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INTRODUCTION

This work plan has been prepared in line with Section F.9 Reporting and Deliverables, Annual Work Plan, in the Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) task order (TO) contract. In accordance with the requirements, this work plan will provide details on how INRM will use the work plan year to effectively achieve the goals outlined in the contract. The work plan will guide INRM implementation and, once approved, will “represent an agreement as to the objectives and timing of specific tasks and interventions.” To comply with the contractual parameters and simultaneously create a document that supports implementation and functions as an adaptable management tool, the work plan will clearly explain how the actions and outputs will lead to the expected outcomes identified in the current theory of change. Since the TO is demand driven, it is expected that new activities may be added throughout fiscal year 2022 (FY 22). Any new activities added after the workplan approval will require approval by the task order contracting officer’s representative.

Highlights from the first year of INRM implementation include:

• Scoped and initiated 12 Washington managed activities in collaboration with technical staff from the Bureau for Development Democracy and Innovation, Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Stabilization, Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, and multiple ENRM working groups
• Distributed two INRM Digests (newsletters), presented two technical talks to USAID Environmental staff and ENRM working groups, and posted one blog describing INRM’s support for HEARTH monitoring, evaluation, research, and learning work
• Collaborated with USAID to host four technical discussions on Land and Resource Governance, land use change, and zoonotic viral emergence at the human-environment interface. Meeting invitees included a select number of USAID staff, as well as five external experts. Findings and recommendations from the meeting series fed into a concept note, which was presented to the USAID Bureau of Global Health.
• Assisted the One Health Working Group in designing and facilitating a 2-day workshop to develop priority activities for the group’s year one workplan

Once finalized, this work plan will guide the implementation of INRM for FY 22. This draft includes the following sections:

Section 1: INRM Description and Theory of Change
The INRM description section includes an explanation of how INRM interprets and applies the term “integrated”.

Section 2: Management, Integration and Learning (MIL)
This section focuses on the INRM operational aspects of implementation that support all INRM initiatives. This includes the scoping of activities and buy-ins, Mission outreach and engagement, INRM
specific communications and knowledge management, cross-cutting gender equality and social inclusion, and the development and implementation of the INRM monitoring, evaluation, and learning plan.

**Sections 3 and 4: Current Technical Activities and Buy-ins**
The activities and buy-ins in these sections include workstreams that were approved and launched in FY 21 and have implementation actions extending into FY 22. The section also includes one new activity (Energy and Infrastructure) which has a well-developed scoping sheet undergoing review and dedicated funding. Many of the activities in this section include outputs labelled as “illustrative”. The illustrative outputs evolved from discussions between the USAID and INRM activity managers on how to build on the actions implemented in FY 21. Illustrative outputs are not scoped and do not have budget estimates, they are examples of the products that could result from actions that require further scoping.

**Section 5: Provisional Technical Activities**
The activities in this section are designated as provisional. They include potential new activities that may be scoped in FY 22 at the direction of the COR.

**Section 6: Activities, Buy-ins, and MIL Budgets**
This section includes budgets for on-going and proposed activities and buy-ins. It also includes a table containing the MIL budget projection for October 1, 2021 – September 22, 2022.
1. INRM DESCRIPTION

INRM is a five-year TO (July 30, 2020 – July 30, 2025) under the STARR II IDIQ. INRM supports multiple Offices in the Bureau for Development, Democracy and Innovation (DDI); activities under this contract may be identified and funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Washington-based offices and/or by Missions. Overall, INRM provides strategic support and facilitation to USAID’s Missions, technical offices, and other operating units on integrated environmental and natural resource management programming and is in alignment with the Agency’s Environmental and Natural Resource Management (ENRM) Framework.

INRM supports integrated analysis and programming across sectors traditionally classified as “environmental,” such as land use, environmental protection, and climate change, as well as many sectors that traditionally have not been linked to environmental programming but are in fact strongly connected (e.g., food security and biodiversity, global health, and conflict and governance). By using a multi-sectoral lens, the task order strengthens the impacts of USAID’s core environmental programming by recognizing synergies, adopting best practices, and building broader constituencies for integrated programming. To do so, INRM works across the USAID Program Cycle, and supports assessment; strategy; activity design; piloting of new approaches; adaptive management; monitoring, evaluation, and learning; and communications.

Implemented by DAI and seven subcontractors—the Center for Biodiversity and Conservation at the American Museum of Natural History, Coastal Resources Center at the University of Rhode Island, Conservation Strategy Fund, New America, Resource Equity, Social Impact, and Stantec — INRM uses a mix of core team expertise and uniquely qualified technical assistance from this team of subcontractors to strengthen the impacts of USAID’s integrated environmental and natural resource management programming. Additionally, INRM strives to work with host country counterparts by identifying uniquely qualified individuals and local organizations that can be engaged to provide technical assistance as needed. In collaboration with USAID, INRM will work to engage host country counterparts through individual consultant agreements, requests for proposals, expressions of interest, etc. to identify individuals or teams to fulfill specific requests. INRM staff will work closely with host country staff to ensure the quality of the deliverable produced and to build capacity in our local counterparts.

1.1 INRM THEORY OF CHANGE

INRM is expected to respond to a range of requests related to integrated environmental and natural resources management programming across all sectors and at all stages of the Program Cycle throughout the five-year contract. As such, the type of INRM technical assistance and direct support will vary each year, and work plans will be developed on an annual basis to reflect the evolving portfolio of activities. To help frame the type of technical assistance the INRM TO will provide, the mechanism was designed to respond to integrated programming requests through five task areas:

1. Assist Missions with analysis and development of an evidence base to support integrated NRM programming
2. Support and facilitate design and adaptive management of integrated NRM programming
3. Test innovative approaches for integrated NRM programming
4. Support integrated monitoring, evaluation, and learning of multi-sectoral programs; and,
5. Support communications and knowledge management (CKM).

The INRM high-level TOC outlines the causal logic guiding INRM implementation and adaptive management based on these five tasks. The TOC was developed around the core objective to support “Improved and sustained development outcomes through more integrated NRM programming”. While this is beyond the manageable interest of INRM, we believe that achievement of our core outcome “More effective and efficient integrated NRM design, implementation, adaptive management, and/or MEL” will contribute to this overall goal. By more effective integrated NRM approaches, we mean having established collaborative relationships and processes, and generating data/learning on best practices.

To achieve the activity objective, the five INRM task areas will contribute to three strategic approach areas:

(1) Generating and synthesizing evidence
(2) Providing direct support and facilitation
(3) Developing guidance and tools

Through these approaches and outputs, INRM will contribute to the activity objective through two pathways. First, by generating, synthesizing, and communicating evidence, INRM will contribute to an increased understanding of when (i.e., under what conditions), why (i.e., potential benefits), and/or how (i.e., approaches proven to be successful) to implement integrated NRM programming. Second, by providing direct support and facilitation as well as developing guidance and tools, INRM will directly contribute to increased technical assistance, evidence, tools, and/or approaches that support integrated NRM programming. Together, these two intermediate outcomes will contribute to building USAID (broadly, including environment and other technical offices, OUs and Missions) capacity to use evidence, tools, and/or approaches that support integrated NRM programming. Figure 1 provides a graphical representation of the INRM TOC. Due to the demand-driven nature of the TO, and to support INRM’s commitment to learning and adaptive management, the team will review and refine this TOC in consultation with USAID during annual Pause and Reflect sessions as needed. These actions will ensure that the TOC serves as a useful tool for USAID in articulating change pathways and broadening Agency and implementing partner understanding of how integration contributes to higher-level results.
**Figure 1:** INRM High-Level Theory of Change. In this figure, T1-5 refer to the five INRM tasks listed above.
2. MANAGEMENT, INTEGRATION, AND LEARNING

This section describes the core INRM foundational and cross-cutting actions required to effectively support cross-team collaboration, learning, and implementation and engagement with USAID. These actions include targeted management, integration, and learning across the INRM team as well as engagement with USAID Washington-based collaborators to scope and implement INRM activities; developing Mission outreach and engagement actions; and systematically addressing gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) throughout activities, using an analytic, iterative approach. Core actions also include implementing the INRM Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) plan, which will enable INRM to assess and report progress in qualitative and quantitative terms; testing assumptions inherent in the INRM TOC; promoting collaborative learning about the technical and organizational aspects of multi-sectoral environmental programming; and using adaptive management to build on successes and address shortcomings.

