WWF *for a living planet*®

PROJECT TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT TEMPLATE

Extended Form, with Performance Ratings —due Dec 31ˢᵗ

This document consists of:
1) The report template (p. 1-5)
2) An annex with instructions on how to generate the ratings for each section (p. 6-15).

Detach and upload only the completed report. You can print out and refer to the annex as you complete the template.

Project Name:	Land of Snow leopards
Project Number:	MN0042.01
Project Start Date (FY):	01.Jan.2008 (FY09)
Date Report Completed (MM/YR):	Dec.2010
Report Completed By:	Onon Yondon

1. ACHIEVEMENTS AND SHORTCOMINGS (OVER THE <u>PAST 12</u> MONTHS)

A. Progress on Activities and Related Financial Issues (max. ¾ page)

(i) Provide a brief (3/4 page) summary of progress at the main activity level against the project workplan, highlighting any areas that are well behind schedule,

Objective 1.1. Institutional capacity of herder groups and local authorities is strengthened for rangeland management, which effectively addresses biodiversity conservation

Output 1.1. Herder community groups in the target area effectively manage their rangeland with respect to biodiversity needs

- As a result of successfully implementation of the new pastureland regulation, pasture condition was significantly improved and the caring capacity of pasture increased by 23% in Tsagaan Gol Island. This Island is a key bird habitat area with very conservation values. Local herders and decision makers are appreciative for good pasture condition. When herders move out of the island by 20th April the number of Dalmatian pelican increased from 4 individuals up to 18-27 as a result of practising improved pasture management. Total 113 households with 26047 livestock living in this winter and livestock number was decreased by 15500 due to 31 winter camps flooded and herders sold number of livestock in autumn. RUA organized an experience sharing meeting and 2 meetings with herders and local decisions makers in the reporting period.

Output 1.2. Biodiversity conservation is incorporated into land use plan of target area using landscape approach

- A training of methodology on wildlife monitoring to volunteer rangers of herder community groups of Jargalant and Bumbat Mountains was conducted and offered certificates for 14 volunteer rangers.
- During the CAP of Jargalant and Bumbat Mountain workshop in Jan 2010, participants initiated to establish free grazing area in Snow leopard main habitat, Rashaant valley of Khar-Us Lake NP. Total 12 households of 2 soums have lived in this valley during the year. Series consultative meetings and public awareness activities have been organized jointly with Administration of PA and soum governors. Soum Governor of Chandmani established an order for limited use pasture in Rashaant valley. Thus, the main outcome against the objective could be summarized as the Rashaant Valley remained free from the grazing from March to begin of November.
- Soums of the Jargalant and Bumbat Mountains have been focused for improving pasture use management through action plan of CAP. 44% of planned activities for High Mountains ecosystem, 31% of planned activities for Wetland ecosystem, 25% of planned activities for Dessert ecosystem of action plan of CAP were implemented in 2010.

Output 1.3. Reduced conflict between humans and SL

- Since 2007, WWF Mongolian office has initiated the Compensation scheme (The "Buy Goat for Snow Leopard" programme) for livestock predation by snow leopards in order to reduce the retaliation kill rate for snow leopards in Uvs aimag. The "Buy Goat for Snow Leopard" programme expanded and replicated to Bumbat and Jargalant Mountains based on monitoring survey. Conducted some surveys and investigations, we have selected and made contracts with eight herder families residing to the south of Bumbat Mountain in Khovd aimag for the project interventions.

Objective 1.2: Livelihood of herder groups improved through cooperative marketing and increased business skills
- An advanced training on wool and felt products design was conducted with financial and logistical support of WWF Mongolia with totally 24 wool masters of community groups from Uvs and Khovd provinces have been trained and certified. Camel wool thread training was organized jointly with Irves enterprice NGO for 6 new community groups.
- Members of some community groups of Uvs and Khovd provinces participated in the International Felt Festival 2010 which was held in Tuva, Russia. There were number of wool masters from many countries and provinces of Russia such as Abakan, Bashkorstan, Khakasia, Krasnoyarsk attending the event. Trade fair was displayed with various activities like wool processing, product making shows, competitions on several nominations and so on. Mongolian participants expressed their satisfaction as they have gained awards in 2 nominations, e.g. the best processed felt and best souvenir product. They were grateful to the organizers as they learned a lot from the masters of other countries. Contact with some of them is being maintained which would open new horizons to expand the existing market.
- As a result trainings, felt festival and felt catalogue, Jargalant Orgil herder community group has increased sale and earns about 4800 USD from felt products at international (Sweden and Russia) and domestic market.
- Since 2010, total 51 local people have working in bussiness incubator of Chandmani soum and 80% of those employers are our members of herder community groups.
- Organized Community development festival in soums by themselves.
- Recommendation and opportunities for improving business of community groups was elaborated by national expert.

Objective 2.1. The National Curricula on ESD is applied at local level and lessons' learned disseminated and communicated at national level

Objective 2.2. Linkage of ESD and Rural Development is ensured within the target areas

Objective 2.3: The technical capacity of WWF Mongolia on ESD is strengthened
The activity has been completed in FY08 and FY09.

