



USAID | **ASIA**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

U.S. CORAL TRIANGLE INITIATIVE (CTI) SUPPORT PROGRAM

CONSOLIDATED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN YEAR 5 2012 – 2013

December 2012 (Bangkok, Thailand)



U.S. CORAL TRIANGLE INITIATIVE (CTI) SUPPORT PROGRAM
CONSOLIDATED
PERFORMANCE
MANAGEMENT PLAN YEAR 5
2012 – 2013

December 2012 (Bangkok, Thailand)

Prepared for U.S. Agency for International Development
by ARD Inc. under Contract No. EPP-I-00-06-00008-00; Order No. EPP-I-07-06-00008-00

U.S. CTI Program Document No. 16-USCTI-12

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| CONSOLIDATED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN | 4 |
| TABLE 1. RESULTS FRAMEWORK FOR THE US CTI SUPPORT PROGRAM | 7 |
| TABLE 2. INDICATORS FOR THE US CTI SUPPORT PROGRAM..... | 8 |

I. CONSOLIDATED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Introduction

This Consolidated Performance Management Plan (PMP) Year 5, 2012-2013 describes the results framework, data collection sources and methods, and performance indicators and targets for the US CTI Support Program. The Consolidated Performance Management Plan (PMP) Year 5, 2012-2013 reflects the US CTI Support Program Results Framework, defines the Program objectives, and presents the consolidated life of program indicator targets for the Coral Triangle Support Partnership (CTSP), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the Program Integrator (PI).

Results Framework

The US CTI Support Program Results Framework is provided in Table I. The overall strategic objective for the US CTI Support Program is Improved Management of Biologically and Economically Important Coastal and Marine Resources and its Associated Ecosystems that Support the Livelihoods of Peoples and Economies in the Coral Triangle. The results framework consists of four results statements that capture the outcomes and impacts of program activities over the life of the program. Respective indicators are detailed in Table 2 incorporating the expected results for the US CTI Support Program team. For USAID RDMA, the objective is Economic Growth, the Program Area is Environment, and the Program Element is Natural Resources and Biodiversity.

Data Sources, Compilation, and Reporting

This PMP provides the ten program indicators and respective targets for the life of the program that will be used to report progress and achievements of the US CTI Support Program against the Results Framework. A description of each indicator, including unit of measure, targets, and data collection methodology is provided in Table 2.

Each program partner is required to measure progress using the relevant indicators provided in Table 2 on a semiannual basis. In cases where the Program partners work jointly in the achievement of specified indicator targets, target “ownership” will be determined through a process of negotiation prior to target achievement allowing for sufficient time to plan supporting data collection approaches. Partners working jointly towards targets will provide the target “owning” agency relevant source documentation to support the data collection process as agreed to during the negotiation process.

Each agency is responsible for collecting source documentation and ensure it is of sufficient quantity and quality to support each target reported achieved. Each partner will be responsible for undergoing a Data Quality Assessment as directed by USAID. Each partner will be responsible for undertaking an annual review of the PMP and submitting revised targets to USAID for approval on agreed upon timelines. The PI will be responsible for the annual consolidation of revised PMPs and for developing consolidated reports against target achievements based upon receipt of inputs from CTSP and NOAA.

The US CTI Program partners will contribute directly to the following program indicators:

- Indicator 1: Area (hectares) of biological significant (marine protected areas) under improved management as a result of USG assistance;
- Indicator 2: Area (hectares) under improved coastal resource and fisheries management as a result of USG assistance;
- Indicator 3: Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation that are implemented as a result of USG assistance;
- Indicator 4: Number of people receiving training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance;
- Indicator 5: Number of laws, policies, agreements, or regulations addressing climate change proposed, adopted, or implemented as a result of USG assistance;
- Indicator 6: Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance;
- Indicator 7: Number of climate change vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance [4.8.1-20];
- Indicator 8: Number of institutions with improved capacity to address climate change issues as a result of USG assistance [4.8.1-23];
- Indicator 9: Number of women or girls receiving training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance; and
- Indicator 10: Number of stakeholders in Timor-Leste with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change as a result of USG assistance [4.8.2-26]

In Year 1 of the Program, the US CTI Support Program team identified Indicators 1 through 6 as the basis for the USCTI Performance Management Plan. These indicators were selected from the U.S. Department of State Foreign Assistance Indicators which were further refined by the USCTI team to reflect the CTI context. In Year 3 upon the direction of USAID Asia, two additional climate change indicators identified as Indicators 7 and 8 relating to DOS Indicators 4.8.1-20 and 4.8.1-23 respectively were added to the PMP. At the beginning of Year 4, USAID/RDMA provided direction for the inclusion of a custom gender indicator to be reported on by the entire program and a climate change indicator to be reported on for achievements in Timor-Leste. These two new Indicators are identified as Indicators 9 and 10.