At the end of the first year, INRM reflected on progress to date and opportunities for adapting operations to increase effectiveness and improve collaboration with USAID. The priority recommendations that emerged from internal pause and reflect sessions with the INRM team and with the USAID INRM Advisory Committee included: streamlining the INRM scoping process and expanding engagement with the Advisory Committee, increasing coordination and collaboration with staff beyond DDI to explore technical and programmatic entry points, and developing communications material targeted for Missions to raise awareness of and create demand for INRM services. These operational adaptations will be integrated throughout INRM’s year two implementation and are described in more detail in Section 2.

2.1 ACTIVITY SCOPECING

To date, INRM’s technical assistance has provided support for two different types of efforts: technical activities managed more broadly by DDI and other Washington-based Bureau staff and buy-in activities. INRM works collaboratively with Washington-based technical teams to scope and implement an array of actions that contribute to the body of knowledge on the tools, approaches, and evidence that support integrated programming. Similarly, INRM collaborates with Missions or the relevant operating unit staff to define the scope of the technical assistance requested through a buy-in.

The INRM activity scoping process involves close coordination with the USAID activity manager, the INRM COR and ACOR, and for Washington based activities, the INRM Advisory Committee. Engaging a broad set of stakeholders across USAID offices, bureaus, and sectors can strengthen the enabling conditions for integrated programming and incorporate innovative and creative implementation actions into activities. Effective cross-sectoral and cross-institutional collaboration can be time intensive. Preparing high quality scopes that deliver integrated results requires frequent communication and discussion. To improve the scoping efficiency in FY 22 INRM will:

- Streamline the scoping process by ensuring USAID staff provides ample input on the technical aspects of a planned activity while INRM provides support on drafting the operational content
• Share early versions of scoping sheets with the USAID INRM Advisory Committee to increase awareness, opportunities for input, and suggestions that can help expand engagement
• Compile a list of scoping sheets available for review in the bi-weekly update to the Advisory Committee
• Provide USAID with an estimate of the LOE and timeframe required to revise or expand an activity scope
• Quickly identify the INRM team members involved in the scoping process and define their roles and responsibilities
• Outline the scoping parameters before beginning the scoping process, for example:
  - Discuss the status of the scope and clarify whether it is a nascent idea that will require an iterative process to evolve from idea to implementable activity or a previously scoped activity that requires revising and refining
  - Identify the funding available for the scoping and activity implementation
  - Discuss the degree of budget flexibility and opportunities for integration options such as expanded technical perspectives and potential funding add-ons (e.g., climate change, GESI, other sectors)

INRM and USAID activity leads will continue to identify and engage relevant USAID and INRM experts from across the core team and the consortium to collaboratively scope all activities. In addition to scoping individual activities, INRM will look across its portfolio of activities to strengthen the activity by identifying linkages among INRM efforts that are tackling similar or shared problems to better align approaches and resources and achieve activity outcomes more effectively.

2.2 MISSION OUTREACH STRATEGY

OVERVIEW

Through much of FY 21, INRM worked to develop communications materials targeted for Missions that help raise awareness and create demand for the services that INRM can provide. INRM engaged in an audience analysis process based on practices of human-centered design. This process helps to better understand and document the goals, values, and day-to-day experiences of Mission staff and the challenges they face in implementing integrated programming. With this understanding, INRM developed targeted messaging that aims to speak directly to these needs, with the aim of increasing the chances of audience members taking notice. The first set of topline messages are currently in review with USAID.

Building on efforts in FY 21 to analyze Mission audience needs and develop high-level communications materials, INRM will develop a suite of materials targeted for Mission staff that incorporate new insights and lessons learned from each engagement with Missions. In addition to the high-level messaging and materials, INRM will produce resources that speak to specific integrated programming challenges, sectors, job functions, or other needs. Throughout this process, INRM will systematically document insights on what works and what doesn’t – and use this knowledge to continuously improve these materials.
COMMUNICATIONS LIFECYCLE

In alignment with the draft INRM CKM Strategy (see section 2.3 below), the INRM team will employ the communications lifecycle (see figure below) as a guide to the Mission outreach process. In practice, this process might look like:

1. **Attract:**
   a. *Communications and outreach:* Share high-level communications materials with prospective Missions identified by USAID staff or other outreach methods to introduce INRM and convey our value. Systematically document any lessons from these engagements: What questions arose? Were there any points of confusion about INRM and what we offer? How did they react during initial presentations — for example, did they seem happy and interested, or bored and indifferent? With these insights, update materials and adapt the outreach process as needed.
   b. *Secure buy-in:* Once we learn about interest from a Mission, begin discussion on how INRM can support their needs. Start process of formalizing engagement, determining details of buy-in, such as activity manager, scoping of specific needs, etc.

2. **Engage:**
   Working closely with Mission activity managers, scope, design, and implement tasks. Demonstrate close attention to “customer service,” ensuring that we identify any shortcomings of our work as early as possible and address concerns as they arise. Continue to document lessons and insights about both our communications and our understanding of Mission needs.

3. **Deliver:**
   Assess satisfaction of Mission with brief interview. Capture anecdotes and examples of specific outcomes INRM helped to achieve, using these to develop additional materials that convey INRM’s capabilities. These might include one-page case studies, quote cards, or targeted sell sheets for specific skill sets or development issues. Assuming that we delivered value exceeding their expectations, gently request if they can help spread the word about INRM, in turn supporting the identification of new prospects.

**ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS**

The following communications and outreach materials could be included in INRM products and other communications materials or distributed through various USAID channels.

- **Messaging manual** that compiles talking points for different contexts, ranging from high-level “general audience” messaging to more targeted and specific messaging. This would be an internal document to be used by all INRM staff to develop products or for use in outreach.
- **Targeted sell sheets** that adapt key INRM messages to speak more directly to specific audience needs. This might include different job functions such as Mission technical staff or program office staff, or sell sheets could highlight implementation successes and INRM capacity to provide sector-specific technical assistance. These sell sheets can be distributed to relevant Mission staff.
• **Case studies** that demonstrate INRM’s capabilities and outcomes achieved in prior Mission buy-in tasks. In one or two pages, these could serve a dual function of promoting INRM while also illustrating integrated programming in practice. These case studies can be published on USAID channels or shared directly with Mission staff.

• **Communications campaigns** conducted periodically that aim to systematically advance a particular message, activity, or other promotional aspect of INRM. These campaigns would entail creating a series of short “micro content” communications pieces that are distributed in a targeted way on social media and other channels.

• **Quote cards** that present favorable or insightful quotes from Mission staff about their engagement with INRM and about integrated programming more generally. These cards can then be shared on various channels or embedded within other resources, such as reports or guidance documents.

• **Integration Checklists, cheat sheets, and other practical “how-to” guides** that make common but tedious or confusing tasks related to integrated programming just a bit easier for Mission staff. These kinds of brief and shareable resources deliver practical value to Mission staff while also helping to embed INRM in the minds of our audience as a trusted and knowledgeable partner.

### 2.3 INRM COMMUNICATIONS AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

**OVERVIEW**

In FY 21, INRM completed a draft CKM strategy. Once the final draft is revised as needed and approved, the INRM team will implement aspects of the strategy that are relevant for FY 22. Many of the CKM implementation tasks will relate to specific INRM activities, buy-ins, and the Mission outreach strategy described above. However, in general, INRM’s CKM efforts will aim to achieve the following goals in FY 22, as presented in the draft INRM CKM Strategy:

• **Raise awareness** of INRM activities and services offered to promote buy-ins by Missions and other operating units. Maintain interest and support of champions and initial stakeholder groups.

• **Produce content for activity and buy-in deliverables** and other CKM outputs, including shorter-form derived materials to provide easier entry points into longer-form technical content.

• **Design and implement a CKM “flywheel”** to accelerate momentum and impact over time. Seek opportunities to capitalize on low-hanging fruit and early wins, while building this machine for long-term success.

• **Leverage products developed through INRM activities and buy-ins to demonstrate INRM’s value and capacities** to support integrated programming goals.

• **Collaborate with the INRM team to spot opportunities to provide technical assistance** for integrated environmental and natural resource management across development sectors.

