management. | Number of biannual market intelligence memos and annual watch briefs produced and shared publicly | *Market intelligence*: Information on commodity market demand trends, trade flows, "hot spots" of deforestation, track market structure | Disaggregate by memo and watch brief | Review project work plan and evaluate progress | Annually | WWF-US/M&E officer | 0 (to be measured during project implementation) | 3 | 6 | 9 | 12 | $0  (M&E and project staff time covered by project funding) | - Demand projections and other market intelligence products are useful to buyers and decision-makers and can influence the direction of future work, policies, and purchases |

**Integrated Ridge-to-Reef Management of the Meso-American Reef Results Framework**

| **Description** | **Indicator** | **Definition** | **Disaggregation** | **Method & Source** | **Responsible** | **Baseline**  **(Year 0)** | **Annual Target (cumulative)** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** |
| **Objective Level Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Project Objective: To support regional collaboration for the integrated ridge to reef management of the transboundary MAR ecoregion by demonstrating its advantages and improving regional, national and local capacities for the integrated management and governance of its freshwater, coastal and marine resources* | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Number of regional policy instruments that promote ridge to reef management of the MAR ecoregion approved due to project activities | Policy instrument *=* protocols, standards, agreements.  Regional = 2 or more countries  Approved = Approved at Minister level or other relevant body | N/A | Policy instrument documents | CCAD, PMU | [[1]](#footnote-1)0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 2 approved |
| Area (ha) of watersheds under IWRM project activities | IWRM project activities = management plans, water reserves, tree planting, soil conservation agroforestry systems, etc. | N/A | GIS analysis, grantee reports, Project records | IWRM Specialist | 761,400[[2]](#footnote-2) | 1,069,358[[3]](#footnote-3) | 1,089,391[[4]](#footnote-4) | 1,102,012[[5]](#footnote-5) | 1,699,512[[6]](#footnote-6) | 1,699,512 |
| Area (ha) of coastal and marine ecosystems under ICMM project activities | ICMM project activities = Management plans, strategies, mangrove and coral protection and restoration. | N/A | GIS analysis, grantee reports, Project records | ICMM Specialist | 0 | N/A | 115,800[[7]](#footnote-7) | 115,800 | 115,800 | 157,800[[8]](#footnote-8) |
| **Outcome Level Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Component 1:*** *Strengthen resource governance and regional collaboration for integrated ridge to reef management in the MAR* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 1.1: The countries have the enabling conditions for MAR R2R management | Number of regional policy instruments developed | Policy instrument *=* protocols, standards, agreements.  Regional = 2 or more MAR countries  Established = Prepared by PMU and validated by focal points | N/A | Policy instrument documents | CCAD, PMU | 0 | N/A | N/A | 2 | N/A | N/A |
| Outcome 1.2: MAR national R2R policy (IWRM and ICMM) frameworks are strengthened [linking Components 2 and 3]. | Number of national policy instruments developed | Policy instrument *=* protocols, standards, other  Developed = Prepared by PMU and validated by ISNC (Intersectoral National Committees) | Country | Policy instrument documents | PMU, ISNC, IWRM and ICMM Specialists | 1 in GT (Coastal Marine Policy)  1 in BZ (ICZM Plan) | N/A | N/A | 2 | N/A | N/A |
| Outcome 1.3 The MAR has a TDA and a SAP that will guide the ecoregional R2R management. | Number of countries in the MAR endorsing TDA and SAP | TDA = Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis  SAP = Strategic Action Plan  Endorsed = TDA approved by Ministers of Environment  Submission for approval=  Final version of SAP is presented by CCAD to the Ministers of Environment for approval | Country | Endorsement letters from Ministry of Environment approving TDA | PMU | 0 | N/A | N/A | 4 | N/A | N/A |
| Letters of Submission for SAP approval to Ministry of Environment | PMU | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4 |
| Outcome 1.4: MAR strategic planning, policy making, management and monitoring supported with updated reliable information accessed via REO. | Number of unique visitors consulting REO (Regional Environmental Observatory) in one full year | Unique users = distinct individuals requesting pages from REO website  regardless of how often they visit. | N/A | REO website reports | REO specialist | 0 | N/A | 25 | 50 | 75 | 100 |
| ***Component 2:*** *Integrated ridge to reef management of watersheds and freshwater resources* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2.1: IWRM in priority watersheds increased. | Number of stakeholders trained in IWRM through project activities | IWRM project activities = management plans, water reserves, tree planting, soil conservation agroforestry systems, etc. Stakeholders = community, local authority, government, NGOs, private sector and beneficiaries. | Trained in IWRM - men | Attendance lists to workshops (including at least name, gender, organization, title, email, country.) | IWRM Specialist | 0 | 50 | 125 | 200 | 300 | 350 |
| Trained in IWRM - women | IWRM Specialist | 0 | 50 | 125 | 200 | 300 | 350 |
| Outcome 2.2. Public-private mechanisms for integrated watershed management are strengthened and supported by stakeholders. | Increase (USD) in funding available for public private mechanisms in BZ, GT and HN | Funding = Voluntary contributions paid or pledged to public private mechanisms (including Sierra de las Minas Water Fund) for IWRM. | N/A | Letters of pledged contributions or receipts for paid contributions | IWRM Specialist | 50,000 | 50,000 | 100,000 | 125,000 | 150,000 | 175,000 |
| Outcome 2.3. Stakeholders engaged in IWRM in priority watersheds. | Per cent of sugar and oil palm producers in project area that are reaching and/or maintaining compliance with Voluntary Standards | Voluntary Standards = BONSUCRO for sugar and RSPO for oil palm  Reaching compliance = Industries that have not previously reached certification meet certification criteria. The target is that they become certified.  Maintaining compliance = Industries that have already been certified and remain certified after yearly audit. | Sugar producers  Reach compliance for certification[[9]](#footnote-9) | BONSUCRO certificates, BONSUCRO webpage listing certified producers | Producers, IWRM Specialist | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | N/A | N/A |
| Sugar producers Maintain certification | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Oil palm producers reach compliance for certification[[10]](#footnote-10) | RSPO certificates, RSPO webpage listing certified producers | Producers, IWRM Specialist | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | N/A |
| Oil palm producers maintain certification | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 11 |
| Number of tourism and tourism development sector actors adopting better management practices (BMP) to protect aquifers and freshwater critical habitats under project activities | BMP = protection or restoration activities[[11]](#footnote-11) to protect aquifers or critical habitats  Tourism sector = hotel and other tourism related businesses and tour operators,  Tourism development sector = construction businesses associated with tourism sector | N/A | Baseline developed by grantee or consultant prior to technical assistance, Grantees or consultant’s progress reports after technical assistance | Grantees,  IWRM Specialist | 0 | N/A | 20 | 24 | 28 | 32 |
| ***Component 3: Integrated ridge to reef management of coastal and marine resources*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 3.1. ICMM strengthened through capacity building and strategic planning. | Number of stakeholders trained in ICMM through project activities | Stakeholder = Government, local authorities, NGOs, fishers, shrimp farmers, tourism sector, tourism development sector, private sector, civil society, communities  ICMM project activities = Management plans, strategies, and ICMM BMPs[[12]](#footnote-12) | Trained in ICMM - men | Attendance lists to workshops (including at least name, gender, organization, title, email, country.) | ICMM Specialist | 0 | 50 | 125 | 200 | 300 | 350 |