Objective 3.1. The poaching Snow leopard and its prey species is stopped in the project area through strong law enforcement and increased public awareness (co-funding MN0033.02)

- The Mobile Anti-Poaching Unit (MAPU) "Irves-3" continued its collaboration with Police, Inspection Agencies and Khar-Us Lake NP. During the reporting period MAPU-5 team has carried out 4 joint patrolling in Gobi-Altai and Khovd provinces. Irves-3 team revealed two illegal hunting cases of Mongolian Saiga and Ibex and investigation process are in place and confiscated 14 guns, 600 marmot skins, 41 fishing nets and 1080 fishes. No Snow leopard poaching case recorded in the project sites of Uvs, Khovd and Gobi-Altai provinces in 2010.

(ii) quantify and explain any financial consequences related to activity implementation (e.g. any major deviations in budget or expenditure).

B. Project Conservation Achievement KPI

Rating :	Good

Complete the Conservation Achievement KPI rating table on the next page and enter the project rating in the box above. See Annex 1 for instructions on how to formulate the rating.

Conservation Achievement KPI Rating Table *(see guidelines in Annex 1 for completing the table)*

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (what you are measuring)	Baseline (value & date of measurement)	Current status (value & date)	Data Source/ Means of Verification	Planned Intermediate Result, & Yr.	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Achievement Rating
Objective 1.1. Institutional capacity of herder groups and local authorities is strengthened for rangeland management, which effectively addresses biodiversity conservation	BD considerations integrated into improved Rangeland Management for herder groups at least in 3 project sites Local authority capacity improved for effective rangeland and natural resources management	No Rangeland management	Regulation on pasture use of Tsagaan gol iseland (4soums) 90 percent implemented of regulation on Pasture use in 2010. Local government don't approve pasture use regulation	Local government Regulation of pasture use action plan (01Apr 2009) Monitoring report of Khar Us Lake PA	At least 60 percent implemented of regulation on Pasture use	100 percent	High
Objective 1.2: Livelihood of herder groups improved through cooperative marketing and increased business skills	Income of herder groups increased substantially: At least 3 marketing cooperatives established Marketing Plan and Strategies	………… Zero	…………. Business plans on Herder	Monitoring programme on data of herder community groups, WWF MPO	Income of herder groups increased substantially: by 10% at least against 2006 level	By 20% at least against 2006 level	Modest

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (what you are measuring)	Baseline (value & date of measurement)	Current status (value & date)	Data Source/ Means of Verification	Planned Intermediate Result, & Yr.	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Achievement Rating
	designed and implemented for cooperatives	No marketing plan	community groups' of joint marketing and information center in Khovd aimag and Business incubator center in Chandmani soum was developed in 2010.				
Objective 1.3: Enabling conditions for sustainable rangeland management created nationwide	Policy and regulatory framework documents revised and adopted with setting of the Think Tank and Lobby Groups at Parliament	Amendment of Pasture law	Mid-term action plan on pasture use management Pasture use management plans were developed in soum level	Order of aimag parliament by 5th meeting of Aimag Citizens' Hural			Modest
Objective 2.1. The National Curricula on ESD is applied at local level and lessons' learned disseminated and communicated at national level	At least 4 best cases from pilot schools are developed and communicated to other schools and relevant education institutions. A mechanism is created at	1.1. The Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MECS) plans to develop a separate curricula on ESD to be introduced in	Two more training sessions have been conducted for pilot schools supported by methodological hand-outs for teachers. Monitoring has been undertaken	Training reports and supporting methodological handouts for teachers from September 2008 to May 2010 Conference report, meeting notes and minutes from	7th training session is expected to be conducted in October in the pilot schools supported by methodological handbook for teachers. The final meeting to develop ESD framework is	The final session is expected to be held in April with the follow-up final evaluation An official framework	Good

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (what you are measuring)	Baseline (value & date of measurement)	Current status (value & date)	Data Source/ Means of Verification	Planned Intermediate Result, & Yr.	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Achievement Rating
	MECS to coordinate at least 3 donor organizations' activities in the field and management structure is clarified at all levels.	the academic year 2008-2009 2.2 Though several players are active in the ESD, namely SCD, GTZ and WWF, there's no coordinating mechanism at the policy level with each organization working within their own programs and priorities.	in line with the endorsed plan. By building the cases upon the national standards the Case methodology becomes an effective instrument for local curriculum implementation. At least 4 best cases from each pilot school have been identified and disseminated. The working group has been established to develop an official framework for ESD	September 2008 to June 2009	expected to be held within the first quarter of the FY	for ESD is expected to be approved within the second quarter of the FY	
Objective 2.2. Linkage of ESD and Rural Development is ensured within the target areas	Small entrepreneurship action plan for youth clubs is introduced at pilot schools of 4 soums	The formal training programme of schools does not provide enough business and entrepreneurship skills	Development and implementation of outreach initiatives by pilot schools supported for sustainable	Training and meeting notes and reports; project proposals submitted by clubs	Local schools' initiatives to promote ESD supported at 2 remaining schools; Monitoring will be undertaken	At least one initiative per club will be supported. Final	Good