• **Develop a compelling and evidence-based case** for integrated environmental and natural resource management programming at USAID, while providing tools and resources to support implementation.
GENERAL CKM OUTPUTS

In addition to specific deliverables for each INRM activity and buy-in, INRM will produce the following cross-cutting CKM outputs in FY 22:

- **Messaging manual** that builds from the Mission-specific messaging manual described above — INRM will develop a set of talking points for general audiences
- **Editorial calendar** capturing a high-level view of INRM CKM activities over a period of several months, organized thematically to convey specific messages, capacities, or outputs and linking to broader Agency or sector events
- **Monthly digests** based on themes in the editorial calendar, describing current INRM activities, buy-ins, and other news, in addition to sharing relevant USAID resources
- **Tech talks** led by INRM team members on specific topics within the scope of INRM's capabilities, relevant to ENRM working groups also linked to themes in the editorial calendar

2.4 GENDER EQUALITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION (GESI)

In Year Two, INRM will continue to consider gender and social inclusion issues across all actions. The INRM GESI lead will continue to participate in the scoping process of all activities, working closely with activity leads to identify possible entry points for GESI integration. In cases where there may be opportunities for standalone gender or social inclusion activities, the opportunities will be raised to the attention of GenDev and the INRM COR for further consideration. Activity reviews will allow INRM to identify and mitigate interventions that may have the potential to produce unintended consequences, particularly those that can potentially lead to gender-based violence or human rights violations and recommend ways to address and respond to their harmful effects. The INRM GESI Lead will work closely with the Monitoring and Evaluation team to document and analyze how GESI considerations help to further development goals within INRM.

In Year 1, the GESI lead began management of activities that have specific GESI objectives and/or are supported by funding directed toward achieving specific GESI outcomes under the Women's Economic Empowerment (WEE) Buy-In. These comprise the three priority areas identified by INRM and GenDev that will help to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment. Specifically, they include 1) developing guidance, tools, and resources to help mainstream gender in USAID environment programming; 2) exploring opportunities to provide direct support to women’s organizations on the ground to build capacity and strengthen efforts to address environment-related challenges; and 3) supporting actions to increase learning, research and evidence to create more effective gender and environment-related decision making and programming.

INRM will continue to implement activities corresponding to these priority areas in Year Two. For example, under the first priority area, INRM began implementation of a Needs Assessment funded through the WEE Buy-In (see Section 4 for more details). The Needs Assessment will identify, confirm, and understand what is required to better address and integrate gender within environment and climate change programs. Using a five-phase approach, the study will include a desktop review of existing environment and climate change programming, focus group discussions and key informant interviews to
examine what are the barriers, constraints and incentives to better engagement of gender opportunities, including institutional norms, policies, resources and attitudes.

GESI interventions in Year 1 also helped to ensure gender equality and social inclusion played a critical role across the INRM portfolio. For example, the supplemental guidance documents on wild fisheries and agriculture developed through the Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, included a discussion on gender inequalities, barriers to women’s full economic participation and leadership roles and an examination of the unequal distribution of benefits. In a global activity for USAID HEARTH (Health, Ecosystems and Agriculture for Resilient, Thriving Societies), a set of provisional indicators will help to monitor how the activity has strengthened women’s critical responses to ongoing threats. And a systematic evidence assessment to determine how participatory natural resources management is linked to greater democratic outcomes will include a discussion on whether addressing GESI can lead to outcomes that mitigate conflict and promote anti-corruption.

2.5 INRM MONITORING EVALUATION AND LEARNING PLAN

The INRM MEL Plan is a living document that will be reviewed annually, to make necessary adjustments to the MEL approaches if found necessary. INRM implementation is guided by a Theory of Change, provided above, that was last updated in February 2021. The INRM MEL approaches, priorities, and performance indicators flow from the TOC.

INRM dedicates resources to operationalize the MEL Plan which is led by the INRM MEL/ Collaborating, Learning & Adapting Lead. These actions include:

- INRM monitoring data collection through activity-specific MEL plans and post-activity surveys with a limited sample of key target stakeholders
- Support for evaluation and learning for adaptive management and to advance the knowledge base on integrated programming
- Implementation of INRM learning tools such as after-action reviews, pause and reflect sessions, and INRM technical trainings
- Contributions to contractually required performance reports
3. TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY 1.1: EVIDENCE AND PNRM

Activity Name: Using Evidence to Improve Analysis and Develop Best Practices in Participatory Natural Resource Management (PNRM)

INRM Activity Manager: Jeff Stark

USAID Activity Manager: Kyle Rearick, Emily Waytoti

This activity will build on the findings from the evidence review produced during INRM’s Activity 1.1 on “Advancing Democracy through Natural Resource Governance: An Evidence Review,” which concludes in December 2021. The Year One evidence review presents findings on the nature and extent of the evidence base on observed linkages between PNRM and democratic variables, including attention to how PNRM has addressed equity and empowerment of women, marginalized groups, and Indigenous peoples. These findings will be disseminated in a technical brief and webinar(s) shared with USAID staff and other practitioner and scholarly audiences in late 2021 and early 2022. With the benefit of feedback from those exchanges, a second phase in Year Two will develop a set of analytic guidelines and best practices that take into account the constraints, enabling conditions, lessons learned, and knowledge gaps documented in the evidence review. The guidelines and best practices will inform PEA and TWP in the environmental sector and contribute to program activity design, implementation, and MEL.

The FY 2022 activity will present in a structured, accessible format examples, lessons, scenarios, and analytic approaches that address these political dynamics and frame a set of best practices. PNRM is central to USAID’s programming in the environmental sector and a rich source of evidence and lessons for PEA and TWP. The final products will help programmers identify realistic, flexible, and adaptive approaches to PNRM activities that incorporate power dynamics, local political realities, and learning throughout the Program Cycle. These outputs are not currently included in the FY 21 activity budget.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

- Technical brief as described above, formatted for both internal and external audiences
- A webinar for USAID staff and IPs to present the results
- Briefings to the Front Office of interested Mission(s)
ACTIVITY 2.1: ENRM CKM

Activity Name: Support for Environmental and Natural Resources Management Framework communications and knowledge management

INRM Activity Manager: Ryan Thompson

USAID Activity Manager: Kate Gallagher

In FY 22, INRM will implement and build on the communications and knowledge management (CKM) strategy co-created in FY 21 through a needs assessment and collaborative workshop with the ENRM task team and other USAID staff. The activity will focus on raising the profile of ENRM with USAID leadership and Missions, clarifying ENRM's value in achieving Agency priorities, and demonstrating pathways for Missions and others to incorporate ENRM across sectors and programs.

INRM initiated Activity 2.1 in April 2021 with a primary focus of developing a CKM strategy to advance the ENRM Framework and environment, climate change, and natural resources management work at the Agency more broadly. The timeline in FY 21 has included:

- **Needs assessment** with two components: interviews and Mission questionnaire
- **Collaborative workshop**: with the support of an external facilitator, this workshop focused on refining CKM goals, refining understanding of target audience segments, clarifying barriers and other challenges, and brainstorming solutions
- **CKM strategy development**: the insights of the previous two activities will inform the development of a CKM strategy. This work is currently underway, with a goal of completion by the end of FY 21 or early FY 22.

OUTPUTS:

The following outputs were identified in the CKM workshop and needs assessment and will be discussed further upon completion of the CKM strategy at the end of FY 21 or early FY 22. **The actions below require further scoping and are not included in the FY 21 activity budget.**

- **ENRM messaging manual** including a set of general and targeted talking points conveying why environmental and natural resources management is important for achieving Agency priorities
- **Curated library of resources** across relevant ENRM areas of work
ACTIVITY 3.1: WILD FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE

Activity Name: Technical guidance on wild fisheries and aquaculture

INRM Activity Manager: Anila Jacob

USAID Activity Manager: Jenny Kane

Sustainable wild fisheries and aquaculture production systems are key to helping the Bureau for Resilience and Food Security (RFS) meet the U.S. Government’s Global Food Security Strategy objectives through the Feed the Future (FtF) initiative. To assist implementing partners design and implement FtF programs, RFS has developed a series of core topic guidance and supplemental guidance documents. To add to this collection, INRM has been working closely with USAID to produce two additional guidance documents around the contributions of wild fisheries and aquaculture to GFSS and Resilience objectives. These documents will address threats to wild fisheries and challenges to sustainable food systems, sustainable aquaculture production systems, and recommendations on how to design impactful interventions within the USAID context that support sustainable fisheries management and aquaculture systems that maximize development outcomes and minimize negative environmental impacts.