| Trained in ICMM - women | ICMM Specialist | 0 | 50 | 125 | 200 | 300 | 350 |
| Outcome 3.2. Stakeholders engaged in ICMM in coastal marine prioritized areas. | Number of shrimp farms and fisheries in project area that are reaching and/or maintaining compliance with Voluntary Standards (Marine Stewardship Council –MSC- and Aquaculture Stewardship Council -ASC) | Reaching compliance = Shrimp farms and fisheries that have not been previously certified that are implementing improvement projects (AIPs and FIPs) and meet the standard’s certification criteria. The target is that they become certified.  Maintaining compliance = Shrimp farms and fisheries that have already been certified (ASC and MSC) and remain certified after yearly audit. | Shrimp farm  ASC certified | Voluntary Standards certificates, Records of ASC webpage listing certified producers  FIP Action Plan and Benchmarking and Tracking Tool | Shrimp farms, fisheries, ICMM Specialist | 9 ASC | 9 ASC | 10 ASC | 11 ASC | 11 ASC | 11 ASC |
| Shrimp farm ASC AIPs[[13]](#footnote-13) | 2 AIPs | 2 AIPs | 1 AIP | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Fisheries  MSC certified | 1 MSC | 1 MSC | 1 MSC | 1 MSC | 1 MSC | 2 MSC |
| Fisheries  MSC FIPs[[14]](#footnote-14) | 1 FIPs | 1 FIP | 2 FIPs | 3 FIPs | 3 FIPs | 2 FIPs |
| Number of tourism and tourism development sector actors, and communities implementing better management practices (BMP) to protect coastal and marine habitats under project activities. | BMP = protection or restoration activities[[15]](#footnote-15) to protect coastal and marine habitats.  Tourism sector = hotel and other tourism related businesses and tour operators,  Tourism development sector = construction businesses associated with tourism sector | Number of tourism sector actors | Baseline developed by grantee or consultant prior to technical assistance, Grantees or consultant’s progress reports after technical assistance | Grantees, consultants and ICMM Specialist | 0 | N/A | 20 | 24 | 28 | 32 |
| Number of communities | 8 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 20 | 24 |
| ***Component 4: Project monitoring and evaluation and knowledge sharing*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 4.1. The project's monitoring and evaluation system employs participatory methods throughout project lifetime. | Number of MAR2R progress reports completed (including mid term and final evaluations and GEF IW Tracking Tool) |  | Progress reports | Report-evaluation documents | PMU  M&E | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| Mid term evaluation | 0 | N/A | N/A | 1 | N/A | N/A |
| Final evaluation | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1 |
| GEF IW Tracking tool | 0 | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 |
| Outcome 4.2. Advantages of the ridge to reef approach shared with local and international audiences, including the GEF IW:LEARN community (funded by at least 1% of project budget). | Number of communication and knowledge management products disseminated | Communication and KM products include:  WP = Webpage  SM = Social media accounts  Pubs = Publications  V/A = Video/Animation  WB = Webinars  NW = National Workshops  IW = IW Conference | WP | Webpage statistics | M&E | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| SM | Social media statistics | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Pubs | Publications produced | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 |
| V/A | Videos/animations produced | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| WB | Webinars hosted | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| NW | Attendance lists to workshops hosted | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 24 | 36 |
| IW | Presentations made in IW conference | 0 | 0 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 2 |

**Improving Mangrove Conservation across the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape Results Framework**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective:** | To implement a comprehensive, multi-government ratified and regionally articulated mangrove conservation strategy in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS) countries of Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia and Ecuador through on-the-ground management activities and the strengthening of national and local policies that inform ridge-to-reef development planning and practices relevant to mangrove conservation. |
| **Indicator(s):** | a. Official endorsement of a regionally articulated multi-government mangrove conservation and sustainable development plan by the four ETPS countries (Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Ecuador) with a coordinated action plan to restore and protect mangrove systems beyond the funded scope of the two year project.  b. At least 2 ETPS countries with have improved legislation governing national ridge-to-reef spatial planning (e.g. upstream watershed management) such that the mangroves in the ETPS region (estimated collectively at 736,000 ha (after Giri et al. 2011)) and are subject to an improved policy conducive to mangrove  c. At least 2 examples of supported local private and/or community based mangrove initiatives that strengthen local planning, improve awareness of key issues, build local capacity, reduce mangrove degradation, instigate reforestation, and improve the retention of ecosystem goods, services with economic and cultural dividends for sustainable societies. |

| **Expected Outcomes**  **and Indicators** | **Project Baseline** | **End of Project Target** | **Expected Outputs**  **and Indicators** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1: Regional mangrove strategy development and implementation** | | | |
| **Outcome 1.1.:**  The four ETPS countries adopt and advance the regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves elaborated by the Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (Permanent Commission for the South Pacific or CPPS) to implement key mangrove conservation and restoration measures identified in this project by Y2Q4.  ***Outcome Indicator 1.1.:***  A regional strategy approved by and published for the appropriate authorities of the four ETPS countries by **Y2Q1**. | **Base-Line 1.1.:**  The four ETPS countries do not share a common strategy for mangrove conservation.  Efforts are underway to evaluate the status and value of mangrove ecosystems in each ETPS country, and frame national mangrove conservation in the context of international conventions and commitments such as UNFCCC and CBD. These efforts still remain relatively isolated endeavors often missing the science to action technical justification or scale of effect to consider upstream ridge-to-reef processes such as watershed management that influence sites.  Despite increasing global and national awareness of the importance of mangrove forested areas in the ETPS region (e.g. significant carbon sequestration, multiple ecological goods and services provided to local and national communities), deforestation remains at an estimated 1-2%/ year across the region. | **Target 1.1.:**  CPPS within its' regional planning for the South Pacific Nations develops a Regional Open Mangrove Initiative Plan. The Plan is supported and validated by an international technical working group convened by CPPS, and is approved, published and implemented through member country Action Plans as part of their national mangrove strategy.  In the mid-term the region-wide implementation of the Plan promotes coordinated actions, cross-learning, an increase in awareness for mangrove sustainable development and advances policy development. Concepts within the regional plan such as EBM ridge-to-reef planning and trans-learning for the conservation and restoration of mangrove ecosystem services and supported sustainable societies are considered where relevant in the development of new national policy.  In the long-term policy changes reinforce the benefits of private and/or community led conservation programs and spatial planning measures that reduce mangrove degradation and reduce or reverse deforestation trends. As a result risk to threatened mangrove biodiversity is reduced, climate change mitigation afforded through carbon sequestration improves and natural coastal defenses are strengthened. | **Output 1.1.1.:**  A Mangrove Technical Working Group/network comprised of leading mangrove experts is created within CPPS to advise on the completion of the regional strategy for the conservation of mangrove.  ***Output Indicator 1.1.1.:***  A Mangrove Technical Working Group is convened by **Y1Q3** as part of the CPPS Operating Plan with a 2015-2017+ commitment.  **Output 1.1.2.:**  At least two meetings of a Mangrove Technical Working Group are held to contribute to regional strategy for the conservation of mangrove.  ***Output Indicator 1.1.2.:***  # Technical Working Group Meetings generating recommendations towards improved regional mangrove conservation strategy by **Y2Q2**.  **Output 1.1.3.:**  The updated regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves is ratified by Ministerial level authorities and published.  ***Output Indicator 1.1.3.:***  # ETPS country governments that officially endorse a regional strategy compatible with their National Planning Instruments and policies by **Y2Q1**. |