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (what you are measuring)	Baseline (value & date of measurement)	Current status (value & date)	Data Source/ Means of Verification	Planned Intermediate Result, & Yr.	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Achievement Rating
			entrepreneurship activities the "Small scale business training" conducted within four pilot schools' teachers and school managers (about 160 participants) in Khovd province Local schools' initiatives to promote ESD supported at school level, a cooperation agreement was signed with the 2 pilot schools in Khovd aimag		regularly	assessment will be undertaken to evaluate the results	
Objective 2.3: The technical capacity of WWF Mongolia on ESD is strengthened	WWF MPO technical expertise on ESD improved for further application	The ESD is seen as separate component within the current Conservation Program of WWF MPO.	Draft ESD strategy of WWF MPO has been finalized as an internal document and is an integral part of the forthcoming Conservation	Training report ESD internal strategy	Consider the strategy while developing the SP for WWF MPO	The strategy is seen as an internal document to be further used in designing new	Good

Goals & Objectives	Indicator (what you are measuring)	Baseline (value & date of measurement)	Current status (value & date)	Data Source/ Means of Verification	Planned Intermediate Result, & Yr.	Planned Final Result, & Yr.	Achievement Rating
			Strategic Plan.			project proposals and planning new activities.	
Objective 3.1. The poaching Snow leopard and its prey species is stopped in the project area through strong law enforcement and increased public awareness	Number of cases on Snow leopard poaching and illegal trade in the project area		Zero	Report of MAPU Irves-3	Zero	Zero	High
							Good

C. Outcomes and Impacts Achieved (max. ½ page)

Describe succinctly the project's achievements and shortcomings in terms of outcomes and impacts delivered against its stated objectives and goals, and reporting information against the indicators and/or milestones in the strategic plan. The description should be a summary of the achievements and shortcomings as reflected in the Conservation Achievement KPI table. In your text, seek to explain specifically what role the project/WWF played in bringing about the achievements in its complex, multi-stakeholder environment.

Rural development component

400 SQ KM free grazing area was established in important bird habitat of Khar Us Lake NP. The Tsagaan Gol Island in limited zone of Khar-Us Lake NP, covering the territory of 400 km^2 with 63 islands remained free from the livestock grazing from 20 April to 15 November. Rangeland User Association (RUA) is established and capacity of members is strengthened which is resulted in regular advocacy and monitoring activities by locals themselves. Hence, the collaboration of RUA and Khar Us Lake NP, coordinated by WWF Mongolia, as a concrete result of improved pasture management, almost 100% out of more than 200 herders move out of Tsagaan gol island by 20th April as agreed with National Park authorities and based on common understanding of the carrying capacity. This island is a key bird habitat area with very high conservation values. In 2010, pasture carrying capacity is increased by 26-29 percent compared to 2009 and total 29 Dalmatian Pelicans inhabited this Island.

Soum decision makers initiated to freeing up from grazing core area of the Snow leopard in Jargalant Mountain of Khar-Us Nuur National Park. Implementation of this initiative requires building of confidence between herders and WWF and some investigations at specific sites on the effects of overgrazing on the rural economy. There are good prospects for establishing temporarily livestock free grazing areas for prey species of Snow leopard in the area as a first step, for several months of the year, at critical sites or at critical times of the year.

Education for Sustainable Development

The assessment made to evaluate the results of our complex activities, exceeded our expectations with nearly 80% of pilot schools' teachers have proper understanding of ESD principles and 50% acquired/used methodologies to integrate ESD concepts into curricula. Hence, the students became able to ground ESD concepts not only through formal education, but also in the course of extra-curricular activities.

D. Success Stories (max. ½ page)

Highlight any actions or successes meriting communications attention e.g. success stories (from A & C above), positive media coverage, new opportunities or partnerships, and major events.

FACTORS OF PERFORMANCE

"Factors of Performance" are the key practices, processes, systems or behaviours at the project, office or Network level, or those that external partners exhibit, that influence the ability of a project to achieve its goals and objectives. These factors are then essentially internal and/or external challenges or strengths a project encounters as it seeks to progress. The Monitoring and Reporting System monitors how these factors affect performance to provide any needed recommendations on how WWF can improve its effectiveness.

Sections 2-4 cover the factors of performance at the project level.

2. DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION (max. 1/3 page)

Rating :	Good

To develop the rating, see the instructions in Annex 2. Copy the overall Design and Implementation rating in the box above.

How did the design and implementation of your project enable it to or hinder it from making progress? For each of the design and implementation best-practice ratings (in Annex 2), provide a brief justification here explaining how the level of use of the best practice helped bring about the project's achievements and/or shortcomings (max. 1/3 page). In the explanation, reference should be made to the project's specific objectives and goals.