CTSP's activities are anticipated to contribute directly to all indicators. NOAA's technical assistance and capacity building efforts are expected to contribute directly to Indicators 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10. The PI's technical support including assistance through the regional exchange and small grants mechanisms are expected to contribute to results for Indicators 3 through 9.

Each Program partner will submit performance management reports to USAID for consolidation by the PI. These results will be incorporated into the Semi-Annual and Annual Reports for the Program that tracks with the semi-annual process for preparing USAID's planning and performance reporting. Completed performance management reports from each partner agency must be submitted on a semiannual basis. As per USAID Performance Management Plan Toolkit April 2003 guidance, partners undertake an annual review and necessary adjustments of PMP targets to reflect evolving realities. This is undertaken during the annual Work Planning process. The PI will facilitate a broader review and adjustment process with US CTI Support Program partners to feed into the annual reporting and consolidated reporting process.

Target division: For Indicators 4 wherein more than one US CTI Support Program team member is providing substantive technical or financial assistance for a regional activity, the team members will divide targets equally. For example, if the PI, NOAA and CTSP work together to implement a Marine Protected Area Regional Exchange, each providing significant technical or financial resources, and 24 people in total are trained, each team member (PI, NOAA, and CTSP) will report 8 targets. The approach will be applied to the associated gender breakdown as well. Target achieved for Indicators 3 and 5 through joint activities will be attributed to the lead for each theme which breaks down as follows: MPA-CTSP; EAFM, CTSP; CCA - PI. This approach was agreed to by PI, CTSP, and NOAA

team leads during the July 2010 US CTI Support Program Management Meeting held in Bangkok, Thailand.

Disaggregation of Data: CTSP, NOAA and the PI are required to capture disaggregated data for their respective targets and provide information during the semi-annual reporting process. The information on disaggregated targets is available in the respective PMPs of CTSP, NOAA and PI. It should be noted that as part of the corrective actions undertaken by CTSP resulting from a Program Audit conducted by the USAID Office of the Inspector General from April-June 2012, CTSP targets are further disaggregated in addition to the breakdowns described in the Indicator definitions below. These further disaggregated categories, their targets and ongoing achievements are available from CTSP.

Reporting Responsibility

Each program mechanisms (CTSP, PI and NOAA) is responsible for identifying, tracking, collecting source documentation for, and reporting on its respective targets to USAID/RDMA. USAID RDMA is ultimately responsible for providing input on these reports to USAID/Washington. At a program level, the PI will assist USAID and each program partner in consolidating reporting data at the overall US CTI Support Program level. The PI will develop a consolidated updated PMP report on an annual basis.

TABLE I. RESULTS FRAMEWORK FOR THE US CTI SUPPORT PROGRAM

US CTI Support Program Strategic Objective

Improved Management of Biologically and Economically Important Coastal and Marine Resources and its Associated Ecosystems that Support the Livelihoods of Peoples and Economies in the Coral Triangle

R1. Regional and national platforms strengthened to catalyze and sustain integrated marine and coastal management in the Coral Triangle