In Year 2, INRM will focus on completing revisions to these documents based on inputs from USAID and external reviewers. Once the revisions are complete, INRM will format and submit the final drafts.

OUTPUTS:
- Two ~10-page formatted guidance documents

ACTIVITY 4.3: COVID AND ENVIRONMENT

Activity Name: COVID and Environmental Programming (Year Two/Phases III and IV)

INRM Activity Manager: Meredith Wiggins

USAID Activity Manager: Daniel Abrahams

There is a complex relationship between the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and development projects working in the natural environment sector. The pandemic’s effects both directly affected ongoing and planned USAID environment programming, but also indirectly affected USAID’s work through issues like supply chains. As originally scoped, this activity was to be somewhat retrospective in nature, capturing actions and lessons learned. However, as the pandemic has continued, new variants have emerged, and new challenges have arisen, it has become clear that USAID Offices and Missions are increasingly interested in understanding the pandemic’s knock-on effects, sharing information and success-stories, and learning from each other. Consequently, FY 22 work planning discussions involved a rescope to address USAID’s changing needs.

Phase I of this activity encompassed an evidence synthesis review of approximately 150 peer reviewed articles as well as USAID documents from 49 ongoing or recently completed environment sector projects. Outputs consisted of a PowerPoint presentation and recorded walk-through of results, as well as the list of interview questions derived from the research. Phase II of the activity (nearing completion)
involves key informant interviews with Mission and Implementing Partner staff in South America, Madagascar, and Asia, as well as D.C.-based staff. Interview transcription and thematic coding are already underway.

During FY 22 Work Planning meetings, INRM and USAID decided that as originally proposed, the activity did not capture the ongoing pandemic’s effects. Based upon information gathered in Phases I and II, and in light of the continuation of the pandemic, Phase III and IV’s outputs were rescoped.

OUTPUTS:

- 3 - 5 guidance products for Missions or for different programs at different stages of the Program Cycle
- An interactive gathering for USAID staff to share information and capture learning
- A blog post or similar CKM product

**ACTIVITY 5.1: HEARTH MONITORING**

**Activity Name:** HEARTH Monitoring Activity

**INRM Activity Manager:** Mike Duthie

**USAID Activity Manager:** Sara Carlson

The activity will provide technical assistance for HEARTH activity monitoring, including the development of a core, customizable data collection and analysis package, to include common indicators, data collection instruments, and methodological guidance to enable standardization of monitoring, evaluation, analysis and learning across the HEARTH portfolio. This package will consist of modules for human well-being and biophysical/biodiversity indicators to measure key outcomes of interest, with the intention that individual HEARTHs will use the modules most relevant to their interventions.

OUTPUTS:

**Phase I:** Develop HEARTH Package of Data Collection Instruments and Methodological Guidance

- Excel-based data collection instruments
- Detailed guidance on how to collect data on each indicator/module, with reference as appropriate to existing PIRS and guidance on sampling (e.g., sample size considerations and sampling approaches)
- Guidance for choosing, collecting, and analyzing different types of data for the biophysical indicators

**Phase II:** Technical Assistance to HEARTH Missions During MEL Workshops

- HEARTH-wide webinar to socialize and increase Mission take-up of the monitoring toolkit and overall HEARTH MERL strategy
- HEARTH activity start-up workshops
  - Conduct training for MI2/USAID facilitators on monitoring toolkit
  - Participate in workshops for HEARTH activities that also have impact evaluations
Give overview presentation of monitoring toolkit for other activities

Phase III: Monitoring Support

- Direct technical assistance to Missions and/or implementing partners as requested, through ongoing monitoring and support throughout MEL plan implementation
- [PROVISIONAL] Scoping assessment for HEARTH indicator tracking system
- [PROVISIONAL] Data collection support as needed to HEARTH Missions

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

These outputs are not currently included in the FY 21 activity budget.

- Explore potential for publishing a paper, with the goal of disseminating the toolkit to the broader conservation community.
- Software program for data collection that can be adapted for each HEARTH

ACTIVITY 6.1: ENERGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Activity Name: Integration of Environmental Impacts in Power Sector Planning

INRM Activity Manager: Andrew Fang

USAID Activity Manager: Daniel Evans

Energy infrastructure typically damages and fragments natural landscapes, producing greenhouse gas emissions and loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services. As USAID and its partners work to meet the growing demand for electricity in developing countries, the extent of power lines and other energy infrastructure will continue to increase, raising questions about how to mitigate impacts on climate and the environment.

If energy infrastructure projects fail to integrate environmental risks into siting and planning, this also creates unintended costs for power-sector utilities, donors, and communities. Unfortunately, conventional environmental impact assessments often do not take place until project permitting begins, when it may be too late to minimize environmental damage and costs to project proponents and beneficiaries.

This activity aims to evaluate how USAID and its partners can better integrate environmental considerations in energy infrastructure planning. INRM will work with USAID’s Energy and Infrastructure (E&I) Office to assess and identify environmental tradeoffs of new energy infrastructure, mitigate environmental impacts, and reduce costs by proactively addressing risks.

USAID developed a scoping sheet for this activity and INRM is collaborating with USAID to refine the details.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS

- Conduct research and produce a report based on timely analysis and best available evidence to make a “business case” for private sector energy actors to reduce costs and improve reliability by proactively addressing risks.
• Draw on the evidence gathered for this report to pilot a strategic environmental assessment that would support energy infrastructure planning in a country where USAID is currently working, possibly Papua New Guinea.

**ACTIVITY 7.1: MAST**

**Activity Name:** Using Mobile Applications to Secure Tenure (MAST) for Integrated Decision-Making and Programming

**INRM Activity Manager:** Yuliya Panfil

**USAID Activity Managers:** Ioana Bouvier and Janet Nackoney

The “MAST Integration Activity” will educate Missions and other OUs about the value of MAST as a multi-sectoral and inclusive approach to assist a range of environmental sectors, including biodiversity conservation, sustainable landscapes, artisanal mining, and natural resource conflict prevention. It will do so through a combination of market research with implementing partners, communications, and technical assistance as needed to help organizations identify ways to integrate MAST into their work and rapid evaluations and highlight MAST’s potential value for non-LRG outcomes. Year two will continue to focus on the development of learning products that showcase potential non-LRG applications of MAST and will also support a virtual convening spotlighting such applications of MAST in Tanzania.

**OUTPUTS:**

- Workshop (likely virtual) with Tanzanian organizations and USAID/Tanzania leadership, discussing the applicability of MAST to non-LRG activities in Tanzania.
- “Beyond Tanzania” findings report, discussing the applicability of land and resource mapping for non-LRG activities in several countries, including Colombia, Ghana, Mozambique, Nepal, Liberia, and Zambia.

**New Action: Learning from MAST**

This activity will build on our work in year one to develop new communications, learning, and evidence products about the MAST approach. This activity will update Tanzania-related MAST materials with findings from the Land Tenure Assistance (LTA) implementation and will also develop new materials related to MAST/Zambia and MAST/Mozambique. It will use data generated by the LTA project to deepen the analysis of MAST in Tanzania. It will also provide early findings related to the LTA NGO, both as a sustainability plan for the LTA project and as a cost recovery model for land registration.

**ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:**

- A suite of MAST-related communications and learning products
- Analysis using LTA/Tanzania data (which now spans tens of thousands of land records)
- Communications and learning materials related to the establishment of the LTA NGO

**New Action: Participatory Mapping and Indigenous Populations**
This activity will build on 7.1 (MAST) to look at participatory mapping, whether through MAST or other approaches, as a technique to help indigenous populations maintain control and governance over their lands.

Evidence shows that programs that strengthen the rights of Indigenous Peoples and customary communities can conserve biodiversity and significantly reduce deforestation. Such approaches are also a cost-effective way to achieve conservation and climate change mitigation goals: research shows that securing indigenous land tenure is five to 42 times less expensive than the average cost of carbon dioxide trapped through fossil carbon-capture and storage. Yet despite the fact that 80 percent of global biodiversity lies within traditional lands, Indigenous Peoples have secure rights to only 20 percent of these lands (USAID, 2020). In response to these challenges, indigenous and customary groups across the world are using participatory mapping in novel ways to equip themselves to better conserve their forests and other resources.