Team building and communication of project implementation team is good in the field and main office. Annual work plan was developed by project implementation team (conservation and communication teams) and all staff develops individual work plans based on the annual report. At least one time tele-meeting was conducted quarterly. The possible solutions to overcome challenges faced during the implementation of activities are intensively discussed in team. The pros and cons of those solutions are considered and appropriate decisions made as result of team work.

3. PROJECT SUPPORT (max 1/3 page)

Rating :	Good

To develop the rating, see the instructions in Annex 3. Copy the overall Project Support rating in the box above.

Describe how the level of support for the project (as defined by the elements in the table in Annex 3) posed challenges to or facilitated the project as it pursued its goals and objectives. Provide a brief explanation for each element's score, focusing on the main strengths and challenges and how they affected the project's progress (max 1/3 page). Reference should be made to the project's specific objectives and goals.

Achievements and lessons learned from the project is introduced for discussion to the country team meeting once a year and the work plans are being revised accordingly.

4. GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC INSTITUTION BEHAVIOUR (max. ¼ page)

Rating :	Modest

To develop the rating, see the instructions in Annex 4. Copy the overall Government/Public Institution Behaviour rating in the box above.

Provide a brief text in support of the rating, describing specifically how each of the elements of government/public institution behaviour (where applicable) influenced the project's ability to make progress. If there is more than one institution involved and an aggregate rating was assigned to them, or the institutions were grouped and then rated, indicate whether particular institutions or groups posed obstacles or showed strong support (max. ¼ page).

There has been a significant success at the local level. The Khovd aimag's Citizen's Representative's Khural has initiated an extensive discussion throughout the aimag to get feedbacks from residents for the sustainable pasture management issues. The main points have been summarized, introduced to decision makers through subsequent stages and get approved. The process was facilitated by number of organizations, including WWF.

The Government of Mongolia has been committed to implementing DESD and joining the global community in socially, economically and environmentally balanced development. The multi-disciplinary teams are currently working on improving the National Standards and one of the teams is responsible for integrating ESD concept and principles into all new curricula at all levels. This indicates that ESD is now streamlined at the policy level: education standard and curricula.

5. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES SAFEGUARDS (max. ¼ page)

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY EVERY TWO YEARS BEGINNING IN JULY 2009, i.e. 2009, 2011, etc.

Does the project affect indigenous peoples or are they in the geographical area of the project?
(Y/N) _N_____

If yes, provide the rating

Rating :	NR

To develop the rating, see the instructions in Annex 5. Copy the overall Indigenous Peoples Safeguards rating in the box above.

Describe what actions the project or office has taken to implement WWF policy principles on indigenous rights. Are there particular achievements or challenges associated with this work, or any support needs? (max. ¼ page)

6. RISKS TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS ACHIEVED (max. 1/3 page)

Rating :	Significant

To develop the rating, see the instructions in Annex 6. Copy the overall Risks to Sustainability of Results rating in the box above.

Based on the risks identified (in Annex 6) and any not included in the list, describe here *the top 3-4 ones* in terms of likelihood and impact to the project's achievement being sustained over the long-term. These may be the same as challenges discussed in earlier sections. What steps could WWF (including the project) take in the future to better ensure the sustainability of the gains made? (max. 1/3 page)

Even though a sustainable pasture management concept is in place at the Khovd aimag's level, there's a high risk at policy level since an appropriate national legal framework is still lacking within pasture management and monitoring aspects. The harsh winter resulted in Dzud, natural disaster affected the vulnerability of herders.

Төслийн хугацаа дууссаны дараа хамрагдсан сургуулиуд хичээлийн хөтөлбөртөө ТХ-ийн үзэл санааг тусгах, ТХБ чиг хандлагатайгаар үргэлжлүүлэн боловсруулах, сургалтандаа байнга ашиглах ажил нь сулрах магадлалтай тул энэ асуудалд анхаарлаа хандуулах, тогтвортойгоор цааш

7. SUMMARY OF CHALLENGES AND STRENGTHS, ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND LESSONS LEARNED

A. Summary of Challenges and Strengths Affecting Performance

Based on your analysis of the progress made, the factors affecting the project's performance, and any other difficulties or enabling conditions encountered, what were the main (i.e. top 3-4) challenges or strengths that your team thinks should be brought to the Network's attention?

- The local authorities were usually non-supportive with pasture management suggestions in the Tsagaan Gol Island. However, thanks to significant efforts of WWF Mongolia, this challenge was smoothly solved and resulted in bottom-up influence approach herders to authorities.
- To reach livelihood improvements, the products produced around KUNNP need to reach a wider market. Linking up and understanding the local market and the demands raised by clients locally are relatively easy. However, the further the market is, the more difficult is the understanding of market values and the opportunities and obstacles to establish reliable linkages to these markets. The process has reached a wider understanding and groups are now cooperating and even planning a common centre for information, technology of community groups in Khovd.
- Though the ESD assessment results were in general positive, schools still face challenges in terms of acquisition of integrated approach for ESD development as whole. Not all pilot schools have developed their overall plan directed to extend ESD vision.