IR 1.1 Policies developed and advanced

IR1.2 Institutional capacity and collaboration strengthened

IR1.3 Learning and information networks strengthened

IR1.4 Public and private sector partners engaged

IR1.5 Sustainable financing mobilized

R2. Ecosystem approach to fisheries management improved in CT countries

IR2.1 EAFM framework developed and endorsed

IR2.2 Fisheries management capacity increased

IR2.3 Enforcement capacity increased

IR2.4 EAFM applied in priority geographies

R3. Marine protected area management improved in CT countries

IR3.1 MPA System framework developed and endorsed

IR3.2 MPA management capacity increased

IR3.3 MPA effectiveness improved in priority geographies

R4. Capacity to adapt to climate change improved in CT countries

IR4.1 CCA framework developed and endorsed

IR4.2 Capacity to apply climate change adaptation strategies increased

IR4.3 Climate adaptation strategies applied in priority geographies

TABLE 2. INDICATORS FOR THE US CTI SUPPORT PROGRAM

| <p>Indicator 1. Number of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved resource management as a result of USG assistance.</p> <p><i>Unit of measure:</i> Hectares</p> | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
|---|--------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | 09 | CTSP | 96,100 |
| NOAA | | | 0 | 0 |
| PI | | | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | | 96,100 | 96,000 |
| 10 | | CTSP | 6,249,230 | 6,424,969 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 6,249,230 | 6,424,969 |
| 11 | | CTSP | 9,551,457 | 9,523,906 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 9,551,457 | 9,523,906 |
| 12 | CTSP | 1,066,467 | 1,085,816 | |
| | NOAA | 0 | 0 | |
| | PI | 0 | 0 | |
| | Total | 1,066,467 | 1,085,816 | |
| 13 | CTSP | 1,063,349 | | |
| | NOAA | 0 | | |
| | PI | 0 | | |
| | Total | 1,063,349 | | |

Definition: “Improved Management” includes activities that promote enhanced management of natural resources for the objective of conserving biodiversity in areas that are identified as biologically significant through national, regional, or global priority-setting processes. Management should be guided by a stakeholder-endorsed process following principles of sustainable natural resources management (NRM) and conservation, improved human and institutional capacity for sustainable NRM and conservation, access to better information for decision making, and/or adoption of sustainable NRM and conservation practices. For US CTI, “Improved Management” within marine protected areas (MPAs) refers to meeting established MPA management effectiveness measures. Meeting established effectiveness measures means established national standards or protocols are met which may include: monitoring and evaluation system in place, management body established and functional, boundaries demarcated and enforcement in place, or other appropriate measures used within a country. For US CTI, “Areas of biological significance” refers to area currently in an MPA or with a strong likelihood of being designated an MPA by 2013. These areas are inside CT Priority Geographies which were identified through participatory eco-regional and national assessments and prioritization processes with expert guidance.

Rationale: Regional and coordinated institution building supports sustainable management of resources across the Coral Triangle. The indicator tracks the areal extent over which that is occurring within MPAs.

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology: The area of marine waters and habitat within MPAs or MPA-designates (using national or local government definitions of MPA) of the six CT countries is all considered to be of “biological significance”. The baseline of area within MPAs is based on spatial mapping using a standard protocol and nationally recognized boundaries. “Improved management” within MPAs will be reported for activities where the USAID supported program is plausibly linked to the improvements observed. CTSP Country Coordinators and Implementation Team Staff will collate data on the baseline of MPAs (ha) and those areas under “improved management”. “Improved management” will be determined through the application locally or nationally adopted protocols or standards that define an effective MPA. Documentation will consist of an Excel spreadsheet that lists the MPAs or MPA-designate, their total area, area under improved management and an associated narrative. The data will also include area (ha) of Priority Geographies and municipal/district waters as appropriate to provide context and scale for the MPAs where interventions are occurring.

Disaggregated by:

1. Country

Data source: Designated national agencies or MPA management boards within Coral Triangle countries with authority over MPAs in coordination with field management teams and non-government organizations.

Data Verification: Boundaries plotted on a map and area verifiable through credible data sources.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <p>Indicator 2. Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance.</p> <p>Unit of measure: Hectares</p> | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
| | 09 | CTSP | n/a | 0 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 0 | 0 |
| | 10 | CTSP | 399,090 | 5,862,587 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 399,090 | 5,862,587 |
| | 11 | CTSP | 5,975,153 | 5,942,522 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 5,975,153 | 5,942,522 |
| | 12 | CTSP | 7,621,770 | 7,746,293 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 7,621,770 | 7,746,293 | |
| 13 | CTSP | 10,086,158 | | |
| | NOAA | 0 | | |
| | PI | 0 | | |
| | Total | 10,086,158 | | |

Definition: “Improved Management” includes activities that promote enhanced management of coastal resources and fisheries resources for one or more objectives, such as sustaining fisheries and other resource uses, mitigating pollution and/or climate change or other appropriate outcomes. Management should be guided by a stakeholder-endorsed process following principles of sustainable natural resources management (NRM), improved human and institutional capacity for sustainable NRM and conservation, access to better information for decision-making, and/or adoption of sustainable NRM and conservation practices.

