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ICF-KPI Context

• International Climate Fund (ICF) represents the UK’s commitment to assisting developing countries with climate change resilience, low carbon growth, poverty reduction and reducing deforestation

• Investments made to ICF are provided by DFID, DEFRA, DECC through bilateral and multilateral channels

• ICF Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) being developed/refined as a set of tools for assessing the effectiveness of individual programmes/projects funded by ICF

• Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) programme developing a suite of indicators over the next 3 years
The ICF Forest KPIs are for:

- Accountability
- Monitoring
- Evaluation
- Learning

Approach

- Mix of quantitative and qualitative methods
- Use existing datasets wherever possible
- Structured but non-prescriptive methods, transparent assumptions
- Integrate with programme MEL activity as much as possible
Methods
• Common approaches across KPIs
• Joint scoping of intervention impact area
• Similar analytical approaches to examine contribution

Results..used for
• Simple accountability reporting
• Monitoring for corrective actions
• Input to evaluation
• Evidence for learning

• What is the resource at risk addressed by the intervention?
• Where are we succeeding?
• Are outputs being translated to outcomes?
• Which populations are benefiting?
ICF Forest Dependent Livelihoods Indicator (KPI 3)

Key drivers and indicators of livelihoods/wellbeing for spatially explicit IFRI data collection/aggregation

Determinants of well-being

- Natural resources
- Land tenure
- Occupation
- Shocks

Well-being

Subjective

- Material
  - Income
  - Assets
  - Consumption

Health

Education/Literacy

Natural resource management

Coupled system sustainability

Measurement of well-being

Outcomes of well-being
Guiding principles of the IFRI approach for estimating impacts of ICF interventions on Forest Dependent Livelihoods (KPI 3)

• Identify units/locations where investments occurred (treatment sites)
• Identify matched units/locations without ICF investments (control sites)
• Analyze before and after data in matched vs control sites to estimate change in both; difference is the contribution from ICF investment
• Key difficulty is finding a control area sufficiently similar to allow outcome differences to be attributed to the programme
  – Potential Solutions: Counterfactual Scenario (National/Homogeneous), Synthetic Control
ICF Hectares Indicator (KPI 8)
Mapping Platform to Combine Data and Run Calculations based on Risk of Deforestation
ICF Hectares Indicator (KPI 8) Methodology Overview

Step 1: Define relevant areas
- Use “theory of change”, logframes and other information to define the geography and types of forest covered by project.

Step 2: Set reference levels (risk mapping preferred)
- Find best available data to map expected loss categories based on Accessible, Cultivable / Extractable, Unprotected forest.

Step 3: Monitor loss and degradation
- Overlay forest loss data (Assess accuracy of UMD forest loss in Brazilian cerrado and Ghana high forest).

Step 4: Analysis of results
- Calculate “hectares avoided loss” ([expected loss – observed loss] in each risk category). Followed by contribution analysis.
### ICF Ecosystem Services Indicator (KPI 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystem Service</th>
<th>Basic Methodology**</th>
<th>Primary Data Sought*</th>
<th>Basic Valuation Options</th>
<th>Monetary Valuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Hectares &amp; % of area protected</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Market, Dose Response</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Benefit to IUCN priority species (spatial MCA)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Non-Monetary, Supporting</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>Biomass mapping</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Market, Dose Response</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quantity</td>
<td>Hydrological modelling</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Derived Demand, Damage Cost</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Risk mapping</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Damage Cost, Dose Response</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Gravity model</td>
<td>RS &amp; LDC</td>
<td>Market, Travel Cost</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Provisioning</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Market, Derived Demand</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Cultural</td>
<td>Ethnography, narrative</td>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Qualitative, Partial Market</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Erosion</td>
<td>Universal Soil Loss Equation</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Damage Cost, Dose Response</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RS = Remote Sensing, LDC = Local Data Collection

** Level of methodological sophistication depends on data availability, locally existing models, resources for primary data collection and analysis

Links with Biota/Biodiversity. Remote (Human) Beneficiaries. Local (Human) Beneficiaries.
Forestry KPI Challenges

• Flexibility given the varying programme contexts
  – Intervention Strategy (Spatially-Explicit vs Governance-Based)
  – Data Availability (Qualitative vs Quantitative)
  – Technical Capacity

• Resource costs for programme practitioners

• Contribution/Attribution
  – Score card approach
  – Impact Contribution Graph
  – On Going Discussion
Forestry KPI Opportunities

- Unique Scale between Global Outcome Monitoring and Programme-Specific Attribution
- Collaboratively defining reference levels
- Availability of latest technology (e.g., Remote Sensing, ES Assessment Methods, Survey Collection Tools)
- Development of Practical Tools for Moving Forward
  - EO Mapping Platform
  - Livelihood Indicator Database
  - Variable Level of Support can be provided
  - *Front-load investment of time/energy in monitoring to establish ease-of-use and consistency*
Implications for SDG/FLEGT

• Focus on National Scale, Stakeholder Driven Reference Setting
  – Opportunity & Challenge (ie. pre-existing MRV levels, government endorsed measurements)

• Contribution/Attribution with Multiple Donors

• Current ICF KPI Efforts, Ghana VPA
  – ‘Window Districts’
  – Synthetic Approach

• Complimented by larger ICF KPI Development Project
  – Can move past Forestry KPIs (eg. LCD KPIs, and Resilience/Adaptation KPIs)
  – Potential for addressing numerous SDGs