B. Adaptive Management

(i) What are your recommendations on how the Network (including your office) should act on these challenges and strengths to help your project improve its performance?
(ii) What changes are needed to project objectives and activities? If changes have been made to your action plan (e.g. logframe) and monitoring plan and you are sending this TPR to a donor office, please attach the latest versions of your revised plans.

- In order to ensure the proper functioning and sustainability of the Centre for information and technology of community groups in Khovd, an national expert have developed recommendations for the business plan of this centre.
- ESD assessment team issued a recommendation to develop management plan for ESD incorporation in teaching curricula, build strong collaboration with schools and their teachers through organizing trainings and workshops, and reflect the knowledge in handbooks and training materials.

C. Lessons Learned

What are the 3-4 key lessons learned from the project that are relevant to others of its kind in WWF? These lessons may be with regard to the strategies or approaches used, internal capacity and coordination, experiences with partners and stakeholders, the project context, or any other issue.

- Changes in attitudes take time and short- term project objectives are often unrealistic and optimistic. To establish cooperation mechanisms and not least to build trust between partners requires consistency, patience and time. The project has been effective in many ways, but much of the positive outcomes have in several cases been noted late or even very late during the implementation. A long- term support with low level input is therefore considered more effective and sustainable than short term and intensive project implementation schedules.

- Changes come slowly and require nursing and continuous support. The project has been successful in changing the situation for herder groups. But to reach real and sustained impact, it is judged that there is a need for mentoring and advisory support for more than 5 years.

- Engagement at local level with pilot schools and simultaneously engage in policy level processes such as national standards has given the project credit and possibility to influence also policy issues. The engagement from MECS and policy level has given credit to the project and motivation for people at all levels to contribute to and engage in implementation. The current change in the school system from 11 to 12 years has also been a key factor and useful vehicle for change opening up interest in ESD and thereby possibilities to introduce ESD in various settings. Thereby, the experiences from local schools have been contributing to the policy and national curricula processes.

- The option of linking the ESD process with RD initiatives carries a lot of expectations and could show to be a highly effective tool to improve livelihoods among the poorest. Linking work in the schools with the reality and thereby the needs of the people and creates a strong linkage to development and thereby making schools using ESD agents for change towards sustainability and poverty reduction.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORMULATING THE PROJECT CONSERVATION ACHIEVEMENT KPI RATING

The project-level Conservation Achievement KPI rating is an assessment of the extent to which the project is achieving the (final or intermediate) goals and objectives set for itself for the reporting period. For developing the project-level KPI rating, the achievement of each goal or objective is rated separately and then these ratings are combined to give an overall rating. Only those objectives/goals that the project expected to have achieved or made progress on by the year it is reporting should be considered for the score.

The KPI scores for projects contributing to a priority programme will be rolled-up to develop a Conservation Achievement score for the programme. The scores for selected projects from each office will also be collected to generate office-level Conservation Achievement KPI scores for the WWOV.

The Process of Developing the Conservation Achievement KPI Rating Involves:

1. Filling in the Conservation Achievement KPI Rating table with the goals and/or objectives and information from the M&E plan of the project

2. Formulating an achievement rating for each of the goals and/or objectives based on guidelines provided below

3. Developing an overall KPI score for the project based on the individual goal/objective scores

1. *Completing the rating table*
In the Conservation Achievement table, list all the project's goals and objectives as stated in its strategic plan or project proposal along with the indicator(s), baseline, current status (i.e. what the project has actually achieved), the intermediate planned result (what the project aimed to achieve by this reporting period), and other information for each goal/objective. This information should come from the project's monitoring plan and the data that has been gathered.

2. *Formulating an achievement rating for each goal/objective*
Based on the guidelines below, score each goal/objective and enter it in the far-right column. Enter the appropriate color as well for each rating.

Goals, if defined according to the WWF Standards, reflect the impact (i.e. change in condition of a species, habitat or footprint) the project is aiming to achieve. An objective would state the threat to be reduced or the improvement in opportunities made in terms of a change in policy, practice or behavior that would make the impact possible. If your project does not include goals because its duration is too short to achieve impacts, list only the objectives. If you define goals differently (e.g. as objectives) or use other terminology, seek to fit it into the goal-objective framework if you can.

To score each objective/goal, compare your information in the "Current Status" column (i.e. what the result on the objective/goal actually is at the time of this reporting) to the "Planned Intermediate Result" (i.e. what result the project planned to achieve by this time) and assign the appropriate rating from the scale below.

If the project is still under implementation and not close to completion, do not base the rating on the extent to which the final objective/goal has been achieved, as this would most likely lead, unfairly, to a low rating.

It is not expected that every objective/goal will have a planned intermediate result. For those that do not, leave the rating area blank.