| **Outcome 1.2.:**  Costa Rica via the Ministry of Environment, attends the official invitation from CPPS to participate in the development of the regional strategy for the conservation of the mangroves by Y1Q3.  ***Outcome Indicator 1.2.:***  Costa Rica is an active participating member of the CPPS Open Initiative for Mangrove Conservation and Sustainable Development. | **Base-Line 1.2.:**  Costa Rica is not a participating member of the CPPS commission under which the project regional framework is being developed.  Costa Rica has national mangrove initiatives underway of relevance to the regional project (e.g. MINAE and SINAC 2014-19 #4966 GEF-PNUD grant for wetland conservation). | **Target 1.2.:**  Costa Rica becomes a full participating member of the Regional Mangrove Action Plan technical forum and GEF ETPS Project Steering Committee, actively contributing to and benefiting from, knowledge sharing/ transfer and conservation incentives afforded by the Ramsar Mangrove and Coral Strategy and CPPS Open Mangrove Initiative for Conservation and sustainable development.  The resulting regional strategy is more robust, while being coherent between ETPS countries, strategies for designated Ramsar sites and effective in meeting international biodiversity commitments. The ETPS countries mutually benefit from counterpart financing, complementary actions and new opportunities leveraged during regional interchanges. | **Output 1.2.1.:**  Official letter of confirmation from Costa Rica’s Ministry of Environment ratifying Costa Rica’s participation in the development of a regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves by Y1Q3.  ***Output Indicator 1.2.1.:***  CPPS - Costa Rica agreement signed with CPPS before **Y1Q3**. |
| **Outcome 1.3.:**  Policy makers and national mangrove managers from at least three countries have the tools and capacity to strengthen the implementation of the regional mangrove strategy.  ***Outcome Indicator 1.3.:***  # of countries that have tools generated by the project that assist and inform integrated regional and national planning (by **Y2Q4**). | **Base-Line 1.3.:**  Decision makers responsible for mangrove conservation and sustainable development are very receptive to sound technical and scientific support that helps consolidate coordinated actions in the region.  The ETPS mangrove coastal areas are managed under different national regimes that reflect their development history. The existing resources available to policy makers across the region address base-line understanding, public awareness, prioritization methods, inter-sector organization, finance mechanisms and ordination of resource use.  Materials and tools produced directly in support of policy improvements are mostly specific to each country and are limited in the thematic areas of climate change and blue forest technologies, policy for mangrove restoration, territorial ridge-to-reef planning and environmental education. | **Target 1.3.:**  Policy makers and mangrove resource managers benefit from capacity building via the project in at least 3 countries. They benefit from access to the technical advice and tools necessary to rationalize and implement improvements in national mangrove related policy and address policy gaps. This encourages a progressive regional agenda that improves overall mangrove health in the ETPS region.  A practical shared reference base is available to decision makers beyond the lifetime of the project. Outreach, cross-learning opportunities and knowledge sharing during the project consolidates mangrove conservation "know-how" across the ETPS region. | **Output 1.3.1.:**  At least two ETPS trans-boundary learning and cooperation exchanges between project countries and at least one international exchange with other countries with similar mangrove conservation challenges completed by Y2Q4.  ***Output Indicator 1.3.1.:***  # of thought leaders trained per country actively working in aspects of mangrove policy and resource planning by **Y2Q4**.  **Output 1.3.2.:**  Communication products on mangrove conservation (policy, regulations, field implementation and other related issues) will be completed and made available to policy makers and stakeholders by Y1Q3.  ***Output Indicator 1.3.2.:***  % completion of communication products (as described in Section 2.13 of ProDoc) by **Y2Q4**. |
| **Component 2: National mangrove action plans and policy strengthening.** | | | |
| **Outcome 2.1.:**  At least two ETPS countries have updated national mangrove action plans in line with the regional strategy that addresses pressure on mangroves from sources across the ridge-to-reef (watershed) scale by Y2Q4.  ***Outcome Indicator 2.1.:***  # of ETPS country updated national plans supported by the regional mangrove strategy. | **Base-Line 2.1.:**  In general ecosystem based management that integrates upstream processes such as watershed management and other ridge-to-reef teleconnections are not traditionally represented in national planning for mangroves. Instead, spatial planning is often undertaken by different agencies and tailored to the needs of the different local populated centers/ divisions.  Each ETPS country is working to develop their mangrove and wetland strategies.  **Costa Rica: D**eveloping a wetland national strategy into 2017 which includes an updated inventory of national mangrove areas.  **Panama:** Developing a national mangrove strategy which has yet to be implemented and adjusted in the context of a new Environment Ministry in 2015.  **Colombia**: Already prohibits the deforestation of mangrove resources and has granted certain concessionary rights to communities but has not yet developed a specific national mangrove action plan.  **Ecuador:** Currently drafting a first national mangrove action plan. MAE has implemented a successful concession program known as "sociomanglares" which would benefit from a viable long term financing mechanism. | **Target 2.1.:**  National regulations and national mangrove action plans are improved and made consistent with the regional mangrove strategy, such that priority Pacific mangroves are put under an improved policy conducive to more effective on-the-ground conservation by Y2Q4.  **Costa** **Rica** incorporates ridge-to-reef processes as relevant upstream watershed processes into their wetland conservation strategy.  **Panama** ANAM and ARAP authorities combine into a new ministry where new competencies are established that improve effective wetland policy development.  **Colombia**: Project inputs support National law 1450 to be established into 2015 towards improved mangrove conservation strategies.  **Ecuador**: The regional action plan contributes to the application of the Ecuador National Plan for Well-Being (Buen vivir). | **Output 2.1.1.:**  Updated national mangrove action plans are formally ratified in at least two ETPS countries.  ***Output Indicator 2.1.1.:***  # of updated and ratified national mangrove action plans (and in development) by **Y2Q4**. |
