



CLIMATE  
INVESTMENT  
FUNDS

# FIP Monitoring and Reporting Toolkit



Photo: Ricky Martin for the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) / Indonesia

# STRUCTURE OF THE TOOLKIT

## GENERAL GUIDANCE

Introduction.....	3
Use of national systems.....	3
Overview on FIP reporting Themes.....	4
Methodology for data and information collection.....	4
The reporting year.....	5
Baselines and expected results.....	5

## FIP REPORTING THEMES

### **CATEGORY 1: COMMON THEMES**

THEME 1.1: GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR AVOIDANCE / ENHANCEMENT OF CARBON STOCK .....	9
THEME 1.2: LIVELIHOOD CO-BENEFITS.....	13

### **CATEGORY 2: OTHER RELEVANT CO-BENEFIT THEMES**

Theme 2.1: Biodiversity and other environmental services .....	20
Theme 2.2: Governance.....	22
Theme 2.3: Tenure, rights and access .....	25
Theme 2.4: Capacity development .....	27

### **CATEGORY 3: ELEMENTS FOR NARRATIVE (IF IT APPLIES TO THE INVESTMENT PLAN AND DATA IS AVAILABLE)**

Narrative 3.1: Theory of change and assumptions .....	31
Narrative 3.2: Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies and uptake of FIP approaches .....	32
Narrative 3.3: Support received from other partners including the private sector. ....	33
Narrative 3.4: Link of Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) to FIP investments (government’s point of view). ....	34
Narrative 3.5: If applicable: highlights/showcases (example of a particular outstanding achievement if available).....	34

### **OTHER REPORTING TYPES (using creative media and platforms such as blogs, videos or webinars)**

Other reporting 1: Role of coordination of implementation of investment plan and synergies between projects.....	36
Other reporting 2: Ongoing stakeholder participation/involvement.....	36
Other reporting 3: How the investment plan is implemented in the context of broader national policies.....	36
Other reporting 4: Knowledge exchange and management.....	36
Other reporting 5: Any analytical work or public communications (evaluative studies, articles etc.).....	36

## GENERAL GUIDANCE

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<p>This toolkit is designed to support the implementation of the document, <i>Results Monitoring and Reporting in the FIP</i><sup>1</sup>, and together they set out the framework for annual reporting.</p> <p>The toolkit consists of guidance and reporting tools to assist countries that are participating in the Forest Investment Program (FIP) to provide annual reporting to the FIP Sub-Committee on progress implementing their endorsed investment plans. In addition to enabling effective reporting to the FIP Sub-Committee, the toolkit has been designed to allow FIP country focal points, the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), project/program implementation units/teams, and other in-country stakeholders to monitor, report and discuss results, as well as share lessons learned for the benefit of the wider REDD+<sup>2</sup> community at the country-level and beyond.</p> <p>The toolkit aims to provide flexible guidance to FIP pilot countries for reporting in categories /themes that were approved by the FIP Sub-Committee in November 2013. It provides practical direction to map or align project/program level data to the agreed FIP reporting themes, and uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data and information by using computed estimates (quantitative data) and scorecards (qualitative data). A narrative that focuses on core elements of the FIP programmatic approach, including the theory of change for each country will complement aggregated data and information from all countries related to their projects and programs implemented under the endorsed investment plans.</p> <p>Both the original <i>FIP Results Framework</i><sup>3</sup> and the guidance document <i>Results Monitoring and Reporting in the FIP</i>, which is the basis of this toolkit, recognize that monitoring and reporting is an iterative and learning process. Given this, we can expect that as the toolkit is applied and lessons around its use generated, the toolkit may come under review and be improved over time.</p>
<b>USE OF NATIONAL SYSTEMS AND INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED METHODS</b>	<p>This toolkit is designed on the basic principles of flexibility, pragmatism and efficiency, using existing national or sub-national monitoring systems where possible. It provides a structured approach that can support countries with low capacities in their efforts to report on REDD+ benefits in the context of the FIP.</p> <p>In general, FIP resources complement other REDD+ financing streams such as provided by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the UN Collaborative Program on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD Programme).</p> <p>Some FIP pilot countries have already developed comprehensive methodologies and guidance for measuring and reporting REDD+ related results, e.g. by following relevant UNFCCC/ IPCC guidelines. In this context, national systems of forest or REDD+ relevant monitoring already in place should be used to report on</p>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/results-monitoring-and-reporting-fip-0>

<sup>2</sup> Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation conservation of forest stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+)

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/fip-results-framework>

	<p>the agreed FIP reporting themes. The applied methodology to generate data and information should be clearly explained in the reporting tables and scorecards. Countries are encouraged to ensure that their national monitoring systems conform with the minimum expected quality of internationally recognized methods and best practices to the extent possible.</p> <p>For countries with low national monitoring capacities, it is suggested that MDB's provide additional support to enhance /build in-country capacity to monitor and report on results, particularly to the level of internationally recognized standards such as those espoused by the UNFCCC and IPCC.</p>
<p><b>OVERVIEW ON FIP REPORTING THEMES</b></p>	<p>It was agreed that FIP pilot countries report on the following themes organized in three categories:</p> <p><i>Category 1: Common themes (to be reported by all pilot countries)</i>  Theme 1.1: GHG emission reductions or avoidance / enhancement of carbon stocks  Theme 1.2: Livelihoods co-benefits</p> <p><i>Category 2: Other relevant co-benefit themes (to be reported if relevant to the investment plan)</i>  Theme 2.1: Biodiversity and other environmental services  Theme 2.2: Governance  Theme 2. 3: Tenure, rights and access  Theme 2.4: Capacity development</p> <p><i>Category 3: Elements for Narrative</i>  Narrative 3.1: Theory of change and assumptions  Narrative 3.2: Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies (e.g. NDCs national forest programs etc.) and uptake of FIP approaches  Narrative 3.3: Support received from other partners including the private sector  Narrative 3.4: Link of DGM<sup>4</sup> to FIP investments from government's point of view  Narrative 3.5: Highlights and show cases (if available)</p>
<p><b>METHODOLOGY FOR DATA AND INFORMATION COLLECTION</b></p>	<p>The FIP monitoring and reporting system is based on two methodological approaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>Participatory approach:</b> through this approach, various stakeholder groups engaged in activities relevant to REDD+ get involved more actively in reflecting and assessing the progress on the performance of the implementation of their FIP investment plan through projects/programs. This approach empowers beneficiaries, builds country ownership, and ensures accountability and transparency.</li> <li>– <b>Mixed-methods approach:</b> this approach combines quantitative and qualitative methods to collect, analyze, and generate knowledge and lessons in implementing FIP investments. The approach is suitable for understanding the richness and complexity of interventions related to REDD+.</li> </ul> <p>Methods use for each of the reporting theme are as followed:</p>