High — the objective/goal has been achieved entirely (or with an insignificant shortcoming), or the planned intermediate result (outcome, milestone or impact) has been entirely met	
Good — there were minor shortcomings in the achievement of the objective/goal, or there are minor shortcomings in the achievement of the planned intermediate result	
Modest — there were significant shortcomings in the achievement of the objective/goal, or there were significant shortcomings in the achievement of the planned intermediate result. **OR** the outcome or impact of the objective /goal is unknown because a monitoring plan for it was not developed and/or appropriate monitoring that gathered evidence for it did not occur *(NB: an objective/goal cannot receive higher than a Modest rating if no monitoring plan for it was developed or if no information is provided on results)*	
Low — the objective/goal resulted in a very weak or no result, or the achievement of the intermediate outcome, milestone or impact in the planned timeframe is very low	

In determining the ratings, it is important for the project team to use its judgment. Not all objectives and goals will necessarily have equal weight. Some may involve greater investment or be more important to achieve because other goals/objectives depend on them for their progress (e.g. policy objectives). If the most important objectives or goals are not being achieved, the rating assigned to them would have greater weight in the derivation of the overall rating. Similarly, if strong progress is being made on an objective or goal on which the others depend for their achievement, the overall rating could be pulled upward.

3. *Developing the project KPI score.*
Using the guidelines below, assign a score to the project and enter it in the shaded cell in the Conservation Achievement KPI Rating table in the template.

High — all or the vast majority of the objectives or goals were rated High
Good — all or the majority of objectives or goals were rated Good
Modest — all or the majority of the objectives or goals were rated Modest
Low — all or the majority of the objectives or goals were rated Low

ANNEX 2—DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Reporting on and scoring Design and Implementation as a factor of performance involves assessing how the level of use of key design and implementation best practices prevented or enabled the project to clearly achieve its intermediate or final goals or objectives. These best practices (listed in the table below) are based largely on WWF's Project and Programme Management Standards and would likely be needed for strong performance.

Why should teams continue to rate design-related elements after the project has begun? Usually, it is only after a project has been under implementation for some time, or has ended, that the strengths and weaknesses in planning are realized. Ideally, over time all the ratings should improve as a team becomes aware of the areas for improvement and addresses them through adaptive management.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING THE PROJECT

To develop the Design and Implementation rating, first use the scoring system below and rate each of the design and implementation elements in the table.

High — the element was fully present with no shortcomings
Good — the element was present with minor shortcomings
Modest — the element was only partially present and there were significant shortcomings
Low — the element was hardly or not at all present
Not Applicable

	The project:	Rating
1	Is fully relevant in that it is targeting the biodiversity most important to conserve and/or footprint processes most critical to reduce, and is in accord with the conservation and sustainable development agendas at the local, national, regional, and/or global levels	High
2	Has a clearly articulated scope (geographic and thematic); project partners have a shared vision of desired final project outcome	High
3	Has a clear and comprehensive understanding of context affecting conservation targets and footprint processes, including direct threats, indirect threats (drivers), opportunities, and their interlinkages; project has prioritized the most important direct threats for priority action; project has a clear and comprehensive understanding of stakeholders affecting/affected by the project and has taken strategic steps to engage them	High
4	Has selected strategies that are optimal in terms of economic/technical feasibility, affordability, WWF niche, likely impact on threats/targets/footprint, etc. [NB: strategies are groups of activities intended to achieve a particular result]	Good
5	Project has articulated SMART goals (corresponding to conservation targets) and SMART objectives (corresponding to selected threats/opportunities); project contains a clear and sound framework for how strategies will lead to desired results, reflecting all key assumptions and relationships of cause and effect. [NB: the use of other terms in place of 'goals' and 'objectives' is acceptable]	High
6	Project engages partners for implementation of activities considering relative niche, with clear partnership expectations, roles and responsibilities, and frameworks for decision making and communications; where necessary, partnerships are formalized with partnership agreements and governance structures; partners have all capacity necessary to carry out their responsibilities	Good
7	Project fully assessed the risks to achieving its objectives and goals and their long-term sustainability, and is taking measures to mitigate them	Good

	The project:	Rating
8	Project includes an M&E plan with indicators for all goals and objectives that are linked to the sequence of results determined by the project logic; indicators enable learning and adaptive management, and assess the extent to which goals and objectives are achieved, as well as WWF's contribution to them; the plan outlines monitoring methods and costs, and is practical and feasible	Modest
9	Project contains a clear budget identifying the financial resources over the lifetime of the project necessary to implement all activities; budget includes necessary provisions for salaries, coordination, training, and M&E costs	Good
10	Project has clear roles, responsibilities, and processes for the overall management of the project and for effective decision making; project management team practices strong communication and coordination and ensures it among all staff, including between conservation and operations	High
11	Project collects data against indicators defined in monitoring plan, regularly reviews progress and impact against goals and objectives, checks key assumptions, captures lessons, and adapts actions where necessary	Good
	Design and Implementation Rating (project-level)	**Good**

To develop the project-level rating, use the rating system below and enter the rating in the shaded cell in the table and in the project TPR.