| **Outcome 2.2.:**  At least two ETPS countries have passed stronger regulations and incentives conducive to mangrove conservation.  ***Outcome Indicator 2.2.:***  # of countries with stronger regulations or incentives that improve mangrove conservation underway and established at the national level by **Y2Q4**. | **Base-Line 2.2.:**  Existing regulations and their effective implementation vary between ETPS country:  **Costa Rica:** Forest Law 7575 (1996) outlawed all mangrove extraction and suspended all licensing for additional shrimp aquaculture, but does not yet consider land-use practice affecting upstream watershed processes. Uses are restricted to tourism, education and investigation complicating management in historically fished areas.  **Panamá**: General Environmental Law No. 41 (1998) and recent resolutions (2008) require special permits with fines for any use that could affect mangroves. Unfortunately urban development approved in 2011 resulted in the destruction of extensive mangrove areas, including in Ramsar listed wetlands.  **Colombia**: Amended Resolution 1602 (1996) specifically outlaws mangrove destruction in all national provinces and require licenses for any activities that could negatively affect mangroves. Practical application though is limited across high poverty communities along the Pacific coast where deforestation rates are highest. Law 1450 (2011) under the National Development Plan later prohibited mining and aquaculture industries in mangrove systems. A further mangrove specific resolution is planned by MADS for 2015.  **Ecuador**: Resolution 56 establishes a fine of $89,273 USD per hectare for mangrove destruction. Concessions agreements across ~50K ha of mangrove have been granted to local communities over the last 5 years. | **Target 2.2.:**  National threat assessment exercises and trans-boundary knowledge exchanges lead to more effective regulations governing ridge-to-reef processes impacting mangrove areas in at least two of the ETPS countries. Changes in policy and national sustainable development programs act to reduce the likelihood of continued mangrove degradation, encouraging instead reforestation.  Positive effects of integrated ridge-to-reef planning propagate to local scales. This provides more effective nursery habitat, food security, water quality and coastal defenses are bolstered. Communities within and around the resource shift towards sustainable mangrove based livelihoods with social and economic benefits that improve community well-being.  Targets for national planning discussed with local authorities during the PPG will be confirmed during project start-up. These included:   * Clarified tenure and use rights for local communities; * Improved upstream watershed management; * Stricter pollution controls; * Mandatory Environmental Impact Assessments; * Mangrove climate adaptation criteria in national plans; * National incentive schemes for effective management; * A financial sustainability mechanism for concession programs; * Strengthening of marine protected networks and biological corridors; * More stringent fines for illegal mangrove destruction. | **Output 2.2.1:**  A national mangrove policy and threat assessment for each ETPS country to orient economic valuation work, informs policy gaps, and identifies outreach needs and priorities in each ETPS country, completed by Y1Q4.  ***Output Indicator 2.2.1.:***  # of ETPS countries with an updated (post PPG) mangrove base-line, national policy and threat assessment by **Y1Q4**.  **Output 2.2.2.:**  Legislation passed to strengthen the protection of mangroves in at least two ETPS countries completed by Y2Q4.  ***Output Indicator 2.2.2.:***  # of new or updated policies containing elements attributable to the project national assessment exercises. |
| **Component 3: Local conservation action.** | | | |
| **Outcome 3.1.:**  At least two key mangrove ecosystems have updated management plans and/or new local development plans consistent with updated national and regional strategies, taking into account the results of economic valuation studies from this and related projects and building on increased national capacity and support to protect mangroves in a comprehensive ridge-to-reef context by Y2Q4.  ***Outcome Indicator 3.1.:***  # of site level management or local development plans generated with stakeholders directly and indirectly as a result of project developments. | **Base-Line 3.1.:**  The demonstration sites in this project are adjacent to communities for which management plans are being developed or improved:  Chira, Gulf of Nicoya (Costa Rica)  Management actions are largely organized by private enterprises (women's collectives within the community). A Responsible Fishing Marine Area was designated and adopted by the Palito community Asopecupachi Cooperative in 2012.  David, Gulf of Chiriquí (Panamá);  CI-Panama has been working in consultation with local authorities and stakeholders since 2007 towards an eventual management plan in David, and more recently (2013+) in Montijo.  Bazan-Bocana (Colombia);  A local management plan was developed in 2012 with the community council of Bazán Bocana by MADS and the CVC with support from Marviva for a Special Nature Reserve covering 800 ha of bay mangroves.  El Morro, Gulf of Guayaquil (Ecuador);  A management plan has been in development since 2008 in revision by MAE with financing and technical oversight from CI-Ecuador. | **Target 3.1.:**  Local policy and management plans are strengthened in each site and made consistent with national plans and the regional mangrove strategy in at least two of the local sites of Chira (Costa Rica), David (Panama), Bahia Malaga (Colombia) and/or El Morro (Ecuador) that have field conservation measures underway to reduce degradation and increase mangrove coverage through restoration efforts.  Targets for local planning discussed with authorities during the PPG will be confirmed during project start-up. Examples included:   * Mangrove climate adaptation criteria in local plans (David, Panama); * Inter-institutional arrangements that regularize no-take nursery areas zoned by community councils. * Consolidate new concession agreements within management plans (El Morro, Ecuador). | **Output 3.1.1.:**  At least two local management plans and/or local development plans for priority mangrove sites are formally ratified by local authorities by Y2Q4.  ***Output Indicator 3.1.1.:***  # of improved site level management plans or local development plans in effect by Y2Q4 and/or % completion. |
| **Outcome 3.2.:**  Economic evaluation tools and methodologies developed through the GEF-UNEP Blue Forests and other related projects are tested in at least two ETPS countries during their development phases to maximize applicability to policy and management at local to national scales by Y2Q3.  ***Outcome Indicator 3.2.:***  # of GEF-UNEP Blue Forests method and/or analogous economic evaluations and tools developed and presented to project stakeholders | **Base-Line 3.2.:**  The GEF-UNEP Blue Forests initiative is currently underway to develop marine carbon accounting methodologies and ecosystem services evaluations that help quantify carbon credit as a potential management as well as financing tool.  The initiative that ran from 2010-2014 envisaged small scale interventions at pilot sites to help resource managers better represent the often underestimated value of mangrove systems (e.g. for carbon and emissions scenarios, fisheries enhancement zones etc.) in national policies. This would better reflect their latent resource potential in emerging economies such as climate change, conservation, biodiversity and sustainable development for tourism etc.  Both Costa Rica (Cifuentes et al, 2014), and Ecuador (Hamilton & Lovette, 2015) have undertaken recent carbon assessments/ valuation estimating and correcting mangrove loss estimations from the 1960s onwards. STRI working with the Carnegie Institute of science have developed LIDAR based methods for a first high fidelity carbon map for Panama (2013). Colombia has some information for the Caribbean coast, but requires more support in carbon technologies, GIS skills (with CVC) and valuation of ecosystem goods and services. | **Target 3.2.:**  The GEF-UNEP Blue Forest Project and WAVES methodology is successfully applied and evaluated in the ETPS country demonstration sites of Ecuador (Gulf of Guayaquil) and Costa Rica (Gulf of Nicoya).  