

## Tracking Tool for SFM/REDD-Plus Projects

### Guidance Note v0.2

#### Introduction

The SFM/REDD-plus tracking tool (TT) aims to measure progress in achieving the impacts and outcomes established at the portfolio level within SFM/REDD-plus projects. The TT provides a number of simple indicators which are being tracked for all GEF 5 SFM/REDD-plus projects, based on the SFM/REDD-plus Results-Based Management Framework.

Data from the individual projects will be aggregated for analysis of trends and patterns at a portfolio-wide level to inform the development of future GEF strategies and to report to GEF Council on portfolio-level performance of the GEF-5 SFM/REDD-plus incentive mechanism.

This guidance note has been prepared to help project teams complete their submissions efficiently as possible.

#### Who should use the tracking tool?

In GEF-5 all projects accessing funds from the SFM/REDD-plus incentive mechanism will have to complete a SMF/REDD-plus tracking tool. Additionally, project teams will have to complete tracking tool returns relevant to the GEF Focal Areas (FAs: biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) providing funding for the project. The GEF Implementing Agency/Executing Agency will guide the project teams in the choice of the tracking tools.

#### When should you use the tracking tool?

The tracking tool is to be applied three times during the lifetime of a project:

1. At CEO endorsement
2. At project mid-term
3. At project completion

#### Template Guidance

##### *PROJECT IDENTIFICATION*

1. Project Title	Please use the same project title as given in the PIF.
2. GEF ID	Please use the GEF ID number assigned by GEFSEC.
3. Agency Project ID	Please use the ID number assigned by Agency.
4. Country	For multi-country projects complete one tracking tool per country involved in the project, based on the project circumstances and activities in each respective country. The completed forms for each country should then be submitted as one package to the GEF.
5. Region	Select the region from the list.

6. Agency	Select the Agency from list.
7. Date of Council/CEO Approval	Month,DD,YYY (e.g. May 12, 2010)
8. GEF Grant (US\$)	\$
9. Date of Submission of TT	Month,DD,YYY (e.g. May 12, 2010)
10. Focal Areas and Objectives	Please select the relevant Focal Areas addressed in the project
11. GEF SFM/REDD-Plus Objectives	Please select the relevant SFM/REDD-Plus Objectives.
12. Scale of the project	Please select the one scale category that best fits the project. <b>Global</b> – projects which are implemented world-wide or designed to provide specific globally applicable outputs <b>Regional</b> – projects designed to be implemented throughout an entire region covering a number of individual nations e.g. Africa, LAC <b>Sub-Regional/Transboundary</b> – projects implemented in two or more countries e.g. a trans-frontier landscape <b>National</b> – projects implemented across an entire country <b>Sub-national</b> – projects implemented within one or more district, province, county of a single country. This could include projects consisting of a number of site-level activities within one country. <b>Site</b> – projects implemented within a single contiguous area e.g. river basin, landscape, watershed/catchment. If you select this please specify.
13 Person responsible for completing the TT	Give the name, position and contact details of the person responsible for completing the tool.

#### *PART I – PROJECT CONTEXT AND TARGETTED IMPACTS*

Direct /indirect targets and benefits – this section of the TT uses the terms ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ in a geographic sense when monitoring and assessing the targeted impacts and eventual outcomes of projects. This is because in complex systems like SFM/REDD-Plus, projects are often targeting impacts and realizing outcomes at very different levels and intensities.

These can be very location-focused with quickly identifiable, tangible outcomes or; more strategic covering much larger areas but where tangible results may materialize less quickly and be less easily quantified. Of course there is a continuum between these two extremes and there is no definite line between the two, but for the tool we are characterizing the former as a direct target and the latter as an indirect target.

For example a project may be mainstreaming biodiversity management activities into a floodplain system, in a pilot area of 1,000 ha that is part of a much larger floodplain of 10,000 ha. The project’s direct coverage refers to the area that is targeted by the project’s site interventions – 1,000 ha. The project may also having an indirect effect over the remaining 9,000 ha of the floodplain through

promoting learning exchanges and training at the pilot site as part of awareness raising and capacity building for the rest of the floodplain.

Although climate change mitigation benefits are counted over the lifetime of the investment which may extend beyond project length, only benefits within the length of the project due to the different characteristics of the activities and benefits.