<sup>4</sup>FIP Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– for Theme 1.1 and Theme 1.2, quantitative data is collected using tables;</li> <li>– for Themes 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and, 2.4 qualitative data is collected using scorecards; and</li> <li>– for narrative themes, a user-friendly template is provided to develop a narrative on the relevant themes.</li> </ul> <p>Countries may add country-specific criteria to score cards if appropriate.</p>
<b>THE REPORTING YEAR</b>	<p>The reporting year for all FIP countries is <b>from January 1 to December 31</b>. Data must be reported to the CIF Administrative Unit by <b>no later than June 30 each year</b>.</p>
<b>BASELINES AND EXPECTED RESULTS</b>	<p>The baseline date in most cases will be the endorsement date of the FIP investment plan. Each country will provide baseline data for the different themes as appropriate.</p> <p>Target setting will be context-specific and will depend on the theme. Further guidance on baseline and targets is provided in the toolkit.</p>
<b>DATA SOURCES AND DATA COLLECTION FOR CATEGORY 2</b>	<p>For establishing a baseline and subsequent monitoring of FIP contribution to the conservation and/or enhancement of biodiversity and other environmental services, the stakeholder workshop scoring exercise (described below) will be the main data source.</p> <p>Evidence for the scoring process should be sourced from project and program reports documents as well as relevant national monitoring systems (if available). All documentation containing relevant information (the evidence base) that has informed the scoring process should be stored by the FIP country focal point for future reference.</p>
<b>RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING FOR CATEGORY 2</b>	<p>The terminology used below is based on the institutional structures in most FIP countries, recognizing that individual countries have different position titles and names for these structures. The Work Plan for Monitoring and Reporting will clearly detail the specific responsibilities in each country, by name and/or position, and agency, including dates and deadlines.</p> <p><b>The FIP country focal point</b> is responsible for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) selecting a range of participants representing different FIP stakeholder groups, actors who are either engaged in FIP projects or offer a national perspective, and represent diversity across geography, forest services and partners. These representatives should be knowledgeable about FIP interventions in the particular country and include both women and men. The stakeholder groups may comprise national and local government; FIP project/program management teams, legislature; civil society; women’s organizations; non-governmental academic and research institutions, communities (local/traditional/ indigenous groups, etc.), the private sector and development partners;</li> <li>b) coordinating a workshop to discuss and score a number of indicators mapped to each theme of category 2. Workshop participants will be</li> </ol>

	<p>asked to work in groups to score indicators by the mean of FIP scorecards for each theme. These scores should reflect the actual progress made in implementing that aspect of the FIP investment plan related to the corresponding theme. Participants will have the opportunity to discuss and assess the relevant questions of each theme in the local context, which may provide insight into challenges and areas for improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) aggregating or negotiating, through discussion, a singular group score for each cell in the scorecard. The end product should be one scorecard that, by consensus, represents the responses all those collaborating to complete the scorecard;</li> <li>d) coordinating the quality assurance process (see below);</li> <li>e) submitting the relevant FIP scorecards for the relevant category 2 reporting themes to the CIF Administrative Unit on a timely and annual basis; and</li> <li>f) keeping all documentation containing relevant information (the evidence base) , including individual scorecards, that have informed the reported results.</li> </ul> <p><b>The lead MDB</b> is responsible for supporting the <b>FIP country focal point</b>.</p> <p><b>The MDB HQ focal points</b> are responsible for supporting their project/program implementation units/teams to ensure that they can effectively carry out their responsibilities for FIP monitoring and reporting.</p>
<p><b>METHODOLOGY FOR CATEGORY 2</b></p>	<p><b>FIP countries should monitor and annually report on this theme if relevant to their investment plan (see work plan)</b></p> <p>FIP pilot countries should report progress on each theme by the mean of the corresponding FIP scorecard. The scorecard should be discussed and finalized during a participatory stakeholder workshop with relevant stakeholders groups.</p> <p>Each of the criteria will be assess using <b>scores ranging from 0 to 10</b>. Each FIP country should clearly define the meaning of the scores in the country context and use this consistently in the subsequent reporting years.</p> <p>Each FIP country should clearly define the meaning of the scores in the country context and use this consistently in the subsequent reporting years.</p> <p>Indicators mapped to Theme 2.1 will provide a qualitative assessment of how FIP interventions have contributed to reduced or avoided loss, or enhancement of ecosystem services.</p> <p>Indicators mapped to Theme 2.2 will provide a qualitative assessment of how FIP has contributed to improve legal and regulatory frameworks and their implementation; institutional arrangements and processes; conflict resolution mechanisms; etc.</p>