This will provide important economic evaluation tools and base-line reference data of direct relevance for both local resource managers and national planning agencies, helping to value the resource and justify steps in national policy revisions and improved site level management (e.g. creation of new mangrove concessions etc.).  A knowledge sharing platform is created drawing upon experiences and examples across the project, and integrated between the outreach platforms of each project partner.  The results of the project are widely communicated in national, regional and global conservation, science, policy and related fora. | **Output 3.2.1.:**  Final report on the economic valuation of ecosystem goods and services provided by mangroves in at least two project sites, including a) fisheries, b) nature-based tourism, c) coastal protection, d) maintaining water quality and bioremediation, and e) carbon storage completed by Y2Q1.  ***Output Indicator 3.2.1.:***  # of completed site studies presented to stakeholders by **Y2Q1**.  **Output 3.2.2:**  Summary outreach document and associated strategy for making it most relevant to decision-makers on the methodology(ies) and toolkit(s) assessed and used to guide the implementation and policy application of economic valuation of mangrove ecosystem services that include cost-benefit analyses of alternative management options, based on existing initiatives including the GEF-UNEP Blue Forest project and WAVES, completed by Y2Q4.  ***Output Indicator 3.2.2.:***  % completion and presentation of outreach document with decision support strategy presented to ETPS decision makers by **Y2Q4**.  **Output 3.2.3.:**  Mangrove valuation, policy and development planning outcomes and field conservation communicated broadly, including through: distribution of communications materials; an interactive knowledge-sharing platform; presentation in at least three national, regional and global conservation, science, policy and related fora (e.g.: Ramsar, CBD, IMPAC, Blue Carbon Working Group, ITTO); participating in the IWLearn mechanism (including allocation of 1% of project budget for this purpose), and presentation to policy makers in other mangrove relevant countries by Y2Q4.  ***Output Indicator 3.2.3.:***  # of outreach and communication media/ platforms/ packages generated, aimed at national, regional and global mangrove conservation, science and policy fora by **Y2Q4**. |
| **Outcome 3.3.:**  Outreach and capacity building for at least 30 local policymakers and stakeholders finalized by Y2Q4.  ***Outcome Indicator 3.3.:***  # Policymakers and stakeholders trained per ETPS country. | **Base-Line 3.3.:**  The project partners do not have existing outreach and training underway for mangrove conservation at the selected project sites. | **Target 3.3.:**  Local policy makers and stakeholders receive directed training in field conservation skills and mangrove restoration scenarios.  Stakeholders are as a result better equipped to develop local policy and action plans, run in-house threat assessments and evaluate their resource use scenarios. This encourages informed decisions when developing alternatives that favor the sustainable use and recovery of their mangrove resources. | **Output 3.3.1.:**  At least two training events are conducted per ETPS country with at least 15 participants each to build skills relating to field conservation measures and restoration of mangroves by Y2Q4.  ***Output Indicator 3.3.1.:***  # of events and training hours received per stakeholder in each ETPS country by **Y2Q4**. |
| **Outcome 3.4.:**  At least two demonstration projects that provide incentives and/or that create business opportunities associated with the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves initiated in at least two selected sites by Y2Q4.  ***Outcome Indicator 3.4.:***  # of demonstration projects providing incentives and/or business opportunities successfully initiated and/or supported by the project in high priority mangrove conservation areas. | **Base-Line 3.4.:**  The project partners do not have existing demonstration projects for mangrove sustainable use and conservation at the selected project sites. | **Target 3.4.:**  The country level exchange of experiences and technical fora developed in the project (e.g. the ecosystem services evaluations, Blue Forests methodologies etc.) stimulate at least 2 demonstration projects designed to promote the conservation and sustainable use of mangrove resources. At least two sites are selected for these projects on the basis of feasibility for implementation and their potential return for conservation and associated societies.  Successful examples improve the grass-roots advocacy for sustainable livelihoods locally and potentially amplify the benefits of similar practices when adapted to adjacent areas and regions. A list of potential demonstration projects considered for each of the four local sites is given in Section 4B. | **Output 3.4.1.:**  Local associations in at least two sites actively participate and commit to demonstration projects by Y1Q4.  ***Output Indicator 3.4.1.:***  MOUs with local associations that outline commitments to participate in mangrove conservation and restoration activities signed by **Y1Q3**.  **Output 3.4.2.:**  Local stakeholders participating in demonstration projects increased by 20% over the project start-up baseline by Y2Q4.  ***Output Indicator 3.4.2.:***  % of initiatives where stakeholders lead activities and actively participate at each local project site between **Y1Q4** and **Y2Q4**. |

**Nepal Results Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | | **Measurement and Description** | **Unit** | **Method/ source** | **Baseline** | **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** | **Extension** |  |
|  | **Objective level indicators** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Objective: By 2017, to improve management in at least 2,500 ha of agro-pastoral lands and 5,000 ha of Churia sal and Churia mixed forest areas in strategic project locations in the four pilot Churia Range districts so as to set enabling conditions to eventually arrest degradation and maintain or improve conditions (post project). | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of hectares (ha) of agro-pastoral land with innovative agricultural and water management practices implemented due to the project | | INDICATOR TYPE: CUMULATIVE  Number of hectares in the project sites where one or more of these improved agricultural and water management practices have been implemented during the project period: 1. SALT model establishment and/or hedge row plantation 2. Zero tillage farming 3. Mixed cropping  4. Irrigation through establishment or maintenance of Micro irrigation technology (MIT)/Plastic ponds/Drip Irrigation technology(DIT) and other water collection and irrigation technologies 5. Bio-engineering 6. Embankment  7. Native fodder and forage plantation  8. Grazing free zone promotion (designation)  9. Crop rotation | Hectares | Programmatic reports, Activity completion reports, CBO's record file and minute registers and focus group discussion with the community groups member | 0  Notes:  7,498 Hectares of degraded agricultural area in the project districts.  Baseline date: 2013 | 1000 | 1500 | 2500 | n/a | Target |
| 471 | 9025 | 9159 |  | Achieved |
| Number of hectares (ha) of forested area in which communities are utilizing integrated landscape management practices | | INDICATOR TYPE: LEVEL  Measured as (i) restoration activities: fencing, open grazing control, other mechanisms to reduce the vulnerability of the site and contributes towards its restoration in the long run; and (ii) at least 5 of these forest management practices: Forest nursery establishment and saplings production, Afforestation/ Plantation, enrichment plantation, Thinning, Invasive species control, Regeneration and saplings management, mechanisms to control forest fire, erosion control and embankment, and regeneration promotion methods such as ban grazing and forest fires, removal of unhealthy plants & saplings, removal of old trees with bigger crown cover that prevents regeneration, fencing. | Hectares | Community forest operational plan, Community forest records/ minute register, community focus group discussions | 2264 ha  Baseline date: June 2015 | 1500 | 3500 | 5000 | n/a | Target |