For US CTI, area (hectares) of “improved management” may fall within fishery management jurisdictions and/or seascapes but not include area of MPAs that are counted in Indicator 1. Accepted criteria to qualify an area for “improved coastal resource and fisheries management” include meeting some aspect of coastal resource and fisheries management benchmarks or measures as established within the country of concern. Such benchmarks may include two or more of the following: management regulations decided and plans adopted, management body established and functional, boundaries demarcated, some level of enforcement in place, or other appropriate measures. Indicator 2 can be satisfied only if sufficient criteria (benchmarks) are met for an area to qualify under “improved management”. Otherwise, the area of concern may be measured through a local ordinance, law or policy change that satisfies Indicator 3 on policies adopted. Replication sites that do not show measured changes through the above criteria can also not qualify under Indicator 2 and should also be measured under Indicator 3, 4 or 6 as appropriate.

Rationale: Regional and coordinated institution building supports sustainable management of resources across the Coral Triangle. The indicator tracks the areal extent over which that is occurring within coastal and marine resource areas outside of marine protected areas.

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology: The baseline of area within priority geographies, coastal resource and fishery management areas is based on spatial mapping using a standard protocol and nationally recognized boundaries. “Improved management” will be reported for activities where the USAID supported program is plausibly linked to the improvements observed. Project managers and/or NGO country teams will collate data on the baseline of priority geography areas (ha) and those areas under “improved management”. “Improved management” will be determined through the application locally adopted protocols or standards as noted above. Documentation will consist of an Excel spreadsheet that lists the area under improved management with an associated narrative. The data will also include area (ha) of priority geographies as appropriate to provide context and scale for the areas where interventions are occurring.

Disaggregated by:

1. Country
2. Management jurisdictions or zones (for example: municipal or district waters, etc.)

Data source: Designated national agencies or local government units within Coral Triangle countries with authority over marine areas in coordination with field management teams and non-government organizations.

Data Verification: Boundaries plotted on a map and area verifiable through credible data sources.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

| Indicator 3. Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation that are implemented as a result of USG assistance Unit of measure: Number of regional, national, or local policies, laws, agreements and regulations | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
|--|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | 09 | CTSP | 11 |
| NOAA | | | 0 | 0 |
| PI | | | 0 | 1 |
| Total | | | 11 | 4 |
| 10 | | CTSP | 22 | 29 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 2 | 3 |
| | | Total | 24 | 32 |
| 11 | | CTSP | 24 | 18 |
| | | NOAA | 5 | 0 |
| | | PI | 6 | 6 |
| | | Total | 35 | 24 |
| 12 | | CTSP | 20 | 20 |
| | | NOAA | 2 | 1 |
| | | PI | 7 | 7 |
| | | Total | 29 | 28 |
| 13 | | CTSP | 33 | |
| | | NOAA | 3 | |
| | | PI | 7 | |
| | | Total | 43 | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 110 | 70 | |
| | NOAA | 10 | 1 | |
| | PI | 22 | 17 | |
| | Total | 142 | 88 | |
| <p>Definition: Policies, laws, agreements and regulations include those formed and formally endorsed by government, non-government, civil society, and/or private sector stakeholders with the intent to strengthen sustainable natural resource management. Under CTI, these may support the following:</p> <p>Regional: Multilateral dialogue and agreements, coordinated action and/or policy endorsements National: Laws, ordinances, policies and/or agreements among local jurisdictions for marine and coastal resource management Local: Laws, ordinances, policies and/or agreements among jurisdictions for marine and coastal resource management</p> <p>Rationale: Regional and coordinated institution building supports sustainable management of resources across the Coral Triangle. Policies, laws, agreements and regulations underpin institution building and strengthened regional governance.</p> <p>Data Collection and Analysis Methodology: Project managers from each US CTI partners will submit information semi-annually to the Coral Triangle Support Partnership (CTSP) and the PI. The PI will consolidate this information into an Excel spreadsheet with an accompanying narrative.</p> <p>Disaggregate: By country and by theme (e.g. MPA, integrated coastal management, fisheries etc.)</p> <p>Data source: Designated national agencies within Coral Triangle countries with authority over marine areas in coordination with field management teams and non-government organizations.</p> <p>Data Verification: Copies of policies and laws or other indicator accomplishments will be available for verification.</p> <p>Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.</p> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| <p>Indicator 4: Number of people receiving training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance</p> <p>Unit of measure: Number of persons receiving training in ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM), MPA management, integrated coastal management, climate change adaptation, and other training activities conducted under the US CTI Program</p> | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
| | 09 | CTSP | 921 | 1,325 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 40 | 25 |
| | | Total | 961 | 1,350 |
| | 10 | CTSP | 867 | 1,944 |
| | | NOAA | 238 | 90 |
| | | PI | 100 | 108 |
| | | Total | 1,205 | 2,131 |
| | 11 | CTSP | 1,715 | 2,860 |
| | | NOAA | 400 | 167 |
| | | PI | 150 | 163 |
| | | Total | 2,265 | 3,190 |
| | 12 | CTSP | 1,552 | 3,233 |
| | | NOAA | 342 | 307 |
| | | PI | 125 | 135 |
| | | Total | 2,019 | 3,675 |
| | 13 | CTSP | 1,021 | |
| | | NOAA | 278 | |
| | | PI | 100 | |
| Total | | 1,399 | | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 6,076 | 9,362 | |
| | NOAA | 1,258 | 564 | |
| | PI | 515 | 431 | |
| | Total | 7,849 | 10,357 | |