*1. Characterization of area in which the project is located*

<p>a) Areas targeted by project categorized by biome.</p>	<p>Give the area of each biome covered by the project.</p> <p>At COE Endorsement/Approval Document stage you will only be able to complete the 'direct' column. At Mid-Term and Project Closure any indirect project coverage should be estimated.</p> <p>The forest biomes used are common across all FAs, although specific categories may differ slightly.</p> <p>Use the 'Other' category when none of the others are suitable.</p>
<p>b) Areas by vegetation/management characteristics targeted by the project</p>	<p>Give the area of vegetation/management characteristics covered by the project.</p> <p>If the project includes proposals for afforestation or reforestation of currently non-forest land this should be included, use the 'Other' category and provide a description of the existing vegetation/management characteristics.</p> <p>At COE Endorsement/Approval Document stage you will only be able to complete the 'direct' column. At Mid-Term and Project Closure any indirect project coverage should be estimated.</p>
<p>c) Areas of ownership/management rights targeted by the project</p>	<p>Identify if the forests are owned by for government or non-government organizations. Within each give the areas managed through community based forest management arrangements and non-community management.</p> <p>At COE Endorsement/Approval Document stage you will only be able to complete the 'direct' column. At Mid-Term and Project Closure any indirect project coverage should be estimated.</p>

*2. Expected socio-economic benefits*

<p>a) Number of forest dependent people</p>	<p>Give the number of forest dependent people benefitting from the project.</p> <p>Forest dependent people are people and communities that are dependent on forests and tree resources for a significant part of their livelihood which cannot be substituted for other resources.</p>
---	--

	<p>These could include small scale poor farmers, landless rural families, artisans and traders in forest products and urban and peri-urban poor.</p> <p>At COE Endorsement/Approval Document stage you will only be able to complete the 'direct' column. At Mid-Term and Project Closure any indirect project effects should be estimated.</p>
b) Number of people defined as poor	<p>Give the number of people who are living on less than US\$1.25 per day at 2005 prices (or give details where another indicator has been used).</p> <p>At COE Endorsement/Approval Document stage you will only be able to complete the 'direct' column. At Mid-Term and Project Closure any indirect project effects should be estimated.</p>
c) Number of indigenous people	<p>Give the number of people from indigenous groups benefitting from the project.</p> <p>“No internationally accepted definition of indigenous peoples exists. Common characteristics often applied under international law, and by United Nations agencies to distinguish indigenous peoples include: residence within or attachment to geographically distinct traditional habitats, ancestral territories, and their natural resources; maintenance of cultural and social identities, and social, economic, cultural and political institutions separate from mainstream or dominant societies and cultures; descent from population groups present in a given area, most frequently before modern states or territories were created and current borders defined; and self-identification as being part of a distinct indigenous cultural group, and the desire to preserve that cultural identity.” (Glossary in Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC).</p> <p>At COE Endorsement/Approval Document stage you will only be able to complete the 'direct' column. At Mid-Term and Project Closure any indirect project effects should be estimated.</p>

## *PART II – PROJECT OUTCOMES*

This section of the SFM/REDD-Plus tool requires you to think about the levels of specific indicators at a number of stages in the project cycle. The tool provides a means to record existing (baseline) levels and predicted (target) levels which are planned to be achieved through the project – this is to be completed at CEO Approval/Endorsement stage. The tool also provides space to record actual achieved outcomes at Project Mid-Term and finally at Project Closure stages.