| 3219 | 4682 | 4450 |  | Achieved |
|  | **Outcome level indicators** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Project Component 1: Sustainable management of agro-pastoral land** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Outcome 1.1 - Improved agricultural management through innovative pilot practices introduced at the field level that reduce erosion and climate vulnerability across 1,000 hectares (ha) | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of hectares (ha) of agro-pastoral land with innovative agricultural and water management practices implemented during the project period | | "INDICATOR TYPE: CUMULATIVE  Agro pastoral land here refers to the landscapes that are used for cultivation (growing crops, vegetables, fruits etc.), raising livestock (grazing lands such as grass lands and shrub lands) and/or river bed areas etc.  Hectares are counted under the following:  1. SALT model establishment  2. Zero tillage farming  3. Mixed cropping(Planting two or more crops and/or vegetables at the same time for maintaining or improving soil quality  4. Irrigation through establishment or maintenance of Micro irrigation technology(MIT)/Plastic ponds/Drip Irrigation technology(DIT) and other water collection and irrigation technologies  5. Crop rotation | Hectares | Programmatic reports, activity completion reports, CBO's record file & minute registers and Focus group discussion with the community groups member | 0  Hectares of agricultural land with irrigation:  Nirmal basti, Parsa: 231.418  Hadikhola, Makwanpur: 358.313  Chandranigahapur, Rautahat: N/A  Ratanpuri , Bara: 106.968  Baseline date: | 300 | 300 | 600 | n/a | Target |
| 208 | 335 | 381 |  | Achieved |
| Number of hectares (ha) of degraded land with bio-engineering introduced to stabilize soils, reduce erosion, and restore productivity | | INDICATOR TYPE: CUMULATIVE  Number of hectares of degraded land conserved/stabilized/restored through the adoption of following practices: 1. Bio-engineering: Plantation of fast growing species that reduce erosion in erosion prone areas (e.g. broom grass and bamboo); Plantation along the river banks 2. Spur and earthen dykes & gabion wire embankment | Hectares | Activity report from district line agencies and community minutes | 181 ha  Note, baseline measurement showed 181 ha with erosion control species, embankment areas not measured  Baseline date: June, 2015 | 200 | 200 | 400 | n/a | Target |
| 421 | 468 | 519 |  | Achieved |
|  | Outcome 1.2 - Improved land management across 1,500 hectares (ha) through an enhanced enabling environment within the agricultural sector | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of hectares (ha) of agro-pastoral land with improved practices including sustainable grazing, stall feeding, and use of native fodder and forage grasses, due to project activities | | INDICATOR TYPE: CUMULATIVE  Number of hectares in the project sites where native fodder and forage has been planted (here the standard ratio of plant per hectare will be used for calculating the area of plantation) + Number of hectares of vulnerable agro-pastoral areas conserved through designation of open grazing free zone to arrest land degradation and promote stall feeding (detail report will be produced and submitted) | Hectares | project reports, District line agencies records, Community minutes and Activity reports | 0 ha | 500 | 1000 | 1500 | n/a | Target |
| 22 | 8222 | 8259 |  | Achieved |
|  | **Project Component 2: Integrated landscape management in forested areas** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Outcome 2.1 - Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities in 5,000 hectares (ha) of forested areas within the four pilot Churia Range districts | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of inclusive community user groups (which include women and vulnerable community members in accordance with selection criteria) operating in the project areas with improved capacity to understand and implement sustainable forest management practices | | INDICATOR TYPE: LEVEL  Improved capacity= CFUG members trained on Sustainable forest management practices+ These CFUGs with trained representatives implements at least 5 of the sustainable forest management practices set forth by the project. | User groups |  | 8  Baseline date: June, 2015 | 10 | 20 | 30 | n/a | Target |
| 13 | 20 | 18 |  | Achieved |
|  | **Component 3: Cross-sectoral coordination and local community engagement** | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of land-use policies/plans developed for sustainable land management | | INDICATOR TYPE: CUMULATIVE | Policies/ plans | Technical progress report, field report, evaluation report | 0  Baseline date: 2013 | 2 | 2 | 4 | n/a | Target |
| 1 | 1 | 2 |  | Achieved |

**NOT** **APPROVED (please keep internal)**

**Coastal Fisheries Initiative—Indonesia Results Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/**  **Component/**  **Outcome** | **Indicator / Unit** | | **Definition** | | | **Disaggregation** | | **Method/**  **Source** | | **Frequency** | | **Responsible** | **Baseline** | | | | | **Midterm (2018) Target** | | | | **Project End (2021) (cumulative) Target** | | | **Assumptions** |
| **Component A:**  **Implementing Enabling Conditions for EAFM in FMA 715, 717 & 718**  **Objective: Improved capacity and compliance of coastal fisheries stakeholders to EAFM policies and regulations by applying relevant rights-based and collaborative management mechanisms and financial incentive schemes at specific sites within FMAs.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Enabling policy: National and local policy and institutional frameworks (including Fisheries Management Plans – FMPs) amended to contribute to the implementation of a holistic ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM). (Supports Program-level Output 2.1.) | # of national frameworks (FMPs for each FMA) amended. | | FMP amendments (which are part of national policy) contribute to EAFM (including MPA management, rights based mechanisms and financial schemes). | | |  | | Existence of amended documents. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **0** | | | | | **1** | | | | **3** | | | FMPs are endorsed by GOI. |
| # of Provincial frameworks amended based on corresponding FMPs for each FMA. | | District level frameworks will be disaggregated by species within FMA. | | Existence of amended documents. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **715** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **3** | | |
| **717** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **3** | | |
| **718** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **3** | | |
| # of FMA decrees adopted and implemented with provincial governments. | | FMPs must be formally approved by the National Government. This can take time and may not occur within the life of project. However, during the life of project, Provincial governments will implement elements of the FMP decrees. | | |  | |  | |  | |  | **715** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **1** | | |
| **717** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **1** | | |
| **718** | | | **1** | | **1** | | | | **1** | | |
| 2. Enabling awareness: Holistic EAFM based plans in place demonstrating the benefits of harvest controls and co-management to fishers and province level managers. (Supports Program-level Output 1.1) | # of EAFM plans developed and operational demonstrating benefits of controls and management to fisheries/  Managers. | | A “developed” plan is one that is available in writing. An “operational” plan is one that is in the process of being implemented.  A written plan will include language on benefits of harvest controls and co-management to fishers and province level managers. | | | Plans will be disaggregated by FMA. | | Existence of plans. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **715** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **2** | | | There is common agreement on a definition for Harvest Control Regulations. |
| **717** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **2** | | |
| **718** | | | **0** | | **1** | | | | **2** | | |
|  |  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | **♂** | | **♀** | | **♂** | | **♀** | | **♂** | **♀** | |  |