Definition: The number of individuals participating in learning activities intended for teaching or imparting knowledge and information on natural resources management and biodiversity conservation with designated instructors, mentors or lead persons, learning objectives, and outcomes, conducted fulltime or intermittently.

This includes formal and non-formal training activities, and consists of transfer of knowledge, skills, or attitudes through structured learning and follow-up activities, or through less structured means to solve problems or fill identified performance gaps. Training can consist of long-term academic degree programs, short- or long-term non-degree technical courses in academic or other settings, non-academic seminars, workshops, on-the-job learning experiences, observational study tours, or distance learning exercises or interventions. Subject areas include: EAFM, MPAs and MPA networks, integrated coastal management, climate change adaptation, sustainable financing, and other training activities relevant for coastal and marine management and conservation in the Coral Triangle.

Rationale: Capacity building for legislation, policy, environmental management and enforcement will be critical to the creation and effective management of fisheries, MPAs and Networks and adaptation to climate change across the region.

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology: Data will be recorded at each training activity, and combined using an Excel spreadsheet. A short narrative (paragraph) on the types, methodologies and subjects of trainings will be provided. All training data will be submitted through Trainet of the US Government.

Disaggregate by: Country, Gender and by Subject Area

Data source: Designated national agencies within Coral Triangle countries with authority over marine areas in coordination with field management teams and non-government organizations.

Data Verification: Sign-up sheets that show lists of participants in trainings by day, gender and subject area verifiable through credible data sources. Information on follow-up contact with trainees available.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| <p>Indicator 5. Number of laws, policies, agreements, or regulations addressing climate change proposed, adopted, or implemented as a result of USG assistance</p> <p>Unit of measure: Number of laws, policies, agreements, or regulations</p> | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
| | 09 | CTSP | 0 | 0 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 0 | 0 |
| | 10 | CTSP | 6 | 1 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 6 | 1 |
| | 11 | CTSP | 5 | 2 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 2 | 3 |
| | | Total | 7 | 5 |
| | 12 | CTSP | 4 | 1 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 1 | 1 |
| | | Total | 5 | 2 |
| | 13 | CTSP | 6 | |
| | | NOAA | 1 | |
| | | PI | 1 | |
| Total | | 8 | | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 21 | 4 | |
| | NOAA | 1 | 0 | |
| | PI | 4 | 4 | |
| | Total | 26 | 8 | |

Definition: Policies, laws, agreements and regulations include those formed and formally endorsed by government, non-government, civil society, and/or private sector stakeholders with the intent to explicitly address climate change. Policies may also contribute to addressing climate change by addressing related sectors like forests, land use and agriculture, and urban development. Because many policies may affect climate indirectly, it is essential that the indicator narrative explains how the policies contribute to addressing climate change.

Rationale: The formal and informal institutional structures in the form of laws, policies, agreements, and regulations are essential aspects of many USAID programs because they provide the enabling environment on which actions are built and maintained.

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology: Data will be collected using an Excel spreadsheet, with accompanying short narratives (paragraphs) on the details of the benefits from each law, policy, agreement or regulation related to climate change adaptation.

Disaggregate by: Country and level of implementation (e.g., regional, national and site)

Data source: Designated national agencies within Coral Triangle countries with authority over marine areas in coordination with field management teams and non-government organizations.