In 2020 USAID released a series of “Effective Engagement with Indigenous Peoples” sector guidance documents, which provide guidance for how USAID will secure and promote the rights of Indigenous Peoples across multiple sectors and in service of multiple objectives. Several of these guides, including the “Sustainable Landscapes” guidance and the “Biodiversity” guidance, explicitly call for helping secure indigenous land and resource rights and improving the land tenure of indigenous populations.

Building on these guidance documents, this activity will spotlight the ways in which customary and indigenous populations use participatory mapping to secure their land and resource rights, in furtherance of climate change mitigation and biodiversity conservation objectives. The activity will leverage the findings of the evidence review conducted under INRM Activity 1.1 (observed linkages between PNRM and issues of equity and empowerment for Indigenous Peoples) and will showcase use cases and best practices from both within and outside of USAID, as well as challenges Indigenous Peoples face in conducting participatory mapping.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

- Briefs and communications products spotlighting the way indigenous and customary communities use participatory mapping towards biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation objectives.
- Update MAST learning platform with a “Participatory Mapping for Indigenous Peoples” section.

ACTIVITY 7.2: GEOSPATIAL ANALYSIS

Activity Name: Integration of Geospatial Analysis Environmental Programming

INRM Activity Manager: Yuliya Panfil

USAID Activity Managers: Ioana Bouvier and Janet Nackoney

The “Geospatial Integration Activity” will elevate integrated environmental geospatial analysis in coordination with the USAID GeoCenter, in order to highlight the value of geospatial analysis for integration across USAID’s environmental sectors. This activity will support and promote systematic use of geospatial analysis for environmental integration, building on experiences applying geospatial data and analytics to program design, 118/119 Analyses, and other cross-sectoral analyses. This integrated service
will provide critical insights to Missions and other OUs throughout the Program Cycle. The “Geospatial Integration Activity” will spotlight the expertise of Missions already excelling at applying geospatial data and analysis to environmental programming and will identify other Missions and OUs who may benefit from these services. In addition, the activity will proactively identify additional sectors and activities that can benefit from integrated environmental geospatial analysis, and work with these actors in coordination with the GeoCenter to improve their capacity for this analysis.

**OUTPUTS:**

- Case study of one Mission's integrated environment analysis (which will likely be an expansion of a sustainable landscapes opportunity analysis in Papua New Guinea).
- Learning and communications materials to increase awareness of the use of geospatial analysis for environmental integration and its benefits for informing the program cycle.
- “Road Show” to showcase integrated environmental analysis to several other Missions.

### ACTIVITY 7.3: LRG RESEARCH

**Activity Name:** Integrated Research LRG Activity

**INRM Activity Manager:** Yuliya Panfil

**USAID Activity Managers:** Caleb Stevens and Ioana Bouvier

The “Integrated LRG Research Activity” will continue to scope the demand for integrated LRG research and conduct demand-driven research to build the evidence base for LRG as a tool to achieve their environmental outcomes, in particular but not exclusively related to climate change and natural climate solutions. In year two, the “Integrated LRG Research Activity” will publish an academic paper on the links between land use change, governance, and viral zoonoses.

**OUTPUTS:**

- Manuscript for submission to a peer-reviewed publication and report on the links between land use change, governance, and viral zoonoses.

**New Action: Zoonosis Virtual Exchange**

In year one, LRG hosted a meeting series on the intersection of land use change, governance, and viral zoonosis. The meeting series was attended by the USAID Land and Resource Governance and Biodiversity Divisions and outside experts and resulted in a concept note that distills the intersection between land use change, governance, and zoonoses, and proposes USAID programming within this niche.

In year two, the LRG Division will build on this meeting series and concept note by hosting a larger virtual exchange on this topic, bringing together internal and a few external stakeholders. The event will broaden the discussions held in year one to capture the role of livestock, agriculture, and the wild meat supply chain in viral zoonotic spillover, as well as a focus on the gender dimensions of this phenomenon. The goal of the virtual exchange would be to present high-quality science on this topic to a wider variety of stakeholders, and to jointly decide how to make this science actionable for programming.
ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

- Virtual exchange
- Communications and learning products capturing the findings of the virtual exchange

**New Action: LRG Research Expansion**

Activity 7.3 (“LRG Research”) is expected to continue throughout the duration of the INRM contract, with new research and related products being added each year. In year two, this activity will pursue two research-related activities, see Section 4 under Learning, Research, and Evidence for More Effective Gender and Environment-related Decision Making and Programming for more details.

**ACTIVITY 7.4: COMMUNICATING LRG**

**Activity Name:** Communicating How to Integrate Land and Resource Governance Across Development Sectors

**INRM Activity Manager:** Karol Boudreaux

**USAID Activity Managers:** Yuliya Panfil

This communications activity is designed to help Missions and other OUs integrate LRG activities into their programming. Many USAID OUs understand that LRG is critical to the success of their non-LRG programming, but may not know their options (i.e., funding, technical assistance, and Program Cycle development) for integrating LRG into their existing or new programs. This activity is meant to develop simple reference sheets that inform OUs of their options for integrating LRG into their programs, and short case studies that show examples of successful stand-alone and integrated LRG programs.

**OUTPUTS:**

- Two to five reference sheets on how to integrate LRG activities with non-LRG programming (of note, the number of reference sheets depends on how many, if any, are published in year one)
- Two case studies that show examples of successful integrated LRG programs
- Two case studies that show how two countries have programmed land over a lengthy period

**New Action: Expanded LRG Comms**

This activity will provide communications support across the LRG division’s portfolio, focusing on (but not exclusive to) the broad topics of climate change, democracy and governance and humanitarian assistance. This communications support will work to achieve three goals:

1. Create more visibility for LRG Division’s existing integrated products
2. Create more internal visibility for LRG Division and LRG work, as it integrates with other major workstreams / earmarks
3. Create more external visibility for LRG as a topic of integration, and the LRG Division as experts and thought leaders
ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

- External “The Front Burner” public speaker series hosted with New America, on hot topics and urgent issues at the LRG interface. We will emphasize ties with the Administrator’s priorities: COVID-19, climate, corruption, democracy. Each event will be accompanied by written collateral.
- Internal webinar series on integrating LRG with the GFSS, Climate Change Strategy and other Agency priorities
- Promotion and audience engagement around integrated LRG research, through the LandLinks newsletter

ACTIVITY 8.1: MI2 EVALUATION

Activity Name: MI2 Evaluation (Activity 8.1)

INRM Activity Manager: Mike Duthie

USAID Activity Manager: Kyle Rearick

The activity will consist of a performance evaluation of the USAID Measuring Impact II (MI2) Activity. MI2’s goal is to enhance the effectiveness and impact of USAID biodiversity conservation and integrated programs, through strengthening the adoption of adaptive management in Agency business processes, increasing capacity and motivation of key Agency stakeholders, and reinforcing the use and value of evidence and learning. INRM will conduct a performance evaluation of MI2 to inform USAID learning and program decisions related to MI2 and future similar programming.

OUTPUTS:

- A 20 - 30-page evaluation report outlining findings, conclusions and recommendations based on evaluation questions that will be mutually agreed with USAID during an inception phase. This report may include 2 - 3 case studies for selected missions, depending on the design agreed during the inception phase.
- Presentation for USAID staff on evaluation results
**ACTIVITY 9.1: NATURAL RESOURCES-RELATED CONFLICT**

**Activity Name:** Improving Natural Resources Governance for Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding

**Current Activity 9.1:** Environment and Natural Resources-related Conflict and Violence Prevention: Documenting the Evidence

**INRM Activity Manager:** Jeff Stark

**USAID Activity Managers:** Kim Thompson and Daniel Abrahams

This activity will build on the findings from the catalogue of the intersections of USAID programming in natural resources/conflict and the set of related issue briefs produced during INRM’s Activity 9.1 on “Environment and Natural Resources-related Conflict and Violence Prevention: Documenting the Evidence” (May 2021 - April 2022).