| 3. Enabling incentives:  Locally based medium scale financial mechanisms established to demonstrate coastal ecosystem conservation as part of a holistic EAFM. (Supports Program-level Output 1.3) | # of financial mechanism projects established and operational that are benefiting marine ecosystems and coastal people. | | These financial mechanisms are defined as medium scale (<$75K/project) Payment for Environmental Services schemes that fund coastal ecosystem conservation as part of a holistic EAFM. | | | These projects will only be implemented in FMA 715 as Blue Abadi (Component C) will be implemented in the other two FMAs. | | Existence of functioning financial schemes. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **715** | **0** | | **0** | | **1** | | **1** | | **2** | **2** | | Funding sources and financial mechanisms are available. |
| 4. Enabling skills: Capacity of fishers, fish workers, and provincial and district government agencies enhanced to effectively participate in the implementation of holistic EAFM approaches.(Supports Program-level Output 2.4). | # of MMAF National, Provincial and District staff trained on Specific Competence Standards for Work (SK3) for EAFM. | | “Trained” is defined as those “passing” (providing correct answers to at least 60% of questions) in a post training test. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA and by gender. | | Attendance sheets from trainings. | | Annual | | PMU | **715** | **4** | | **2** | | **7** | | **3** | | **12** | **28** | | Stakeholders are willing to participate in the project and are committed to implementing training results. |
| **717** | **1** | | **1** | | **7** | | **3** | | **12** | **28** | |
| **718** | **0** | | **0** | | **7** | | **3** | | **12** | **28** | |
| # of fisher folk applying BMP. | | BMPs include improved fishing, fish handling and post harvest practices to maintain fish quality. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA and by gender. | | Survey of fisher folk who have participate in project BMP trainings. | | Midterm and EOP | |  | **715** | **0** | | **0** | | **13** | | **7** | | **39** | **21** | |
| **717** | **0** | | **0** | | **17** | | **8** | | **51** | **24** | |
| **718** | **0** | | **0** | | **13** | | **3** | | **36** | **9** | |
| **Component B:**  **Implementing EAFM Tools to support EAFM in FMA 715, 717 and 718.**  **Objective: Select coastal fisheries improved using MPAs, FIPs, and BMPs as well as the application of EAFM principles at key locations in FMA 715, 717 & 718 – aligned with Program Component A & C** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Improved planning and management of MPAs for cross-sectoral collaboration implemented as part of a holistic EAFM approach that includes ecosystem restoration and conservation strategies and other innovative approaches. (Supports Program-level Output 2.2) | # of ha of new MPAs established. | | These MPAs include Provincial and National level. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA. | | Existence of Decrees | | Midterm and EOP | |  | **715** | **0** | | | | **25,000 ha** | | | | **150,000ha** | | |  |
| **717** | **0** | | | | **30,000 ha** | | | | **100,000 ha** | | |
| **718** | **0** | | | | **150,000 ha** | | | | **800,000 ha** | | |
|  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | **Yellow (%)** | | | | **Green (%)** | | | | **Blue (%)** | | |  |
|  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | **B** | **MT** | | **EoP** | **B** | **MT** | | **EoP** | **B** | **MT** | **EoP** |  |
| % of ha of existing MPAs under improved management. | | # of National or Provincial MPAs having a “blue” ranking per the MPA management effectiveness E-KKP3K/MPA scorecard. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA. | | MMAF effectiveness E-KKP3K/MPA scorecard results. | | Baseline (B) Midterm (MT) and End of Project (EoP) | |  | **715** | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 75 | 85 | | 90 | 75 | 85 | 90 | MMAF’s E-KKP3K measures are based on % of existing MPAs falling under each category and progressing from yellow to green to blue) Note that FMA 715 ~ =2.1Mha  FMA 717=3Mha and FMA 718 =  150,000ha |
| **717** | 41 | 75 | | 100 | 0 | 35 | | 90 | 0 | 15 | 30 |
| **718** | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 71 | 80 | | 90 | 76 | 85 | 90 |
| # of FMAs with 20% improvement in fisheries management performance over project baseline. | | EAFM performance is measured using the six domain indicators for (Fisheries Resources, Habitat and Ecosystem, Capture Fisheries Technique, Economic, Social, and Governance) as defined by the Indonesian government. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA. | | MMAF EAFM performance indicators. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU |  | **0** | | | | **1** | | | | **3** | | |  |
| # of whale sharks in FMA 717. | | Whale sharks IUCN Vulnerable and are a project conservation target. | | | Whale shark populations are found in FMA 717 and are regularly monitored. | | WWF ID population monitoring data. | | Annual | | PMU | **717** | **60** | | | | **60** | | | | **60** | | |  |
| # of leatherback turtles legally permitted to be traditionally hunted per year. | | Leatherback turtles are IUCN Critically Endangered and a project conservation target. | | | Leatherback populations are found in FMA 718 and are regularly monitored. | | WWF ID population satellite monitoring data. | | Annual | | PMU | **718** | **60** | | | | **30** | | | | **5** | | |  |
|  |  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | **♂** | | **♀** | | **♂** | | **♀** | | **♂** | **♀** | |  |
| 2. Small scale business sector investment increases in coastal fisheries management. (Supports Program-level Output 1.2) | # of small scale fisheries enterprises investing in EAFM (including BMPs). | | Small scale businesses include community level enterprises (such as mud crab fisheries) that are operated by men and women. Investments will include coastal fisheries management, coastal ecosystem recovery, and methods for reducing waste and post-harvest loss. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA and gender. | | Project surveys. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **715** | **0** | | **0** | | **14** | | **6** | | **28** | **12** | | Small scale businesses are committed to implementing FIP/AIP guidelines. |
| **717** | **0** | | **0** | | **14** | | **6** | | **28** | **12** | |
| **718** | **0** | | **0** | | **14** | | **6** | | **28** | **12** | |
| % women residing in project sites benefitting from activities designed to address and reduce losses in post-harvest fisheries. | | Training activities will focus on women’s role in post-harvest fisheries and ways to reduce waste/loss. “Benefitting” actively engaging in training event activities and discussion and applying new skills to their post harvest fishery activities. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA. | | Project surveys. | | Annual | | PMU | **715** | **10%** | | | | **20%** | | | | **20%** | | | Women are willing to participate in the trainings. |
| **717** | **10%** | | | | **20%** | | | | **20%** | | |
| **718** | **10%** | | | | **20%** | | | | **20%** | | |
| 3. Business sector invests and implements FIPs. | # of FIPs established. | | FIPs are formal agreements established between the project and a fishery business that defines a set of practices to be adopted to ensure the longterm viability of a specific fish stock. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA. | | Signed FIP agreements. | | Annual | | PMU | **715** | **0** | | | | **1** | | | | **2** | | |  |
| **717** | **0** | | | | **1** | | | | **1** | | |
| **718** | **0** | | | | **1** | | | | **2** | | |
| # of businesses using revised procedures/practices that support EAFM. | | “Supporting EAFM” includes abiding by licensing requirements, harvest control limits, respecting MPA regulations, etc. Relevant operating procedures will include fisheries purchasing, practices and processing. | | | Data will be disaggregated by FMA. | | Existence of Operating procedures supporting EAFM | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **715** | **0** | | | | **1** | | | | **3** | | | The seafood industry is committed to implementing EAFM policies. |
| **717** | **0** | | | | **1** | | | | **3** | | |