	<p>Indicators mapped to Theme 2.3 will provide a qualitative assessment of how FIP has contributed to improving the tenure, resources rights, and access and benefit sharing.</p> <p>Indicators mapped to Theme 2.4 will provide a qualitative assessment of how FIP has contributed to develop and enhance capacity of relevant REDD+ stakeholders to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.</p> <p>This qualitative assessment draws on several approaches currently in use in major forest governance-related processes and initiatives, for example the <i>Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance</i> developed by PROFOR<sup>5</sup>.</p>
<p><b>QUALITY ASSURANCE</b></p>	<p>It is suggested that the FIP’s monitoring and reporting system be overseen through a multi-stakeholder national-level steering committee. Pilot country governments should take advantage of an existing, cross-cutting multi-stakeholder national-level steering committee (e.g. a REDD+ task force or equivalent structure) to play this role or establish one if no appropriate structure exists yet.</p> <p>This committee led by the Government should include <b>representatives of relevant government agencies, indigenous peoples and local communities, local NGOs, the private sector, and other members of civil society</b>. In establishing or identifying this committee, gender considerations should be taken into account.</p> <p>The <b>FIP country focal point</b>, in collaboration with MDB task teams should invite stakeholders to critically review the provided data and information included in the reporting tables 1.2A before sharing the final results with the CIF Administrative Unit.</p> <p>This would be done as part of an annual multi-stakeholder national-level steering committee/stock-taking meeting on the implementation of the FIP investment plan.</p>
<p><b>REPORTING PROCESS FOR PRIVATE SECTOR PROJECTS</b></p>	<p>Due to confidentiality of project related private sector information, and the specific processes MDBs implementing private sector projects must follow to report on project results, the process below should be followed to collect and report on FIP-funded private sector project data:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the beginning of each annual reporting cycle, the CIF Administrative Unit will prepare and submit the project reporting templates to the relevant MDB implementing FIP-funded private sector project(s);</li> <li>2. The relevant MDB implementing FIP-funded private sector project (s) will then populate the reporting templates with relevant data/ information and send them to CIF Administrative Unit before the deadline for countries to submit their annual results reports;</li> </ol>

<sup>5</sup> The Program on Forests, implemented through the World Bank. <http://www.profor.info>

3. After receiving the populated reporting templates, the CIF Administrative Unit will send them to the respective FIP Country Focal Point and to the lead MDB;
4. The Country Focal Point should include the private sector project(s) data into the Country Results Report before submitting the report to the CIF Administrative Unit by no later than June 30<sup>th</sup>.

## Category 1: Common themes

<b>Theme 1.1:</b>	<b>GHG emission reductions or avoidance / enhancement of carbon stocks</b>
<b>RATIONALE/ REASON FOR MEASURING</b>	Indicators for this theme will estimate the climate change mitigation potential of country actions as estimated quantities of avoided or reduced GHG emissions and removals or increase in carbon stocks that the implementation of the investment plan is able to achieve directly through its associated investments.
<b>TECHNICAL DEFINITION</b>	<p><b>GHG emission reduction/avoidance/removals</b> refer to <b>greenhouse gas emissions, mainly CO<sub>2</sub></b>, that are avoided/reduced from being released or emitted to the atmosphere as a direct result of project or program activities. Examples include CO<sub>2</sub> emissions avoided or reduced or removed by addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and supporting sustainable forest management, e.g. from improving sustainability of existing agricultural systems instead of expanding agricultural areas into forested areas; using more efficient cook stoves and/or processing of charcoal to reduce fuel wood culling.</p> <p><b>Enhancement of carbon stocks</b> refers to activities which result in the increased removals of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere in above and below ground biomass, including soil organic matter. Examples would include improved forest management practices, forest restoration and afforestation activities, establishment of plantations in previously degraded areas, enrichment planting or agro-forestry activities.</p>
<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<p><b>All FIP pilot countries should annually monitor and report on this theme.</b></p> <p><b>FIP Table 1.1</b> should be completed using the available accounting methodology for GHG emission reductions/avoidance and enhancement of carbon stocks (removals) available in the country. Consistent with the <i>FIP Operational Guidelines</i><sup>6</sup>, countries are expected to collaborate with MDBs in preparing their annual reports and thereby ensure that the methods and practices used in measuring and reporting are at least of minimum acceptable international standards – in this case, tier 1 as outlined in the <b>IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry</b><sup>7</sup>.</p> <p>Each FIP country, if applicable, should measure or estimate annually, as best as possible, the following indicators depending on the type of the supported interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– metric tons (millions) of CO<sub>2</sub>e reduced or avoided from reduced or avoided deforestation and forest degradation;</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/FIP\\_Operational\\_Guidelines\\_final.pdf](https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/FIP_Operational_Guidelines_final.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpplulucf/gpplulucf.html>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– metric tons (millions) of CO<sub>2</sub>e sequestered through natural regeneration, re- and afforestation activities.</li> </ul> <p>For the first year of reporting, FIP pilot countries should report only on the baseline and expected results (targets) using FIP Table 1.1. There will be two targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>target 1</b> , target achieved during the implementation of the investment plan (ending with the financial closure of the last project supported under the investment plan); and</li> <li>– <b>target 2</b>, projection of the target taking into account the lifetime of the results achieved through the implementation of the investment plan.</li> </ul> <p>As appropriate and available, the <b>“reference emission level” or “baseline”</b>, defined as the amount of GHG that would have been emitted if there had been no FIP, should be reported. Alternatively, countries may report the <b>simple historical average of annual emissions as the baseline</b> where it is not possible to estimate the business-as-usual reference level.</p> <p><b>The expected emission reductions/ avoidance or removals</b> is an estimate of the target for the total volume of emissions reduction/avoidance / removals expected through the implementation of the investment plan.</p> <p>Annual reporting on results will be limited to actual results even where these numbers are zero or near zero. During year X, an estimate of the reduced or avoided GHG emissions or increase in carbon stocks will be reported. During year X+1 actual measurement will be reported.</p> <p>A brief description of the interventions (context, objective and area size) should be provided as well as the methodology used to measure, estimate or project the different values. For non-carbon emissions, measurements should be converted to carbon dioxide equivalents prior to reporting.</p> <p>Lessons learned during the implementation of the intervention on what works and what doesn’t work should be captured.</p>
<b>DATA SOURCE</b>	<p>In FIP pilot countries where a credible and accurate MRV<sup>8</sup> system exists, this system should be used as the main source of data on GHG emissions and removals.</p> <p>In FIP pilot countries, where a robust forest monitoring system is in place that consistently provides transparent data and information, and is suitable for measuring or estimating and reporting emissions and removals, these data and information should be used. It is presumed that such systems meet minimum acceptable international standards for monitoring and reporting on GHG emissions.</p> <p>For those countries with limited national monitoring capacities, it is suggested</p>

<sup>8</sup> MRV: Measurement, Reporting and Verification. ‘MRV system’ is a system used to measure the results of REDD+ activities, reporting those results to the international community, and then verifying the reports. It presumes UNFCCC and IPCC standards.