Data Verification: Copies of policies and laws or other indicator accomplishments will be available for verification.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

| Indicator 6. Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance <i>Unit of measure:</i> Number of public-private partnerships formed supporting regional, national institution building and governance, including strengthened local or site management and seascape management | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
|---|--------------|--------------|-----------|----------|
| | | 09 | CTSP | 2 |
| NOAA | | | 0 | 0 |
| PI | | | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | | 2 | 0 |
| 10 | | CTSP | 7 | 8 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 3 | 0 |
| | | Total | 10 | 8 |
| 11 | | CTSP | 10 | 1 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 3 | 6 |
| | | Total | 13 | 7 |
| 12 | | CTSP | 6 | 6 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 4 | 2 |
| | | Total | 10 | 8 |
| 13 | CTSP | 8 | | |
| | NOAA | 0 | | |
| | PI | 2 | | |
| | Total | 10 | | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 33 | 15 | |
| | NOAA | 0 | 0 | |
| | PI | 12 | 8 | |
| | Total | 45 | 23 | |

Definition: A partnership is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. An operating unit or an implementing mechanism may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this likely to be rare. Public entities include: the USG, developed country governments, multilateral development institutions, national governments of developing countries, and universities or other arms of national governments. For-profit enterprises and non-governments organizations (NGOs) are considered private. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions.

Rationale: This indicator measures USG leveraging of public and private resources to regional institution building and governance, including strengthened target area management and seascapes, which is critical to improved and sustained management.

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology: Public-private partnerships that have been established with CTI support will be analyzed. To the extent that the partnerships support better regional management and coordination, they will be incorporated into an Excel spreadsheet with brief accompanying narrative that explains the public-private partnership.

Disaggregate by: Country.

Data source: Designated national agencies within Coral Triangle countries with authority over marine areas in coordination with field management teams and non-government organizations.

Data Verification: Lists of partnerships verifiable through credible data sources and explanations.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

| Indicator 7. Number of climate change vulnerability assessments conducted as a result of USG assistance [4.8.1-20] <i>Unit of measure:</i> Number of assessments. | FY | Org | Planned | Actual | |
|---|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----|
| | 09 | CTSP | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | 10 | CTSP | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | 11 | CTSP | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | 12 | CTSP | 10 | 7 | |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 | |
| | | PI | 5 | 5 | |
| | | Total | 15 | 12 | |
| | 13 | CTSP | 1 | | |
| | | NOAA | 0 | | |
| | | PI | 0 | | |
| Total | | 8 | | | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 11 | 7 | | |
| | NOAA | 0 | 0 | | |
| | PI | 5 | 5 | | |
| | Total | 16 | 12 | | |

Definition: Where existing vulnerability assessments carried out under national or donor processes are not sufficient for developing and implementing an adaptation program, a climate vulnerability assessment should be conducted using best practices, at a relevant temporal and spatial scale for the envisioned program, and involving key stakeholders. Best practices include the participatory identification of priority climate-sensitive sectors, livelihoods or systems; identification of priority populations and regions; assessment of anticipated climate and non-climate stresses; estimates of potential impacts; and assessment of exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity of the system to climate stresses. Targets are annual.

Rationale: Vulnerability assessments that take climate and non-climate stressors into account form the basis for adaptation programming by presenting an integrated problem analysis. A vulnerability assessment should inform, and will help to justify, an adaptation program by indicating why certain strategies or activities are necessary to minimize exposure to climate stress, reduce sensitivity, or strengthen adaptive capacity. A range of methods may be used, depending on the decision context, including participatory workshops, community-based PRA-type assessments, economic assessments, risk and vulnerability mapping, etc.

Data Compilation and Analysis Methodology: Documentation will consist of copies of Vulnerability Assessments conducted, report on results of VA conducted and/or presentations describing assessment results. This will be supported by the Terms of Reference for conducting the assessments and information on the members of the Vulnerability Assessment team including roles, responsibilities and contact information. These items will be sent to the CTSP RPO for CTSP related targets or the PI DCOP for PI targets.

Disaggregated by: Country

Data source: US CTI Support Program Activity Managers.

Data Verification: Copies of assessments will be available for verification. Copies of documents will be retained by Activity Managers.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

| Indicator 8. Number of institutions with improved capacity to address climate change issues as a result of USG assistance. [4.8.1-23] Unit of measure: Number of institutions. | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
|---|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | 09 | CTSP | n/a |
| NOAA | | | n/a | n/a |
| PI | | | n/a | n/a |
| Total | | | n/a | n/a |
| 10 | | CTSP | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| 11 | | CTSP | n/a | 0 |
| | | NOAA | n/a | 0 |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| 12 | | CTSP | 26 | 18 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 13 |
| | | PI | 37 | 38 |
| | | Total | 63 | 69 |
| 13 | | CTSP | 15 | |
| | | NOAA | 8 | |
| | | PI | 15 | |
| | | Total | 38 | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 41 | 18 | |
| | NOAA | 8 | 13 | |
| | PI | 52 | 38 | |
| | Total | 101 | 69 | |

Definition: Institutions with improved capacity will be better able to govern, coordinate, analyze, advise or make technical decisions or to provide inputs to decision-making related to climate resilience, clean energy, or REDD+. This includes capacity to engage local communities to ensure that policies, plans, budgets and investments reflect local realities and ensure that local communities benefit from climate change investments in adaptation, clean energy, and REDD+.