High — all of the elements were rated High
Good — all or the majority of the elements were rated Good
Modest — all or a majority of the elements were rated Modest
Low — all or a majority of the elements were rated Low

ANNEX 3—PROJECT SUPPORT

The Project Support rating is an assessment by the project team of the quality of funding, management and capacity support that the donor NOs, Shareholder Groups and/or programme lead units, offices and Network as a whole, provided or are providing to the project as it seeks to achieve its goals and objectives. While design and implementation is largely the responsibility of the project team, for the team to conduct its work it needs the support of the Network. Adequate levels of support are critical for a project to be able to accomplish its aims. The Project Support rating is therefore an opportunity for the project team to explain how the level of support hindered or enabled performance.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING THE PROJECT

To develop the Project Support rating, first use the scoring system below and rate each of the project support elements in the table.

High — the element was fully present with no shortcomings
Good — the element was present with minor shortcomings
Modest — the element was only partially present and there were significant shortcomings
Low — the element was hardly or not at all present
Not Applicable

	The project:	Rating
1	Is receiving the financial support necessary to allow the project to achieve its objectives/goals (in the medium term at least), meets the stated commitments of the donors, is made available in a timely manner	High
2	Is receiving NO and/or office funding that is sufficient or flexible to allow for quality project planning, M&E, capacity strengthening, and adaptive management	High
3	Possesses all the relevant disciplines (e.g. technical, project management, M&E, communications, finance, operations, etc.) and support systems (HR, finance, IT, etc.) at the capacity levels necessary for successful planning and implementation; capacity gaps are filled in a timely manner	Good
4	Is receiving appropriate and timely management support from governing/senior management bodies/programme coordinator in terms of actions to address project needs or opportunities	Good
	Overall Project Support Performance Rating (project-level)	**Good**

To develop the project-level rating, use the rating system below and enter the rating in the shaded cell in the table and in the project TPR.

High — all of the elements were rated High
Good — all or the majority of the elements were rated Good
Modest — all or a majority of the elements were rated Modest
Low — all or a majority of the elements were rated Low

Again, judgment needs to be used in developing the overall rating, as some elements may be more important for the project than others and thus their rating should be given the appropriate weight.

ANNEX 4—GOVERNMENT/PUBLIC INSTITUTION BEHAVIOR

The behaviour or actions of the government(s), or regional or global multilateral government institutions as partners or stakeholders in the course of a WWF project can significantly affect to what extent the project is able to achieve its goals and objectives. A project team may anticipate and plan around how government partners/stakeholders will act, but these entities could when the project is underway behave in ways that were not expected and thus stall or prevent the achievement of results. On the other hand, a strong public partner could contribute significantly to achieving outcomes. Since WWF works closely with these institutions, the monitoring system gathers and analyzes information across projects to understand what effects they have on performance and offer recommendations on how the Network can be more effective in working with them.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING THE PROJECT

To develop the Government/Public Institution rating, first use the scoring system below and rate each of the elements in the table below.

High — the element was fully present with no shortcomings
Good — the element was present with minor shortcomings
Modest — the element was only partially present and there were significant shortcomings
Low — the element was hardly or not at all present
Not Applicable

	The government/public institution:	Rating
1	Is, through its statements and actions, exhibiting ownership and commitment to the project during design and implementation	Modest
2	Is formulating and implementing quality policies, legislation, regulations, institutional reforms, etc., and/or providing counterpart funding supportive of the WWF project in a timely way	Modest
3	Is providing political and counterpart management support for the WWF project	Modest
4	Has the necessary capacity (staff, knowledge, administrative, financial) to conduct its work as a project partner	Low
	Government/Public Institution Rating (project-level)	**Modest**

To develop the project-level rating, use the rating system below and enter the rating in the shaded cell in the table and in the project TPR.

High — all of the elements were rated High
Good — all or the majority of the elements were rated Good
Modest — all or a majority of the elements were rated Modest
Low — all or a majority of the elements were rated Low

If more than one government or regional or global institution has been involved and they are not too many in number, develop an aggregate rating for them. If there are a large number of public bodies involved and you think resolution would be lost in an aggregate rating, you might wish to group the institutions by type (local, national, regional, etc.), region or some other classification, and give each group an aggregate rating. If you choose this option, copy the list of elements above and paste them below the original list for the number of groups you have and rate each one. Please make sure to explain the classification and name each group. In this case, there is no need to develop an overall rating.

ANNEX 5—INDIGENOUS PEOPLES SAFEGUARDS

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY EVERY TWO YEARS BEGINNING IN JULY 2009, i.e. 2009, 2011, etc.

WWF's Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation includes safeguard requirements that focus on avoiding negative impacts on the human and customary resource rights of indigenous peoples. The safeguard requirements consist of special efforts for WWF to make to respect, protect and comply with these basic and customary rights (as set out in national and international law) in conservation initiatives.