	<p>that the relevant MDB’s methodology, to the extent they conform to minimum accepted international standards, be used.</p> <p>All documentation containing relevant information (the evidence base) supporting reported results should be stored by the FIP country focal point for future reference (e.g., key data including maps and methods that are sufficiently detailed to enable the reconstruction of the reference emission level, and the reported emissions reductions and removals.</p>
<p><b>RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING</b></p>	<p>The terminology used to describe the roles and responsibilities below is based on the institutional structures in most FIP pilot countries, recognizing that individual countries have different position titles and names for these structures. The <i>Work Plan for Monitoring and Reporting</i> will detail the specific roles and responsibilities in each country, by name and/or position, and agency, including data collection and reporting dates and deadlines.</p> <p><b>Project/program implementation units/teams</b> are responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) organizing one or more sessions with FIP project /program implementation units/teams relevant institutions in the country on how to complete FIP Table 1.1;</li> <li>b) obtaining data and information collected through FIP Table 1.1 from relevant institutions in the country;</li> <li>c) coordinating the quality assurance process (details below);</li> <li>d) submitting in a timely manner and on an annual basis, FIP Table 1.1 to the CIF Administrative Unit ; and</li> <li>e) keeping all documentation containing relevant information (the evidence base), including individual project or program reporting tables, that has informed the reported results.</li> </ul> <p><b>The lead MDB</b> is responsible for supporting the FIP focal point in this effort.</p> <p>The <b>MDB HQ focal points</b> are responsible for supporting their project/program implementation units/teams to ensure that they can effectively carry out their responsibilities for FIP monitoring and reporting at the project/program levels.</p>



**THEME 1.1 : GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR AVOIDANCE / ENHANCEMENT OF CARBON STOCKS**

<b>&lt;Country&gt;</b>		<b>Lead MDB:</b>		<b>Level: Investment Plan (IP)</b>			
		<b>Other Implementing MDBs:</b>					
		<b>Endorsed FIP funding (million USD):</b>					
		<b>Co-financing (million USD):</b>					
<b>Reporting period</b>		<b>From</b>	mm/dd/yy	:	<b>To:</b>	mm/dd/yy	
Table 1.1	Unit	Reference emissions level/baseline	Target 1	Target 2	Previous Report year	Current Report year	Total actual to date
		(if applicable)	<i>(Expected results after the financial closure of the last project/program under the investment plan )</i>	<i>(Lifetime projection of expected results of projects/programs under the investment plan)</i>	Actual annual	Actual annual	
<b>GHG emission reductions/avoidance/ enhancement of carbon stock (Total)<sup>9</sup></b>	Million tons of CO2 equivalent						
<b>GHG emissions from reduced/avoided deforestation and forest degradation</b>	Million tons of CO2 equivalent						
<b>GHG sequestered through natural regeneration, re- and afforestation, and other related activities</b>	Million tons of CO2 equivalent						
<b>Type of forest(s)</b>							
<b>Area covered</b>		ha					
<b>IP lifetime</b>		years					
Please specify methodology (ies) used for GHG accounting (e.g. by project/program), including the start year and period for the Reference Emissions Level							
Please provide a brief description of the interventions (context and objective)							
1. What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding GHG emission reductions / avoidance / enhancement of carbon stock in your country context during this reporting year?							
2. What have been your key challenges and what opportunities for improvement do you see?							

<sup>9</sup> Where possible, countries are encouraged to disaggregate total GHG savings into GHG emissions from reduced deforestation and forest degradation and GHG emissions sequestered (enhancement of carbon stocks, reforestation, afforestation etc).

## Category 1: Common themes

Theme 1.2:	Livelihoods co-benefits
<b>RATIONALE/ REASON FOR MEASURING</b>	<p>Indicators mapped to this theme will capture the extent to which FIP contributes to improving the economic and social well-being of the intended beneficiaries from FIP investments.</p> <p>Under this theme, as best as possible, the number of people benefiting from the FIP out of the total number of people targeted through FIP investments is assessed. Where households are counted instead of people, the assumptions about household size and gender ratio needed for disaggregation should be documented in the reporting table”.</p>
<b>TECHNICAL DEFINITION</b>	<p>Under this theme, <b>livelihood co-benefits</b> refer to any monetary or non-monetary benefits received by beneficiaries as a result of activities associated with FIP-supported projects and programs. These monetary and non-monetary benefits may relate to improvements concerning income, employment, entrepreneurship, access to finance, education, health and any other relevant benefits flowing from FIP investments.</p>
<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<p><b>All FIP countries should monitor and annually report on this theme.</b></p> <p>Each FIP country should describe key monetary and non-monetary benefits received by beneficiaries through FIP interventions. If possible, this information should be disaggregated <b>by gender, by socio-economic vulnerability and/or other country-relevant criteria.</b></p> <p>FIP Table 1. 2 should be used to report annually on livelihood co-benefits relevant to the investment plan. Some <u>examples</u> of livelihood co-benefits indicators are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Number of people (number of men, women) in forest or forest-adjacent rural communities with increased income over time;</li> <li>b) Number of boys and girls enrolled in primary and secondary education among local and / forest communities;</li> <li>c) Number of people (number of men, women) attending educational and training opportunities for improved forest resources, forest landscape management and agroforestry etc.;</li> <li>d) Number of people (number of men, women) with access to finance and markets;</li> <li>e) Number of people (number of men, women) with new employment opportunities, such as with non-timber forest livelihoods.</li> </ul>