Relevant institutions might include public sector entities (ministries, departments, working groups, local government units, academic institutions, Marine Protected Managements boards etc.) private sector entities, community groups (women’s groups, CBOs or NGOs, farmers or fishing groups), trade unions or others.

Some examples of ways to enhance capacity could include participating in assessment or planning exercises, receiving relevant training, or gaining new equipment or inputs necessary for planning, assessment and management. Technical exchanges, certifications, or trainings could improve the capacity of an institution to engage with climate change adaptation, clean energy or REDD+. Changes to the institutional or policy environment, for example, facilitating collaboration between scientists and policymakers, or workshops or planning processes across sectors or themes (e.g. agriculture, environment, forestry, energy, and water) may also enhance capacity. Targets are annual.

Rationale: Good governance related to climate change is a precondition for successful adaptation, REDD+ and clean energy programs

Data source: US CTI Support Program Activity Managers.

Data Compilation and Analysis Methodology: US CTI Support Program Activity Managers will compile data for institutions receiving technical support identifying relevant activity and recipient details. Source documents will include descriptions of technical content from trainings, workshops, technical exchanges, or other assistance activities contributing to building of institutional capacity. Source documentation may also include training materials, assessment materials, proceedings or activity reports describing the assistance, participant lists from workshops or trainings with daily signed attendance sheets, copies of certificates of completion, correspondence documenting content and duration of technical exchanges, correspondence

from recipients describing and verifying type of assistance received, and documentation of equipment provided to enhance climate change planning or management. Different sub-sections of any single institution that are geographically or hierarchically distinct will be treated as a separate institution for the purpose of measurement. For example, the national, regional and local office of a Ministry of Fisheries will be treated as separate institutions. Each Program team member (CTSP, NOAA and the PI) may count the same institutions towards their respective targets; however, each Program team member can only count a respective institution once. For example, NOAA, CTSP and the PI may all count support to a national Ministry of Fisheries as targets achieved; however, if there is repeated capacity building assistance provided to the national Ministry of Fisheries over the course of the Program, it can still only be counted once by CTSP, NOAA and/or the PI. In addition wherein a single individual is a member of more than one institution, it is the number of institutions the individual represent rather than the individual that will count towards targets.

Disaggregated by:

1. Adaptation, REDD+, Clean energy, Cross-cutting
2. Country
3. Type of institution (government; other)

Data Verification: Copies of source documentation will be available for verification. Copies of documents will be retained by Activity Managers.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| <p>Indicator 9: Number of women or girls receiving training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance.</p> <p>Unit of measure: Number of women or girls receiving training in ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAFM), MPA management, integrated coastal management, climate change adaptation, and other training activities conducted under the US CTI Program.</p> | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
| | 09 | CTSP | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| | 10 | CTSP | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| | 11 | CTSP | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| | 12 | CTSP | 466 | 1,277 |
| | | NOAA | 104 | 95 |
| | | PI | 38 | 41 |
| | | Total | 608 | 1,413 |
| | 13 | CTSP | 275 | |
| | | NOAA | 65 | |
| | | PI | 33 | |
| Total | | 373 | | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 741 | 1,277 | |
| | NOAA | 169 | 95 | |
| | PI | 71 | 41 | |
| | Total | 981 | 1,413 | |

Definition: The number of women or girls participating in learning activities intended for teaching or imparting knowledge and information on natural resources management and biodiversity conservation with designated instructors, mentors or lead persons, learning objectives, and outcomes, conducted fulltime or intermittently.

This includes formal and non-formal training activities, and consists of transfer of knowledge, skills, or attitudes through structured learning and follow-up activities, or through less structured means to solve problems or fill identified performance gaps. Training can consist of long-term academic degree programs, short- or long-term non-degree technical courses in academic or other settings, non-academic seminars, workshops, on-the-job learning experiences, observational study tours, or distance learning exercises or interventions. Subject areas include: EAFM, MPAs and MPA networks, integrated coastal management, climate change adaptation, sustainable financing, and other training activities relevant for coastal and marine management and conservation in the Coral Triangle.