| **718** | **0** | | | | **1** | | | | **3** | | |
| **Component C:**  **Sustainably financing the protection of coastal ecosystems and EAFM activities in FMA 715 and 717.**  **Objective: Through the capitalization the Blue Abadi Fund in West Papua Province (FMA 715 and 717), permanently support a network of local institutions working to protect coastal ecosystems, increase fisheries production, and enhance EAFM for the benefit of small-scale local fishers and their communities.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Financing provided to the Blue Abadi Fund for critical coastal ecosystem protection and EAFM in West Papua Province (FMA 715 and 717), results in Indonesia’s first sustainably financed MPA network, serving as a national and regional model for sustained marine resource management, as well as in positive impacts to ecosystem health, fisheries production, and the livelihoods and food security of local fishers and their communities. | | | The Blue Abadi Fund is capitalized. | | The Blue Abadi Fund has been capitalized at a minimum amount of USD $30 million | N/A | | Annual Blue Abadi Report from Kehati | | Once | | CI | | **0** | | | | | **1** | | | | **1** | | |
| Blue Abadi Fund is fully operational. | | Operations are in compliance with the Blue Abadi Operations Manual. Funds are being disbursed annually to Indonesian organizations in West Papua for activities consistent with the Blue Abadi Strategic Plan. | N/A | | Annual Blue Abadi Report from Kehati | | Annual | | CI | | **0** | | | | | **1** | | | | **1** | | |
| **Component D:**  **Implementing knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation for sustainable coastal fisheries in FMA 715, 717 and 718.**  **Objective: Platforms established for project monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and knowledge management promote data sharing, communication of lessons learned and adaptive management.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Results-based performance monitoring used to track project status and inform governance and management of project sites to support EAFM in FMAs 715, 717 and 718. (Supports Program-level Output 3.2) | Existence and use of a comprehensive results-based project monitoring tool for the CFI Indonesia project compatible with other CFI Child monitoring programs. | | Monitoring plan will be implemented at the site level in each FMA over the life of the project. | | | Data will be disaggregated at the site level. | | Existence and use of a results-based performance monitoring tool compatible with other CFI Child Projects. | | Within 6 mos. of project start up | | PMU and CI | **0** | | | | | **1** | | | | **1** | | | ProDoc monitoring plan will provide baseline for the project monitoring scheme  Required data and tools are available. |
| 2. Existing and new data and information management systems established, maintained and updated so that information is secure and available. (Supports Program-level Output 3.1) | # of secure information management systems updated and publicly available. | |  | | |  | | Existence of updated and available EAFM management systems. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **0** | | | | | **1** | | | | **1** | | | Stakeholders are willing to participate and are committed to implementing a data sharing mechanism. |
| 3. EAFM information for coastal fisheries management available and disseminated in the respective FMAs, the CFI Programme and other interested national/regional/global audiences. (Supports Program-level Output 3.1) | # of websites documenting project available on line. | |  | | |  | | Documentation of websites and in hard copy. | | Midterm and EOP | | PMU | **0** | | | | | **2** | | | | **3** | | |  |
| # of reflection exercises held during PSC meetings incorporated into AWP formulation. | | “Reflection exercise” includes the review and documentation of progress towards the Program Theory of Change, progress towards implementation of work plans and results, and lessons learned. Incorporation of the reflection exercise into AWP means lessons learned and revised project logic result in adaptations to strategies/ activities of annual work plans. | | | **0** | | | | | **2** | | | | **5** | | |
| # of contributions to CFI Programme Communication Tools | | “Contributions” include stories, lessons learned on EAFM but also Xcutting themes such as community engagement, gender, etc that are shared through print or media with the CFI Programme and other international fora. | | | **TBD after project start up** | | | | | **TBD after project start up** | | | | **TBD after project start up** | | |

1. Tulum +8 is a regional ecoregional agreement, however it does not have a Ridge to Reef approach and therefore it is not taken into account as baseline. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Baseline hectares correspond to the portion of the Hondo River which already has an IWRM plan, according to Programa de Gestión de la Cuenca del Río Hondo, SEMARNAT 2009. The PMU will verify this figure. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Hectares correspond to the watersheds of Rio Hondo (MX & BZ = 1,059,200) and Pasabien (10,158 GT). The PMU will verify. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Hectares correspond to the watersheds of Rio Hondo (MX & BZ = 1,059,200), Pasabien (10,158 GT) and Teculutan (20,033 GT). The PMU will verify. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Hectares correspond to the watersheds of Rio Hondo, Pasabien, Teculutan, and Manchaguala (12,621 HN). The PMU will verify. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Hectares correspond to the watersheds of Rio Hondo, Pasabien, Teculutan, Manchaguala and Belize River (597,500 BZ)). The PMU will verify. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Hectares correspond to Belize’s coast (386 km \* 3 km of ICZM Plan mandate). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Hectares correspond to Belize’s coast and the Guatemalan coast according to the area under jurisdiction of the Caribbean Coastal Marine Strategy management, which is to be defined through project activities. At the moment, the value was calculated by the length of the Caribbean Guatemalan coast (148 km\*3km), the PMU will confirm the figure. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Values for ‘compliance” are NOT CUMULATIVE because once producers reach compliance they are accounted for in the ‘maintain certification’ category. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Values for ‘compliance” are NOT CUMULATIVE because once producers reach compliance they are accounted for in the ‘maintain certification’ category. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. BMPs for aquifers and critical habitats may include protecting remnant vegetation (fire prevention, cattle exclusion etc.) or more active interventions to accelerate natural regeneration, as well as tree planting and/or sowing seeds (direct seeding) of species characteristic of the target ecosystem, according to project developed guidance. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. BMPs for coastal and marine systems may include protecting ecosystem’s (mangroves and corals) from further destruction or restoration (mangrove and coral planting), reduced impacts from productive activities via improved production and harvesting techniques, improved protocols for tourism activities when visiting coral reefs, according to project developed guide, and others including those promoted by FIP’s (Fisheries Improvement Plans), AIPs (Aquaculture Improvement Plans), MSC (Marine Stewardship Council) and ASC (Aquaculture Stewardship Council). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Values for ‘AIPs” are NOT CUMULATIVE because once producers reach compliance with ASC standard they are accounted for in the ‘ASC certified’ category. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Values for ‘FIPs” are CUMULATIVE because reaching compliance with MSC standard might take more than five years. The overall goal for fisheries is to have 3 FIPs from which at least will be able to achieve MSC certification. The goal at year 5 of the project is to have 2 MSC certified fisheries. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Same as BMPs defined in footnote 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)