	<p>Other key relevant quality of life indicators identified in the investment plan and in project/program documents could be listed in the FIP Table 1.2A and 1.2B. This theme should be reported at the Investment Plan level and at the project level separately.</p>
<p><b>DATA SOURCES AND DATA COLLECTION</b></p>	<p><b>FIP Table 1.2</b> should be completed by aggregating data or information from the latest household survey available or from the MDB project/program information system.</p> <p>All documentation containing relevant information (the evidence base) supporting reported results should be stored by the FIP country focal point for future reference.</p>
<p><b>RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING</b></p>	<p>The terminology used to describe the roles and responsibilities below is based on the institutional structures in most FIP pilot countries, recognizing that individual countries have different position titles and names for these structures. The <b>Work Plan for Monitoring and Reporting</b> will detail the specific roles and responsibilities in each country, by name and/or position, and agency, including data collection and reporting dates and deadlines.</p> <p><b>The FIP country focal point is responsible for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) organizing a session with FIP project /program implementation units/teams on how to complete FIP Table 1.2B;</li> <li>b) obtaining project/program level data and information collected through FIP Table 1.2B from Project /program implementation units/teams;</li> <li>c) compiling the data into one table at the level of the FIP investment plan using FIP Table 1.2 A;</li> <li>d) coordinating the quality assurance process (for details, see below);</li> <li>e) submitting the summary table to the CIF Administrative Unit on a timely and annual basis; and</li> <li>f) keeping all documentation containing relevant information (the evidence base), including individual project or program reporting tables, that has informed the reported results.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project/program implementation units/teams</b> are responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) measuring /estimating values related to Theme 1.2 and complete Table 1.2B</li> <li>b) submitting the completed FIP Table 1.2B to the FIP country focal point on a timely and annual basis; and</li> <li>c) keeping all documentation containing relevant project/program-level information (the evidence base) that has informed the reported results</li> </ul> <p><b>The lead MDB</b> is responsible for supporting the FIP focal point.</p>

	<p><b>The MDB HQ focal points</b> are responsible for supporting their project/program implementation units/teams to ensure that they can effectively carry out their responsibilities for FIP monitoring and reporting at the project/program levels.</p>
--	--



2. Employment Indicator :.....	<i>Total</i>						
	<i>Men</i>						
	<i>Women</i>						
3. Entrepreneurship	<i>Total</i>						
	<i>Men</i>						
	<i>Women</i>						
4. Access to finance	<i>Total</i>						
	<i>Men</i>						
	<i>Women</i>						
5. Education	<i>Total</i>						
	<i>Men</i>						
	<i>Women</i>						
6. Health	<i>Total</i>						
	<i>Men</i>						
	<i>Women</i>						
7. Other relevant benefits							
What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding livelihoods co-benefits in your country context during this reporting year?							
What have been your key challenges and what opportunities for improvement do you see?							

<Country> MDB:	<b>Implementing</b>  Executing agency: Amount of FIP funding (million USD): Co-financing (million USD):	<b>Level: project/program</b>
Date of MDB approval:		mm/dd/yy    mm/dd/yy

<b>Table 1.2B</b> <i>(Please provide individual project /program data)</i>	Baseline	Target at the time of MDB approval	Previous reporting year	Current reporting year	Additional information	Total actual to date
			Actual annual	Actual annual		
<i>Please use livelihood co-benefits indicators identified in your project/program. Use only <b>the number of beneficiaries</b> or households as your metric. If households are used, please indicate the average number of people per household and the source for that information.</i> <i>Please also disaggregate for each indicator the number of beneficiaries by gender</i>						
1. Income	<i>Total</i>					
Indicator :.....	<i>Men</i>					
	<i>Women</i>					
2. Employment	<i>Total</i>					
Indicator :.....	<i>Men</i>					
	<i>Women</i>					
3. Entrepreneurship	<i>Total</i>					
	<i>Men</i>					
	<i>Women</i>					
4. Access to finance	<i>Total</i>					
	<i>Men</i>					
	<i>Women</i>					

5. Education	<i>Total</i>						
	<i>Men</i>						
	<i>Women</i>						
6. Health	<i>Total</i>						
	<i>Men</i>						
	<i>Women</i>						
7. Other relevant benefits							

## Category 2: Other relevant co-benefit themes

Theme 2.1	Biodiversity and other environmental services
<b>RATIONALE /REASONS FOR MEASURING</b>	<p>This theme is important to demonstrate that FIP investments enhance, or at least avoid loss of biodiversity and other ecosystem services (such as water purification, nutrient cycling, etc).</p> <p>Indicators mapped to this theme assess (as best as possible) whether the FIP contributes to conserving and/or enhancing biodiversity and conserving and/or enhancing other environmental services associated with forests and/or wider forest landscapes.</p>
<b>TECHNICAL DEFINITION</b>	<p>Under this theme, <b>biodiversity</b> refers to both the richness of local species typical for a habitat, ecosystem or biome in all areas covered by the investment plan.</p> <p><b>Other environmental services</b> refer to any ecosystem function that is demonstrably beneficial to humankind. Examples include the roles of forests in regulating air and water quality, stabilizing the local climate, soil protection and in enhanced resilience to climate stress.</p>



## THEME 2.1: BIODIVERSITY AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

**Scorecard 2.1** provides a qualitative assessment of how FIP interventions have contributed to reduced or avoided loss, or enhancement of biodiversity and other environmental ecosystem services. Please score the criteria below using scores from 0 to 10

<b>SCORECARD 2.1</b> <i>(Choose criteria that are relevant to the IP)</i>	Not applica-ble	No/ not at all	Partially										Yes comple-tely	Evidences/Sources/Comments
Scores	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
<b>a</b> To what extent has FIP contributed to reducing the loss of habitats and other environmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>b</b> To what extent has FIP contributed to protect or increase the number of keystone species in habitats/ ecosystems/biome?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>c</b> To what extent has FIP improved environmental services associated with forests and forest landscapes?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>d</b> To what extent has FIP supported/contributed to country's capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>e</b> Any other criteria (to be added by country, if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>													

*Q1 Scoring: How have you defined the scores in your country context?*

*Q2 What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP interventions regarding biodiversity and other environmental services in your country context during this reporting year?*

*Q3 What have been your key challenges and what opportunities for improvement do you see?*