Rationale: Capacity building for legislation, policy, environmental management and enforcement will be critical to the creation and effective management of fisheries, MPAs and Networks and adaptation to climate change across the region.

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology: Data will be recorded at each training activity, and combined using an Excel spreadsheet. A short narrative (paragraph) on the types, methodologies and subjects of trainings will be provided. All training data will be submitted through Trainet of the US Government.

Disaggregate by: Country, and by Subject Area

Data source: Designated national or sub-national agencies within Coral Triangle countries with authority over marine areas ; field management teams; and non-government organizations.

Data Verification: Sign-up sheets that show lists of participants in trainings by day, gender and subject area verifiable through credible data sources.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.

TIMOR-LESTE SPECIFIC

| | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| <p>Indicator 10. Number of stakeholders in Timor-Leste with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change as a result of USG assistance [4.8.2-26]</p> <p>Unit of measure: Number of persons.</p> | FY | Org | Planned | Actual |
| | 09 | CTSP | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| | 10 | CTSP | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| | 11 | CTSP | n/a | n/a |
| | | NOAA | n/a | n/a |
| | | PI | n/a | n/a |
| | | Total | n/a | n/a |
| | 12 | CTSP | 4 | 4 |
| | | NOAA | 0 | 0 |
| | | PI | 0 | 0 |
| | | Total | 4 | 4 |
| | 13 | CTSP | 2 | |
| | | NOAA | 3 | |
| | | PI | 0 | |
| Total | | 5 | | |
| TOTAL | CTSP | 6 | 4 | |
| | NOAA | 3 | 0 | |
| | PI | 0 | 0 | |
| | Total | 9 | 4 | |

Definition: Adaptive capacity is the ability to adjust to climate change, to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the consequences. USG support to increase adaptive capacity should aim beyond only the near term, to also have benefits in the middle and longer term.

An increase in adaptive capacity can be shown with the use of surveys or assessments of capacities.

Having the “ability to adjust” to climate change impacts will measure an objective of the project to deal with climate stresses (in the context of other stresses).

Stakeholders with improved adaptive capacity may be:

- Implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change, for example:
- Implementing water-saving strategies to deal with increasing water stress
- Making index-based micro-insurance available to assist farmers in dealing with increasing weather variability
- Adjusting farming practices like soil management, crop choice, or seeds, to better cope with climate stress
- Implementing education campaigns to promote the use of risk reducing practices, like use of storm shelters and bed nets that help people cope with climate stress

Using climate information in decision making, for example:

- Utilizing short term weather forecasts to inform decision-making, for example, by farmer cooperatives, disaster or water managers
- Utilizing climate projections or scenarios to inform planning over medium to longer term timescales, for example, for infrastructure or land use planning
- Conducting climate vulnerability assessment to inform infrastructure design or planning as “due diligence”

This indicator relates most closely to two of the three main categories under the adaptation pillar: support for improved information and analysis, and implementation of climate change strategies. The narrative accompanying this indicator should describe adaptive capacity in the project context and indicate the stakeholders involved. Targets are annual.

Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact: This indicator is a measure of stakeholders’ abilities to understand, plan, and act as climate stresses evolve. The ability to deal with climate change will depend on awareness, information, tools, technical knowledge, organization, and financial resources, which are partly captured by this indicator.

Indicator Type: Outcome.

Unit of Measure: Stakeholders, as defined by the project is individuals.

Use of Indicator: These results will help to estimate the coverage and effectiveness of USAID's portfolio.

Data Source and Reporting Frequency: Data for this indicator should come from project documentation about activities and stakeholders engaged, ideally validated by surveys or interviews to ensure the use, retention, and continuation of risk reducing measures, information use, or other forms of adaptive capacity . Project implementers should gather data about stakeholder capacities through standard M&E procedures, such as quarterly and annual reports. A baseline survey or assessment of capabilities should be updated over the course of the project at regular intervals. US CTI Support Program Activity Managers.

Known Data Limitations:

Reliability: Consistent methods should be used from year to year to capture this indicator.

Timeliness: Projects may not be able to report on this indicator in terms of actual use of information or implementation of risk reducing practices in initial years.

Disaggregate(s):

- Implementing risk reducing practices or actions to improve resilience to climate change.
- Using climate information in decision making.

Baseline Information: The baseline as of October 2011 is considered zero.