Inclusive, transparent, and accountable natural resource governance can help societies increase trust and strengthen resilience. Many environmental interventions focus on facilitating institutional arrangements and behavioral change to improve NRM, identify the rights and responsibilities of resource-users, and ensure equitable outcomes. By integrating conflict sensitivity, context monitoring, and adaptive management, environmental interventions can produce enhanced development outcomes that support conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

This activity will develop a series of short technical briefs on important and actionable issues related to the integration of peace and conflict dynamics into natural resources governance programming. The briefs will provide succinct summaries of the evidence, program connections, relevance, and timeliness of these issues for Environmental and Natural Resource Management working groups, regional bureaus, Missions, and USAID operating units. The following is an illustrative list of possible subject areas. The first three topics take advantage of evidence collected (or emerging) through other INRM activities:

- Integrating conflict prevention and peacebuilding into the formalization of ASM (INRM is collecting evidence on ASGM for the Mission in Colombia and will be conducting an impact evaluation on ASM in Central African Republic).
- Experiences and lessons learned in participatory natural resource management, dispute resolution, and conflict reduction (INRM has conducted a systematic evidence collection on PNRM and democratic outcomes, a subset of which addresses conflict management/mitigation)
- Natural resource governance partnerships between government, communities, and the private sector for cooperation on resource use and benefit sharing (INRM’s work on HEARTH activities can help to define and structure this topic area)

**Additional topic areas may include:**

- Recent experiences of women’s groups in NRM, conflict prevention, and peacebuilding
- Information gathering in support of sanctions to tackle grand corruption
- Land and resource rights as components of strategies to reduce fragility
- Addressing compound environmental risks through NRM to increase climate security
- Strengthening the involvement and capacity of local government to support community stability through improved NRM
• Understanding the role of criminality and kleptocracy in environment-related conflicts to strengthen related programming (e.g., cattle rustling)
• Conflict early warning systems in rural areas prone to ethnic/group conflict (e.g., farmers, herders)
• Enhancing protection of environmental defenders
• Biodiversity as key to environmental peacebuilding

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

These outputs are not currently included in the FY 21 activity budget.

• Short, technical briefs as described above, formatted for both internal and external audiences
• Webinar for USAID staff and IPs to present the results of selected technical briefs
• Briefing to the Front Office of interested Mission(s), including summary of main findings and their relevance to Agency’s goals and the Mission’s work
4. BUY-INS

WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

INRM Activity Manager: Sue Telingator

USAID Activity Manager: Corinne Hart; Georgia Hartman

In collaboration with the DDI GenDev and EEI INRM will support actions in Missions and Washington to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment internally across USAID’s environment and climate change programming. To direct the scoping and programming of INRM’s WEE-related activities, INRM and GenDev identified three priority areas to help advance gender equality and women’s empowerment internally at USAID and externally with USAID implementing partners. The first area focuses on developing guidance, tools, and resources to help mainstream gender in USAID environment programming; the second area will explore opportunities to provide direct support to women’s organizations on the ground to build capacity and strengthen efforts to address environment-related challenges; and the third will support actions that increase learning, research, and evidence for more effective gender and environment related decision making and programming.

1. Developing guidance, tools, and resources to help integrate gender in USAID environment programming

Approved Activity: WEE Needs Assessment

This activity will identify the specific processes and resources that are needed to better support gender integration into environment sector programming decisions, including templates, checklists, and other tools, best practices, and evidence gaps—all of which will strengthen programming and improve outcomes. The first action INRM will support is a needs assessment to help USAID determine the programming needs or gaps that prevent more effective gender integration in environment sector investments.

2. Supporting Women’s Efforts to Address Environmental Challenges

New Action: Funding for Local Women’s Groups

The WEE Buy-In will provide financial support to local women’s organizations to strengthen their capacity to achieve gender-responsive environment and climate change outcomes. Strategically, by providing the money directly to local groups, GenDev hopes to achieve locally sustained results and build solution-driven networks.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS

• Identification and funding for four to five local women’s groups whose efforts contribute to environment and climate change programming and policies. Groups will be identified using an iterative, competitive process involving contract mechanisms such as requests for proposals and expressions of interest.
• Deliverables from each local women’s group commensurate with the strategic objectives developed during the activity design process.

3. Learning, Research, and Evidence for More Effective Gender and Environment-related Decision Making and Programming

New Activity: Land and Resource Governance Research and Virtual Exchange

INRM WEE buy-in will support a Land and Resource Governance research activity that examines women’s empowerment in Ethiopia, Zambia, and Tanzania, specifically on how women’s land rights impact women’s economic empowerment. The Land and Resource Governance research and virtual exchange is a part of the INRM portfolio of Washington-based activities, specifically Activity 7.3, “Integrated LRG Research Activity” and will be implemented in collaboration with DDI and administered by INRM’s sub-contractor, New America. INRM’s GESI Lead will serve as technical advisor. **A scoping sheet has been developed for this activity and is with USAID for review.**

**ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:**

• The research will use realist synthesis or other robust systematic methods to assess evidence from impact evaluations in the geographic target areas for publication in a high-impact journal.

• Additionally, the WEE buy-in funding will support a one-day virtual exchange on governance, land use change, and zoonosis, focused on interventions that can mitigate risks around land and resource governance while ensuring equitable outcomes, with a specific focus on women and girls and the issues they face at the forest/landscape edge.

New Action: Learning Agenda and Research

Currently, there is no USAID gender-responsive learning agenda for environment and climate change. The Learning Agenda activity will follow USAID guidance on [good practices in establishing learning agendas](#). It will be implemented in collaboration with INRM’s key partner for research and evidence synthesis, the American Museum of Natural History Center for Biodiversity and Conservation.

**ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:**

• A set of learning questions aimed to address critical knowledge gaps that impede design and implementation of gender-responsive environment and climate change programming

• Learning activities to help answer those questions

• Human-centered knowledge products aimed at sharing findings and applying learning to ongoing and future work
COLOMBIA MINING HORIZON

INRM Activity Manager: Daniel Evans

USAID Activity Manager: Gustavo Vargas (USAID/Colombia)

Mining Horizon strengthens the Government of Colombia’s capacity to govern artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM), and to mitigate the impacts of informal gold mining on the environment. The activity also responds to the Colombian Government’s request for technical assistance to strengthen formalization of the mining sector and to train miners in good mining practices. The geographic focus for this activity is in the regions most affected by illegal/informal ASGM, i.e., Antioquia, Chocó, and a third department to be selected. This buy-in will focus on improving the existing ASGM e-learning platform, supporting mining formalization clinics, encouraging expert knowledge exchange, facilitating dialogue among key stakeholders, and developing a cross-cutting learning agenda.

OUTPUTS:

- Create at least 10 new e-learning training modules
- Host at least one clinic per department in three departments: Antioquia, Chocó, and a third TBD
- Host six virtual learning exchanges
- Host two virtual, solutions-oriented stakeholder dialogues
- Produce an ASGM systems map, a research and learning agenda, and a research strategy

HEARTH MADAGASCAR BASELINE

INRM Activity Manager: Mike Duthie

USAID Activity Manager: Ramy Razafindralambo (USAID/Madagascar)

The USAID/Madagascar Mission is planning three HEARTH activities to operate under the SEED Office’s Conservation and Communities Project (CCP). CCP aims to help conserve biodiversity, promote resilient livelihoods that provide alternatives to unsustainable natural resource management practices, and take concrete actions to secure effective local ownership and management of natural resources. This scope of work focuses on the three HEARTH activities: TSIRO, MARISA, and MIARAKAP. Consistent with HEARTH’s focus on engaging private-sector partners, each of the activities are partnerships with private-sector actors in Madagascar. The activities are meant to help businesses and local communities co-invest in economic growth sectors, expand community-based and market-driven livelihoods, and provide alternatives to unsustainable natural resource management practices.

INRM will design and conduct baseline data collection using household surveys for indicators selected by USAID and HEARTH implementing partners. Additionally, INRM will support each project’s implementing partners in collecting and analyzing environmental monitoring data. Finally, INRM will conduct analysis to assess change in tree cover in forested areas near the TSIRO intervention area. Additional information about data collection, analysis, reporting, and technical support for each project is given below. During FY 21, INRM designed and started the baseline for the first of the three activities (TSIRO). The reporting and forest cover analysis for TSIRO and baseline support for MARISA are expected in FY 22. Support for MIARAKAP is also anticipated in the second half of FY 22.
OUTPUTS:

- 20 - 30-page baseline report for TSIRO, including forest cover analysis.
- 20 - 30-page baseline report for MARISA
- A brief guidance document for MARISA implementing partners outlining standardized monitoring approaches for key indicators collected by NGO partners
- A brief guidance document for MIARAKAP implementing partners outlining recommended approach to standardized data collection (this may be produced in FY 23)
- Presentations to USAID on each deliverable

ASIAN GREY TIMBER ANALYSIS (AGTA)

INRM Activity Manager: David Abrahamson/Tom Erdmann

USAID Activity Manager: Todd Johnson

Intra-regional timber trade in the Asia-Pacific region is a critically important economic activity. However, the timber trade faces many challenges, including overharvesting, illegal harvests, and various methods of minimizing national fiscal and societal benefits. The global trade in illegal wood products has been estimated to be worth $50-150 billion annually (INTERPOL, 2020), and the World Bank calculated fiscal losses of $6-9 billion in forgone tax revenues by countries with high rates of illegal logging in 2019 (World Bank, 2019).