## Category 2: Other relevant co-benefit themes

Theme 2.2	Governance
<p><b>RATIONALE /REASONS FOR MEASURING</b></p>	<p>The quality of governance often determines whether forest resources are used efficiently, sustainably and equitably, and whether countries achieve forest-related development goals. Poor forest governance has ripple effects and often reflects overall weakness in governance within a country. Forest governance is important in regulating timber and non-timber use and providing an enabling environment for sustainable forest management and conservation.</p> <p>Indicators mapped to this theme captures the extent to which FIP contributes to improved forest governance.</p>
<p><b>TECHNICAL DEFINITION</b></p>	<p>Under this theme, <b>governance</b> refers to the processes, including legal provisions and enforcement by which officials, institutions, and forest users both women and men acquire and exercise authority in the management and conservation of forest resources.</p> <p><b>Improved forest governance</b> is characterized by the development/ enhancement, enforcement of and compliance with policies, laws, and other regulatory mechanisms and incentive programs which encourage sustainable forest management and conservation as well as the related institutional capacity. Cross-sectoral mechanisms related to national or sub-national land use planning and management which influence the existing or potential impacts of non-forest sector activities (such as agriculture, mining, or transport) on forests are also an important feature of improved forest governance.</p> <p>Underpinning all aspects of improved forest governance are the principles of transparency, effectiveness, efficiency, fairness/equity, participation and accountability.</p>



## THEME 2.2: GOVERNANCE

**Scorecard 2.2** provides a qualitative assessment of how FIP has contributed to improved legal and regulatory frameworks and their application; institutional arrangements and processes; conflict resolution mechanisms; etc.

SCORECARD 2.2 <i>(Choose criteria that are relevant to the IP)</i>	Not applica-ble	No/ Not at all	Partially										Yes, comple-tely	Evidences/Sources /Comments
Score	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
<b>1 Consistency of broader development and land use policies in the context of REDD+</b>														
<b>1.a</b> To what extent has FIP contributed to the development of legal and regulatory frameworks on forests?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>1.b</b> To what extent is the FIP helping to make forest policies consistent with national policies for land management, climate change mitigation and adaptation or equivalents (e.g. REDD+ strategies)?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>1.c</b> To what extent is inter-sectoral dialogue between agencies responsible for forests and those responsible for sectors affecting but outside of forests facilitated and encouraged by the FIP?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>1.d</b> To what extent has FIP contributed to the existence and adequacy of safeguards against social and environmental harm from forest related policies and activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>2 Financing incentives, economic instrument and benefits sharing</b>														
<b>2.a</b> To what extent has FIP supported equitable sharing of forest revenue (sharing benefits or income from public forest with the local communities), equity in the distribution of access to forest resources, rights and rents?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>2.b</b> To what extent has FIP supported equitable sharing of forest revenue (sharing benefits or income from public forest with the local communities); equity in the distribution of access to forest resources, rights and rents for women?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>2.c</b> To what extent has FIP contributed to create economic incentives and policies to sustainable utilization of timbers and non-timber forest products, including value addition for women and men??	<input type="checkbox"/>													

		N/A	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Evidences/Sources/ Comments
<b>3</b>	<b>Stakeholder Participation:</b>													
<b>3a</b>	To what extent has FIP contributed to ensure that stakeholder processes allow the participation of marginalized or vulnerable groups (including women) such as indigenous/traditional groups in forest-related decision-making processes?	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<b>3b</b>	To what extent has FIP contributed to the existence and effectiveness of conflict resolution and grievance redress mechanisms, including women's access to and use of such mechanisms?	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<b>4</b>	<b>Transparency and accountability</b>													
<b>4.a</b>	To what extent has FIP contributed to the quality, timeliness, comprehensiveness and accessibility of forest-related information available to stakeholders, including public notice of and dialogue on pending actions?	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<b>5</b>	<b>Stakeholder action:</b>													
<b>5.a</b>	To what extent has FIP resulted in corporate entities and businesses operating in the forest sector or forest-relevant sectors actually complying with recommended international codes of conducts, standards and safeguard?	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<b>6</b>	<b>Quality of decision making:</b>													
<b>6.a</b>	To which extent has FIP contributed to ensure that forest management planning is adaptive	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<b>7</b>	Any other criteria (to be added by country, if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>												
<b>Q1</b>	<i>Scoring: How have you defined the scores in your country context?</i>													
<b>Q2</b>	<i>What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding forest governance in your country context during this reporting year?</i>													
<b>Q3</b>	<i>What have been your key challenges and what opportunities for improvement do you see?</i>													

## Category 2: Other relevant co-benefit themes

Theme 2.3	Tenure, rights and access
<b>RATIONALE / REASONS FOR MEASURING</b>	<p>A clearly defined system of property and resources rights, and access and benefit sharing is important to incentivize and empower forest-dependent people to use forest resources sustainably. Land tenure rules define how rights to use, control, and transfer of land and how resources are allocated within societies.</p> <p>Indicators mapped to this theme capture the extent to which FIP contributes to improving the tenure security, resources rights and access, and benefit sharing of relevant stakeholders, particularly indigenous peoples, women and local communities as it relates to forest resources (timber, non-timber, wildlife, carbon, land etc).</p>
<b>TECHNICAL DEFINITION</b>	<p>Under this theme, <b>land tenure security, resources rights and access, and benefit sharing</b> are taken collectively as a benefit arising from legal or regulatory frameworks which enable individuals and communities, particularly indigenous peoples within the range of their traditional lands, as well as women to own, control, use and peacefully enjoy their lands (cultural rights), territories, and other forest resources and to be secure in their means of livelihoods and the exercise of such rights over time.</p>



## THEME 2.3: TENURE, RIGHTS AND ACCESS

Scorecard 2.1 provides a qualitative assessment of how FIP has contributed to improving the tenure, resources rights, and access and benefit sharing.

<b>SCORECARD 2.1</b> <i>(Choose criteria that are relevant to the IP)</i>		Not Appli- cable	No/ Not at all	Partially										Yes comple- tely	Evidences/Sources /Comments
		Scores	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
<b>a</b>	To what extent has FIP contributed to the improvement of legal frameworks to protect forest-related property rights and access for all forest stakeholders (including women and indigenous peoples)?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>b</b>	To what extent has FIP contributed to establishing measures and mechanisms which ensure the tenure security of female forest owners and rights-holders?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>c</b>	To what extent has FIP contributed to recognizing customary and traditional rights of forest dependent communities, women, including local communities and traditional forest users?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>d</b>	To what extent has FIP contributed to the comprehensiveness and accuracy of documentation and accessibility of information related to forest tenure and rights?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
<b>e</b>	Any other criteria (to be added by country, if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>													

Q1 Scoring: How have you defined the scores in your country context?

Q2 What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding forest tenure, rights and access in your country context during this reporting year?