### *Tracking tool indicators*

<p>SFM/REDD-plus Core Result</p> <p>Carbon stored in forest ecosystems and emissions avoided from deforestation and forest degradation.</p>	<p>This element requires information on the area (hectares) and the quantity of carbon (tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e ) stored in forests as a result of the project. Note that carbon benefits means that these are the benefits expected above a baseline. Only the additional avoided emissions and enhanced sequestration attributable to the project should be accounted for here. For emission or removal factors (tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per hectare per year), use IPCC defaults or country specific factors.</p> <p>In this section, referring to carbon, lifetime length for SFM/REDD+ (and LULUCF) projects is defined to be 20 years for comparability to other CC mitigation projects, unless a different number of years is deemed appropriate.</p> <p>The tool is tracking 2 different carbon elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoided deforestation and forest degradation – this relates to project activities which protect existing forests from immediate and/or medium term threats of forest conversion and further degradation.</li> <li>• Conservation and enhancement of carbon in forests – this relates to project activities which safeguard, and as appropriate expand existing carbon stocks in working forests, in particular forests subject to commercial logging and shifting agriculture, against long-term decline.</li> </ul> <p>The tool is also tracking direct and indirect carbon benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct carbon (and other) GHG benefits: attributable to the investments made during the project's supervised implementation period, totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.</li> <li>• Indirect carbon (and other) GHG benefits: attributable to the long-term outcomes of the GEF activities that remove barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, catalytic action for replication.</li> </ul>																
<p>EO 1.1 An enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector.</p>	<p>Forest policy – use the following table to score the development and enforcement of the enabling forest policy.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="623 1507 1419 1871"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rating</th> <th>Benchmark</th> <th>Note</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Not an objective/component</td> <td rowspan="6">Baseline assessment during project design and planning phase and repeated annual assessments reported in PIRs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>No action</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Sector policy/regulatory framework has been discussed but not formally proposed</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Sector policy/regulatory framework has been formally proposed but not adopted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Sector policy/regulatory framework has been adopted by the Government, but enforcement mechanisms are weak</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Sector policy/regulatory framework has been adopted by the Government and are enforced</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rating	Benchmark	Note	0	Not an objective/component	Baseline assessment during project design and planning phase and repeated annual assessments reported in PIRs.	1	No action	2	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been discussed but not formally proposed	3	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been formally proposed but not adopted	4	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been adopted by the Government, but enforcement mechanisms are weak	5	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been adopted by the Government and are enforced
Rating	Benchmark	Note															
0	Not an objective/component	Baseline assessment during project design and planning phase and repeated annual assessments reported in PIRs.															
1	No action																
2	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been discussed but not formally proposed																
3	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been formally proposed but not adopted																
4	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been adopted by the Government, but enforcement mechanisms are weak																
5	Sector policy/regulatory framework has been adopted by the Government and are enforced																

	<p>Payment for Ecosystem Services – identify where PES systems have been developed through the project and record for each system or pilot site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ecosystem services included</li> <li>• The spatial area (hectares) covered by the system</li> <li>• The overall value of the PES i.e. the revenues generated by the PES (US\$/year)</li> </ul>														
EO 1.2 Good forest management practices applied in existing forests.	<p>Forest certification – certification provides independent verification that forest management is being carried out in compliance with an agreed performance standard. Certification schemes are mainly focused on timber but non-timber forest product schemes also exist. Record the area of forest (hectares) which has gained forest certification and the name of the certification scheme.</p> <p>Forest management plans – these are a basic building block of SFM, record the area of forest (hectares) which are covered by management planning documentation.</p> <p>Restoration/rehabilitation of degraded forests – record the area of forest (hectares) that the project has supported forest restoration or forest rehabilitation activities. As restoration and rehabilitation efforts may take years or decades to complete, record areas where site-level activities have already been carried out.</p>														
EO 2.1 Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks.	<p>Use the following table (from the CC TT) to score the development and implementation of a national carbon stock monitoring system.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rating</th> <th>Benchmark</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Not an objective/component</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>No action</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Mapping of forests and other land areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Compilation and analysis of carbon stock information</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Implementation of science based inventory/monitoring system</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Monitoring information database publicly available</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rating	Benchmark	0	Not an objective/component	1	No action	2	Mapping of forests and other land areas	3	Compilation and analysis of carbon stock information	4	Implementation of science based inventory/monitoring system	5	Monitoring information database publicly available
Rating	Benchmark														
0	Not an objective/component														
1	No action														
2	Mapping of forests and other land areas														
3	Compilation and analysis of carbon stock information														
4	Implementation of science based inventory/monitoring system														
5	Monitoring information database publicly available														
EO 2.2 New revenue for SFM created through engaging in the carbon market.	<p>Give the quantity (tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e) and value (US\$) of carbon credits (CERs or VERs) which have been issued as a result of project implementation.</p>														

*2. Knowledge contribution as global public goods*

a) Knowledge resources and products	<p>What knowledge resources and products has the project produced? These could be printed and electronic resources developed by the project. For each of the categories give a citation for each product.</p>
b) Knowledge dissemination	<p>How has the project provided knowledge dissemination? These could be workshops, seminars, websites, media products etc. For each of the methods of knowledge distribution give the number of events and the number of users/delegates/participants.</p>