To enable WWF to monitor how well it is following these safeguards, improve its performance on them over time if necessary and become more transparent, the new TPR is collecting information on how much projects are able to comply with the safeguards, on behalf of the units that have developed them. Please assign a rating to the extent to which your project has carried them out as listed below.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING THE PROJECT

To assign a rating, use the scale below and rate each safeguards in the table:

High — the safeguard was fully implemented with no shortcomings
Good — the safeguard was implemented with minor shortcomings
Modest — the safeguard was only partially implemented and there were significant shortcomings
Low — the safeguard was hardly or not implemented at all
Not Applicable

	Indigenous Peoples Safeguards:	**Rating**
1A	Prior to initiating conservation activities, sought out information about the historic claims and current exercise of customary rights of indigenous peoples in that area	
1B	Prior to initiating conservation activities, informed itself about relevant constitutional provisions, legislation, and administrative practices affecting such rights and claims in the national context	
2	Identified, sought out and consulted with legitimate representatives of relevant indigenous peoples' organizations at the earliest stages of programme development	
3	Provided ongoing fora for consultation between WWF and affected peoples so information can be shared and problems, grievances and disputes can be resolved in a timely manner	
4	Not sought contact with indigenous peoples living in voluntary isolation, and worked through appropriate channels responsible for protection of their lands	
5	Received the free, prior and informed consent of affected indigenous communities for conservation, research or development interventions – and refrained from supporting activities that have not secured free, prior and informed consent or would have negative impacts on indigenous rights	
6	Prior to starting work in the area, established agreements with communities and organizations ensuring full indigenous participation and equitable benefit-sharing regarding the use and management of knowledge acquired	
7A	Ensured that WWF partnerships with national governments, donor agencies, private corporations and other NGOs have not undermined, and if possible promoted, indigenous rights	
7B	Shared relevant information on these partnerships with indigenous representatives	

Indigenous Peoples Safeguards:	Rating
8	Ensured consultation in advocacy or fundraising activities related to indigenous peoples	
	Overall Indigenous Peoples Safeguards Performance Rating	

To develop the overall Indigenous Peoples Safeguards Rating, use the rating scale below and enter the rating in the shaded cell in the table and in the project TPR.

High — all of the elements were rated High
Good — all or the majority of the elements were rated Good
Modest — all or a majority of the elements were rated Modest
Low — all or a majority of the elements were rated Low

ANNEX 6—RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY OF RESULTS ACHIEVED

Your project could be making good progress towards achieving its intermediate or final goals and objectives. However, the positive results it has achieved thus far, and/or the project itself, might at this time face certain risks or threats (new government policies, infrastructure projects, weak partner capacity, etc.) that only recently emerged or that have been in existence since the project began but that the mitigation steps could not eliminate completely, that jeopardize the long-term sustainability of the project's achievements. These unforeseen or longstanding risks could be political, economic, financial, capacity-related, technical or environmental, and could also come from civil society or the private sector. Hence while a project might have succeeded in achieving major gains, they might only be short-lived. Since the sustainability of the results achieved depends in large part on societal ownership of the project, the score inversely reflects the level of ownership. It is important for the Network to know what the risks and threats are for its projects so it can adjust its strategies appropriately.

It should be noted that the risk assessment and mitigation conducted at the planning stage is therefore different from the risk to sustainability assessment requested here. But the rating here is also a measure of the degree to which the project properly assessed and mitigated risks at the planning stage and the resilience of the project and its achievements. Nor is the risk rating based on the primary threats identified during planning (e.g. deforestation, hunting, pollution, etc.) that the project is seeking to address. The level of those threats is reflected by the extent to which the project's goals and objectives, which are designed to address those threats, are being met.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING THE PROJECT

Using the scale below, rate each risk factor in the table considering both its likelihood and impact. The greater each of these aspects is, the greater the risk posed.

High
Significant
Modest
Low
Not applicable

Note that the rating scale is reversed here: a High or Substantial rating means the project gains are threatened and not likely to last in the long-term, and therefore not what a project would like to see.

	Risks Elements:	Rating
1	Political -- e.g. level of government ownership of, or commitment to, the project's aims and achievements; change in political leadership and stance on environment; effects of new government policies/legislation/actions on project achievements; quality of regulatory, judicial and governance frameworks; stability of political situation	Significant
2	Other Stakeholder Ownership -- e.g. civil society and private sector ownership of project aims and results; effects of community or private sector actions/practices (i.e. infrastructure development) on the project's achievements; level of community participation	Low
3	Economic -- e.g. the general nature of the country's economic situation; specific market and trade policies and practices; changes in the exchange rate	Significant
4	Financial -- e.g. the budgets of partner institutions to sustain results and systems the project helped to produce; sustainability of benefit streams from revenue-generating activities	Significant
5	Capacity -- e.g. the level of knowledge, technical skill and organizational management in public, private and NGO institutions; effectiveness of partner governance structures	Modest

Risks Elements:		Rating
6	Technical -- e.g. viability of revenue-generating components; feasibility of innovative technologies introduced	Significant
7	Environmental -- eg. climate change; invasive species; natural disasters	Significant
	Overall Rating for Risks to Sustainability of Results	Significant

To develop the Overall Rating for Risk to Sustainability of Results Achieved, use the rating scale below and enter the rating in the shaded cell in the table and in the project TPR.

High — all or most of the risk factors were rated High
Significant — all or most of the risk factors were rated Significant
Modest — all or most of the risk factors were rated Modest
Low — all or most of the risk factors were rated Low