Q3 What have been your key challenges and what opportunities for improvement do you see?

## Category 2: Other relevant co-benefit themes

Theme 2.4	Capacity development
<b>RATIONALE / REASONS FOR MEASURING</b>	<p>Institutional and individual capacity at the national, regional and local levels is needed to ensure that forests are conserved or managed sustainably and the main direct and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are addressed. Increased capacity to plan and implement solutions comprises evidence that decision makers have better access to scientific, economic and social data as well as good practices with regards to addressing the drivers of deforestation and degradation.</p> <p>Indicators mapped to this theme captures the extent to which FIP supports the development of the capacity of relevant REDD+ institutions and stakeholders to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.</p>
<b>TECHNICAL DEFINITION</b>	<p>Under this theme, <b>capacity development</b> refers to any activity which aims to improve the ability/ competence of stakeholders (individuals, entities or institutions) to address the direct and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. The exact nature of capacity development activities will vary according to stakeholder-specific needs.</p>



## THEME 2.4: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

**Scorecard 2.4** provides a qualitative assessment of the extent to which FIP helps to build capacity of relevant REDD+ stakeholders to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

SCORECARD 2.1 <i>(Choose criteria that are relevant to the IP)</i>		Not Appli- cable	No/ Not at all	Partially										Yes comple- tely	Evidences/Sources /Comments
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
		Scores	N/A	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
a	To what extent has FIP enhanced institutional capabilities to develop and implement forest and forest-relevant policies at the national, regional and local level?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
b	To what extent has FIP contributed to improve human resources capacities of women and men in the forest and related sectors to detect and manage drivers of deforestation and forest degradation?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
c	To what extent has FIP improved capacities of stakeholders in forest and land use planning and management?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
d	To what extent has FIP increased the capacities of Indigenous Peoples, and local communities to participate in forest and landscape management?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
e	To what extent has FIP increased the capacities of women to participate in forest and landscape management?	<input type="checkbox"/>													
f	To what extent has FIP contributed to strengthen staff capacity and effectiveness of forest administration agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>													

Q1 Scoring: How have you defined the scores in your country context?

Q2 What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding capacity development in your country context during this reporting year?

Q3 What have been your key challenges and which opportunities for improvement do you see?

## Category 3: Elements for Narrative

### Category 3: Elements for Narrative

<b>Narrative 1</b>	<b>Theory of change and assumptions (Assessment on the design, process, and implementation of interventions; what is working and what is not working?)</b>
<b>RATIONALE</b>	The theory of change of the investment plan refers to the logic of how the FIP investments individually, cumulatively, and synergistically contribute to transformational changes in addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in the country. The FIP country program intends to change the business-as-usual leading to substantial GHG emission reductions/avoidance, enhanced carbon stocks and other co-benefits. The baseline for the theory of change is provided in the endorsed investment plan and the annual update through Narrative 1 reflects on how well that theory is playing out in practice, what can be learned and whether corrective measures need to be taken.
<b>Narrative 2</b>	<b>Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies and uptake of FIP approaches</b>
<b>RATIONALE</b>	This narrative will describe how the FIP investments individually, cumulatively and synergistically contribute to or advance the national REDD+ process (including REDD+ readiness) and relevant development strategies.
<b>Narrative 3</b>	<b>Support received from other partners including the private sector.</b>
<b>RATIONALE</b>	The narrative goes beyond the hard numbers reported as co-financing for FIP investments or new REDD+ funding. It will describe how partners, including the private sector, assist, facilitate, encourage, co-operate and otherwise lend support to the activities supported by the FIP.
<b>Narrative 4</b>	<b>Link of DGM to investments from government's point of view.</b>
<b>RATIONALE / REASONS FOR MEASURING</b>	<p>The <i>FIP Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities</i> (DGM) is a grant mechanism established for and by indigenous peoples and local communities including women in the eight FIP pilot countries. This finance stream is additional to resources allocated under the country investment plans for each pilot country. It aims to stimulate and extend participatory governance, transparency, and accountability in pilot countries by providing indigenous people and local communities including women with the resources they need to meaningfully engage in REDD+ activities at the local level and with the government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Transparency and accountability in DGM vis-à-vis government?</li> <li>b) Relationship with the IPLCs;</li> <li>c) Contribution to FIP objectives, including IP objectives;</li> <li>d) How the governments take action on identified needs which cannot be addressed by DGM?</li> </ul>
<b>Narrative 5</b>	<b>If applicable: highlights/showcases (example of a particular outstanding achievement that you want to mention)</b>

<b>DATA SOURCES AND DATA COLLECTION</b>	Data and information collected to develop the narrative will be sourced from e.g. the project/program information systems, national MVR or national forest monitoring system available, stakeholder meetings, consultations.
<b>METHODOLOGY FOR ALL NARRATIVE THEMES</b>	For Narrative themes, a user-friendly template will be provided to countries to provide data and information on the different themes. Under this category, countries will report only if at least one of the themes applies to their investment plan and data or information is available.
<b>RESPONSIBILITIES FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING</b>	The country focal point will be responsible for developing the narrative and completing the templates.
<b>QUALITY ASSURANCE</b>	The quality assurance process should be consistent with the one developed for category 3 related themes.



### **NARRATIVE 3.1: THEORY OF CHANGE AND ASSUMPTIONS**

**Please briefly describe how the FIP contributed to transformational changes in addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in your country as presented in the endorsed FIP investment plan? What is the value added of FIP?**

**Please assess how well the theory of change and underlying assumptions described in the endorsed investment plan are playing out in practice, what can be learned and whether corrective measures need to be taken.**



**NARRATIVE 3. 2: CONTRIBUTION TO NATIONAL REDD+ AND OTHER NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AND UPTAKE OF FIP APPROACHES**

Please describe how the FIP enhanced and/ or advanced the national REDD+ process (including REDD+ readiness and performance-based mechanisms) and relevant development strategies?