Of particular concern, there are no comprehensive data on the volume of “partially legal” or “grey” timber trade. This includes timber and/or timber products with permits or other paperwork obtained through illicit or improper means, e.g., bribery, intimidation, political patronage, or other unsanctioned practices. A robust estimate of the volume and value of grey timber is necessary to achieve transparent documentation and traceability of sourcing. INRM is working with USAID/Asia Regional to produce an analysis of intra-regional trade in timber and other wood products to estimate the volume and value of grey timber being traded, identify strategically targeted interventions to improve forest governance and sustainable management of forests in the region, and contribute toward reducing forest conversion by increasing the financial viability of forest-based enterprises.

OUTPUTS

- A report on a desk study about the volume and value of grey timber traded annually within the Asia-Pacific region
- A brief description (not to exceed 10 pages) of the proposed methodology for a robust, refined methodology for estimating the volume and value of grey timber traded annually in select forest industry commodity chains in select countries in the Asia-Pacific region
- A brief report (not to exceed 15 pages + annexes) of the preliminary results of the analysis for review and revision as needed
- One or more expert consultation sessions to “ground-truth” preliminary findings of the analysis and co-create a provisional set of strategically targeted interventions aimed at reducing or removing grey timber in the commodity chains analyzed
- A synthesis report (not to exceed 10 pages) summarizing key highlights from the consultation event(s)
• A dissemination plan (not more than 5 pages) including a description of intended audiences, key messages for each audience, and proposed means of dissemination to reach that audience.
• Produce and submit a package of materials for dissemination to each selected audience. Materials may include inter alia research papers for submission to academic journals, infographics, tweets or other social media postings, a full report on the analysis and its findings, an executive summary of the full report, two-page flyers with highlights and links to other materials, blogs for industry publications (online or print), press releases or other media-focused materials, or other materials as appropriate.
• Disseminate the materials to their intended audiences and to the extent possible track initial reactions by each audience.

ZAMBIA IMPACT EVALUATION

INRM Activity Manager: Mike Duthie
USAID Activity Manager: Caleb Stevens

Zambia Kafue Impact Evaluation – Feasibility Assessment

The activity will consist of a desk-based feasibility assessment to inform design options for a potential Impact Evaluation (IE) of the HEARTH Global Development Alliance Eastern Kafue Alliance for Nature and Prosperity activity. This includes identifying illustrative IE design options that meet Agency-wide HEARTH, and Mission learning interests and are considered feasible for a credible assessment of impacts, should USAID decide to conduct an IE of the activity. This feasibility assessment will be an iterative process that includes a combination of desk-based document review and analyses of existing relevant data, and a small number of scheduled telephone and/or follow-up email discussions with USAID and implementing partners. The team will work towards gathering the information needed to construct a set of IE design options, associated illustrative budgets, and recommendations for USAID regarding the strengths and limitations of each.

OUTPUTS

• Develop up to three feasible IE design options and associated illustrative budgets. The illustrative IE design options may vary across scope of evaluation learning interests covered by the proposed design and/or methodological approaches. These options will be discussed substantively with USAID.
• Develop and finalize a draft, second draft, and final IE feasibility assessment report, not to exceed 40 pages excluding any annexes.

New Actions: If a rigorous IE of Activity impacts is determined feasible, and USAID decides it would like to conduct such an activity, it is expected that the impact evaluation would launch in early 2022.
DRC GORILLA COFFEE ALLIANCE IMPACT EVALUATION

INRM Activity Manager: Mike Duthie

USAID Activity Manager: TBD

The activity will consist of four sub-tasks, including a Feasibility Analysis, Impact Evaluation Design, Baseline Study and One-Year Tracking Survey for the USAID/DRC Gorilla Coffee Alliance, a public private partnership through the HEARTH Global Development Alliance (GDA). The Gorilla Coffee Alliance GDA seeks to improve livelihoods and economic well-being, nutrition, access to WASH and health services, and conservation of tree cover and biodiversity, both on-farm and in the adjacent Kahuzi Biega National Park. It is anticipated that the impact evaluation supported by this scope of work will be quasi-experimental.

OUTPUTS:

- **Feasibility Analysis**: The team will present quasi-experimental design options for the IE, as well as our recommended approach, to USAID.

- **Impact Evaluation Design**: The team will develop an evaluation design report with the approach determined based on the feasibility analysis, including a detailed sampling plan.

- **Baseline Study**:
  - **Data Collection**: Qualitative interview guides, quantitative survey questionnaires, and biophysical data collection tools will be developed and translated into local languages as appropriate. The team will prepare for enumerator training (including development of manuals) and undertake pre-testing and piloting for all instruments. After all preparations are in place, enumerator training and data collection will be conducted.
  - **Analysis and Reporting**: Data will be prepared and cleaned, before analysis and preparing the report with baseline findings. The team will also prepare de-identified data for publication in line with USAID policies.

- **One-Year Tracking Survey**: The team will design, plan, and implement a tracking survey to reduce potential attrition/loss of respondents between the baseline survey and subsequent midline and endline data collection.

Provisional Activities: Currently available funding will support the initial stages of this impact evaluation (see list of outputs/deliverables above). Additional funds will need to be sought for the following tasks: midline data collection planning and implementation, a subsequent tracking survey, endline data collection planning and implementation, impact evaluation analysis, and any ex-post evaluation-related data collection tasks.
5. PROVISIONAL TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

The activities in this section are designated as provisional and include new activities that emerged from discussions with USAID. These activities will be scoped further in FY 22 at the direction of the COR.

DDI-RFS JOINT STATEMENT: GFSS ACTIVITY

INRM Activity Manager: Yuliya Panfil

USAID Activity Managers: TBD

The newly updated DDI-RFS Joint Statement provides a framework for USAID’s approaches to LRG in the context of resilience and food security, and identifies key areas of mutual interest between the LRG Division and the RFS Bureau, in line with the draft Global Food Security Strategy refresh.

INRM will develop and socialize guidance for Missions on how to implement the newly refreshed GFSS as it relates to a range of natural resource management and LRG topics, in the context of climate change.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

- Short briefs outlining how to implement the newly refreshed GFSS as it relates to a range of natural resource management and LRG topics, in the context of climate change.
- Series of brownbags, webinars or other events meant to introduce the content of the briefs to relevant OUs, field questions and offer support.

DDI-RFS JOINT STATEMENT: MIGRATION AND FOOD SECURITY ACTIVITY

INRM Activity Manager: Yuliya Panfil

USAID Activity Managers: TBD

The newly updated DDI-RFS Joint Statement provides a framework for USAID’s approaches to LRG in the context of resilience and food security, and identifies key areas of mutual interest between the LRG Division and the RFS Bureau, in line with the draft Global Food Security Strategy refresh.

Climate change-driven events (including deteriorating environmental conditions like coastal erosion and deforestation, and environmental emergencies like typhoons) are forcing populations to leave their homes in search of more arable land, more durable water resources, and more sustainable economic opportunities. Experts predict that by 2050 the world will host hundreds of millions of climate migrants, and many of the countries in which USAID works are already either source countries or destination countries for climate migrants.
How should the Agency think about the problem of climate migration, and how does land and resource governance play a role in both the decision for populations to leave their homes and the ease with which they are able to integrate into destination countries?

Aligned with the Joint Statement, and building on scoping conducted in Y1 under Activity 7.3 to analyze the ways in which climate change is driving migration, Activity 7.6 will implement actionable analysis related to the ways in which different LRG regimes impact resilience to climate shocks and bear on climate migration outcomes (both for source and destination countries). The activity may initially focus on Madagascar, where South – North migration is leading to unsustainable land use and land conflicts. The activity will broaden its findings from Madagascar to discuss how they may be relevant to other countries experiencing climate migration. Other countries/Missions of interest may include: Sahel Regional Mission; Central Africa Regional Mission; Philippines; Indonesia; India; Uganda; Sahel Regional Mission; and West Bank/Gaza or other MENA Missions.

**ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:**

- Climate migration analysis for Madagascar.
- Global analysis that frames the issue of migration as it relates to climate change and resilience and explains the ways in which LRG considerations bear on migration.
- CKM products related to these analyses, including one-pagers and programming guides for Missions.

**ENRM LEARNING AGENDAS**

**Provisional Activity Name:** Mapping the Landscape of ENRM Learning Agendas

The activity will provide technical assistance for implementing the ENRM Framework and supporting cross-Agency learning for the nine ENRM focal areas. This activity will consist of an analysis of existing USAID research and learning agendas to identify common learning questions and potential synergies across groups under each focal area; the beta development of a database for linking learning agenda topics and tracking research activities; and a series of focal area-themed tech talks to promote awareness, learning, and collaboration across Offices and Missions, across the ENRM portfolio.

**ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:**

INRM proposes a modular structure for this activity, meaning the activities listed below can be mixed and matched depending on ENRM needs. Module 1 is a foundational activity and can be paired with one or a combination of 2, 3, and 4.

- Module 1: Identify shared learning questions across existing Research & Learning Agendas
- Module 2: Identify and define networks of actors engaged in learning and research across shared topic areas
- Module 3: Develop pilot interactive data portal
- Module 4: Develop and implement a knowledge sharing strategy to disseminate findings and support learning network
INTEGRATED INDICATORS

Integrated approaches are based on the premise that synergies or interactions among interventions that span two or more sectors will generate benefits such as improved development outcomes or operational benefits. However, monitoring and evaluation for integrated programs can be or be perceived as being more challenging and/or costly when compared to single sector programs. In the environment and natural resources sector, not accounting for the contributions of ecosystem services to development outcomes limits our ability to identify, quantify, and conserve the often critically important inputs biodiversity provides. Across all sectors, incomplete MEL of the costs and benefits of integration limits our capacity to compare the value of integrated versus single sector programming. Advancing the practice of MEL for integration should help decision makers determine when to choose integration over single sector approaches and inform the design and implementation of integrated programs.

Building on previous USAID work, including the integrated MEL guidance document (USAID Office of Forestry and Biodiversity, 2020) and INRM’s support to HEARTH MERL, this activity will produce a short document describing how to identify what integration means within the context of an integrated ENRM program and the pathways through which different sectoral outcomes are expected an effect on the overall targets/goals.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUT:

- A 10 to 15-page document outlining high-level considerations for the design of integration indicators, and including an illustrative example showing the application of integration indicators in an ENRM activity.

CLIMATE AND BIODIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING

USAID Missions across the globe are experiencing climate change in different ways, which affects how they design programs and the kinds of support and information they need. This provisional activity will explore how to better address climate-change-driven biodiversity loss and integrate climate change considerations into biodiversity programming. The Biodiversity Division is interested to know how Missions have undertaken climate-smart biodiversity programming and what information they may need in order to help communities and ecosystems to adapt and be more resilient. Specifically, USAID Washington wishes to assist Missions in:

- Understanding how climate change’s ongoing impacts have affected existing programs
- Building-in climate-smart objectives for future programming, and
- Identifying tools for decision-making and developing guidance for their use

Below is a list of potential activities that INRM proposes, based upon discussions with USAID colleagues (*denotes options where other USAID Offices have suggested similar products and may be interested in collaboration). Although this list has tried to explore stated interests, it should not be seen as prescriptive or exhaustive, and instead represents a range of potential opportunities for further exploration.
ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUTS:

- **Climate/Biodiversity “Landscape Analysis”**: Provide a broad perspective on the current state of knowledge on integrating climate-smart approaches across the environment sector, and in global policy/research/practice.

- **USAID Climate/Biodiversity “Opportunities Analysis”**: Conduct an opportunity analysis to identify synergies and leverage points where relevant climate-smart approaches can be introduced. This analysis will examine what work has already been done in the Development sector as a whole, and specifically by USAID, in order to better understand current capacities and needs of USAID.

- **Targeted Climate Risk “Needs Assessment”**: Conduct a needs assessment across selected Missions to identify outstanding challenges and critical needs for technical and conceptual tools to integrate climate considerations into Biodiversity programming. This needs assessment would assess what is needed to mainstream climate in biodiversity programming for Missions. This activity would ideally build on the insights from outputs #1 and #2 above to assess potential synergies for action and leverage points to bring in tools and guidance to develop improved and responsive resources and guidance for future programming.

- **Piloting “Climate Advisory Services” for Missions**: These on-demand interactions would bring climate expertise directly to Missions to provide guidance on holistically integrating climate change considerations into programming. Working together with Missions to understand geographic, environmental, and capacity needs, information (including potential NbS/NCS approaches, methods and tools to integrate social, ecological, and climate considerations into biodiversity programmatic activity, policy/SDG/NDC linkages), could be 'packaged' into bespoke trainings, studies, or tools.

- **Share innovation and knowledge across the Agency**: INRM could design and facilitate an “Integration Summit” to envision future climate-smart programming across Biodiversity, Resilience and Natural Climate Solutions’ portfolios (including consideration of LRG issues and NbS/NCS intersections), with sector-specific capacity-building resources as outputs.

**NATURAL CLIMATE SOLUTIONS SUPPORT**

**Provisional Activity Name: Sustainable Landscape Opportunity Assessments**

USAID has developed a series of Sustainable Landscape Opportunities Analyses (SLOAs) for national and regional USAID missions. The goal of these analyses is to help missions develop Natural Climate Solutions (NCS) programming that maximizes emissions reductions and associated co-benefits. The approach to a SLOA is to (1) characterize the greenhouse gas emissions profile of each country or region, (2) identify land-based emissions mitigation opportunities, and (3) prioritize among those opportunities. The prioritization is based on four attributes for each potential mitigation opportunity:

- The magnitude of the biophysical potential for emissions reduction or sequestration enhancement
- The feasibility of the opportunity and its likelihood of success
- The cost per unit of emissions mitigation
- Co-benefits of the activity to other sectors, such as biodiversity, livelihoods, or other aspects of human well-being
In FY 22 INRM will support the development of assessments in countries where USAID directly supports NCS programming and USAID countries that do not program NCS funding but have potential opportunities to reduce land-based emissions through other sector programming.

ILLUSTRATIVE OUTPUT:

- SLOAs in NCS funded and non-funded countries that include cross-sectoral NCS considerations and provide recommendations that address national gaps in USAID and other donor programming.

**Provisional Activity Name: Natural Climate Solutions and Climate Risk Management**

Climate risk management (CRM) is required for nearly all USAID strategies, projects, and activities. INRM will collaborate with the NCS Division to scope actions that can help incorporate NCS into climate risk management screening and planning processes. This activity will be scoped further with INRM, NCS and other relevant USAID stakeholders in the first quarter of FY 22.
PEA AND ENRM

Political economy analysis (PEA) and environment and natural resource management programming

The DDI Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Center has requested support from INRM to develop and implement an activity related political economy analysis and environment and climate change programming. At the time of writing this draft of the work plan INRM has held one initial meeting with the DRG activity managers and is in the process of scheduling a follow-up meeting.

COCOA FOR CLIMATE PARTNERSHIP SUPPORT

**INRM Activity Manager:** Yuliya Panfil

**USAID Activity Managers:** Caleb Stevens and TBD

INRM will provide technical support for development of the first-year work plan for the Cocoa for Climate (C4C) Partnership, which is a 5-year partnership between USAID and Barry Callebaut Sourcing AG. The project will design and implement an Environmental Impact Bond and Payment for Ecosystem Services scheme to, among other things, reduce land-based GHG emissions by restoring native forest, especially in ecosystem corridors and large landscapes, and supporting sustainable agroforestry adoption in the cocoa sector. Initial implementation and testing will occur in Cote d’Ivoire, Ecuador, and Indonesia.

INRM will: 1) design and facilitate a work planning start up workshop with key stakeholders, including relevant USAID Operating Units and Missions, Barry Callebaut, and other private sector partners, and 2) conduct a pre-workshop assessment. Both tasks will focus on Côte d’Ivoire.

**OUTPUTS:**

- Draft C4C Assessment
- Final C4C Assessment
- C4C Work Planning Workshop
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