**NARRATIVE 3.3: SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM OTHER PARTNERS INCLUDING THE PRIVATE SECTOR.**

**Please describe how bi- and multilateral development partners supported the interaction of FIP and other REDD+ activities.**

**Please describe how the (formal and informal) private sector actors have taken up good practices demonstrated through FIP? Please describe challenges encountered in involving the private sector in FIP.**

**Please describe how civil society organizations and other stakeholders have been involved in FIP implementation?**



**NARRATIVE 3. 4: LINK OF DEDICATED GRANT MECHANISM FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES (DGM) TO INVESTMENTS FROM GOVERNMENT'S POINT OF VIEW.**

Please provide comments on the complementarity of the DGM and its contribution to the investment plan.

Especially,

a) How effective is the DGM in supporting the government-led FIP process?

b) How does the government take action on identified needs which cannot be addressed by DGM?



**NARRATIVE 3. 5: IF APPLICABLE: HIGHLIGHTS/SHOWCASES  
(EXAMPLE OF PARTICULAR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT(S) THAT  
YOU WANT TO MENTION)**

**Please provide example of a particular outstanding achievement or key successes that you want to mention.**

## Category 4: Other reporting types (using creative media and platforms such as blogs, videos or webinars)

<b>OTHER REPORTING TYPES 1</b>	Role of country program coordination and synergies between different FIP investments.
<b>OTHER REPORTING TYPES 2</b>	Ongoing stakeholder participation/involvement.
<b>OTHER REPORTING TYPES 3</b>	How the investment plan is implemented in the context of broader national policies.
<b>OTHER REPORTING TYPES 4</b>	Knowledge exchange and management.
<b>OTHER REPORTING TYPES 5</b>	Any analytical work or public communications (evaluative studies, evidence-based learning, articles, etc.)
	<p>FIP countries will develop, on a voluntary basis, different knowledge products on at least one of the above five themes using creative media and platforms such as blogs, videos or webinars etc.</p> <p>This represents an opportunity for FIP countries to share lessons learned or success stories from the implementation of their investment plan.</p>



**Summary of the scoring workshop  
(only for scorecards)**

**Who were the different stakeholder groups invited to the scoring workshop (composition and number)? Please attach the list of participants.**

**How did you empower stakeholders during the workshop? Which methodologies were used? How did you ensure stakeholder participation?**

**What were the key issues raised during the workshop?**

## Annex 1 – Example of scoring criteria

### 2.1 Biodiversity and other environmental services

Score	To what extent has FIP contributed to reducing the loss of habitats and other environmental services?	To what extent has FIP contributed to protect or increase the number of keystone species in habitats/ ecosystems/biome?	To what extent has FIP improved environmental services associated with forests and forest landscapes?	To what extent has FIP supported/contributed to country's capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services?	Any other criteria (to be added by country, if applicable)
0	The FIP has not contributed in any measure.	The FIP has not contributed in any measure.	The FIP has not contributed in any measure.	The FIP has not contributed in any measure.	
1	A concrete work plan has been agreed.	A concrete work plan has been agreed.	A concrete work plan has been agreed.	A concrete work plan has been agreed.	
2	Some of the work plan activities have started recently.	Some of the work plan activities have started recently.	Some of the work plan activities have started recently.	Some of the work plan activities have started recently.	
3	Most of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	Most of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	Most of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	Most of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	
4	All of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	All of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	All of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	All of the work plan activities have started. Results have not yet been measured.	
5	The FIP has contributed to reduce slightly the habitat loss and other environmental services. Measurements of results have been done. Reduction of habitat and other environmental services loss is not significant.	The FIP has contributed to increase slightly the keystone species. Results have been measured. The number of species showing an increase is not significant.	The FIP has contributed to improve slightly environmental services associated with forests. Results have been measured. The number of environmental services associated with forests showing an improvement is not significant.	The FIP has contributed to improve slightly. Results have been measured. The improvement of capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services is not significant.	
6	The FIP has contributed successfully. Results have been measured. Reduction of habitat and other environmental services loss is significant.	The FIP has contributed successfully. Results have been measured. The number of keystone species showing an increase is significant.	The FIP has contributed successfully. Results have been measured. The number of environmental services associated with forests and forest landscapes showing an increase is significant.	The FIP has contributed successfully. Results have been measured. The improvement of capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services showing an improvement is significant.	

7	The FIP has contributed very successfully. Results have been measured. Reduction of habitat and other environmental services loss is very significant.	The FIP has contributed very successfully. Results have been measured. The number of keystone species in the habitats, ecosystems and biomes showing an increase is very significant.	The FIP has contributed very successfully. Results have been measured. The number of environmental services associated with forests and forest landscapes showing an increase is very significant.	The FIP has contributed very successfully. Results have been measured. The improvement of capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services showing an improvement is very significant.	
8	The FIP has contributed notably. Results have been measured. Reduction of habitat and other environmental services loss is very significant.	The FIP has contributed notably. Results have been measured. The number of keystone species in the habitats, ecosystems and biomes showing an increase is very significant.	The FIP has contributed notably. Results have been measured. The number of environmental services associated with forests and forest landscapes showing an increase is very significant.	The FIP has contributed notably. Results have been measured. The improvement of capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services showing an improvement is very significant.	
9	The FIP has contributed outstandingly. Results have been measured. Reduction of habitat and other environmental services loss is very significant.	The FIP has contributed outstandingly. Results have been measured. The number of keystone species in the habitats, ecosystems and biomes showing an increase is very significant.	The FIP has contributed outstandingly. Results have been measured. The number of environmental services associated with forests and forest landscapes showing an increase is very significant.	The FIP has contributed outstandingly. Results have been measured. The improvement of capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services showing an improvement is very significant.	
10	The FIP has contributed to completely reduce the loss of habitat and other environmental services in the project areas. The improvement appears in all habitats and all environmental services considered by the project/s. Several measurements have been done for all expected results and all show an improvement.	The FIP has contributed to completely reduce the loss and to increase the number of keystone species in habitats, ecosystems and biomes in project areas. The improvement appears in all habitats, ecosystems and biomes considered by the project/s. Several measurements have been done for all expected results and all show an improvement.	The FIP has contributed to improve environmental services associated with forests and forest landscapes in project areas. Several measurements have been done for all expected results and all show an improvement.	The FIP has contributed to promote the country's capacities to conserve biodiversity and other ecosystem services in the project areas. Several measurements have been done for all expected results and all show an improvement.	