**UK Blue Carbon Fund 2019 Annual Review**

***Summary Sheet***

|  |
| --- |
| **Title:** *The UK Blue Carbon Fund* |
| **Programme Value: £12,750,000.00** | **Review Date: October 2019** |
| **Programme Code:** **PO008** | **Start Date:** December 2018 | **End Date:** **December 2024** |

**Summary of Programme Performance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | **2020/21** | **2021/22** | **2022/23** | **2023/24** |
| **Score** | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Risk****Rating** | Moderate |  |  |  |  |  |

Summary of Progress

The UK Blue Carbon Fund (the Fund) was approved by Defra Ministers in September 2018. Defra and Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) officials signed an administration agreement establishing the Fund in December 2018. This first agreement covered the technical cooperation component of the programme, and was superseded by a second administration agreement in March 2019, which included the blended finance element of the project too. The programme has not yet reached implementation stage and so this Annual Review is predominantly focused on assessing the management and implementation process. A more detailed review will follow in June 2020.

# **Introduction and Context**

Outline and Rationale for Intervention

Climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time; it is a threat to economic and national security across the globe. The impacts of climate change are felt most severely in the developing world, where 100m people could be pushed into poverty by climate impacts as soon as 2030, according to the World Bank.

Nature-based solutions have the potential to play a critical role in tackling climate change and supporting adaptation and sustainable development. Mangroves can help to reduce emissions (they can store three to four times more carbon on a per area basis than most terrestrial forests), while also supporting biodiversity and protecting fisheries habitats. Furthermore, they can contribute to the wellbeing and prosperity of coastal communities, and reduce the effects of natural disasters. According to the UN environment programme’s 2014 report on the importance of mangroves to people,[[1]](#footnote-1) these ecosystems are worth between $33-57,000 per hectare per year, to the economies of developing countries. Mangroves are, however, one of the most threatened forest ecosystems on the planet, with more than 35% thought to have been lost; in some regions mangroves have been cleared faster than tropical rainforests.

The UK Blue Carbon Fund aims to produce a transformational change in the conservation of mangroves in target countries in Latin America and the Caribbean by developing and embedding operational blue carbon markets. It will do this by mobilising strategic public and private sector investments in the blue carbon sector. It will also fund projects in sectors (such as the sustainable aquaculture, coastal zone management and eco-tourism sectors) that target the main drivers of mangrove degradation, and which act as barriers to mangrove conservation. These interventions seek to encourage the sustainable management of mangrove forests and accelerate sustainable development in key mangrove-focused countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The programme will focus on developing and implementing incentive-based instruments through the IDB Group, including technical cooperation grants, loans, high-risk investment grants and equity.

Overview of expected results

The UK Blue Carbon Fund seeks to protect and restore mangrove forests in key sites across Latin America and the Caribbean. The programme expects to achieve:

* 2,912,000 tonnes of GHG emissions sequestered or avoided,
* 5570ha of mangroves restored or protected and
* £48m of ecosystem services restored or protected.[[2]](#footnote-2)

In addition, the programme aims to deliver significant livelihoods benefits for programme recipients. Defra and the IDB will carry out further detailed scoping in November 2019, to quantify the number of people projected to benefit across programme activities, to feed into the logical framework. These indicators will be at the outcome level. All annual reviews will report on value for money, and will consider whether or not any issues have affected the delivery of the project.

# **Performance and Conclusions**

The programme has not yet reached implementing stage, as the two projects that Defra has approved have not yet been cleared by the IDB Board (clearance for project 1 is expected in November, and for project 2, in January). This review will therefore assess the Fund’s performance against the overall management and implementation process, including commitments made in the administration agreement signed in March 2019. Future annual reviews will consider the Fund’s performance against the outputs and outcomes agreed in the logical framework (set out in section 4).

The project has been given an overall performance score of A, in its first year. Some of the commitments made in the administrative agreement have been completed (e.g. the issuing of a Promissory Note), and the ways of working set out in that agreement (e.g. responding to project proposals within ten days) are being implemented effectively. Performance against these commitments has therefore been assessed as A+. In other areas (e.g. holding the Advisory Board meeting), Defra and the IDB have, by mutual agreement, decided to defer carrying out commitments made in the administrative agreement until at least 3 projects have been approved, and therefore the shape of the programme is clearer. As they differ from the administrative agreement, these commitments have been awarded Bs.

**Assessment of performance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Commitment** | **Performance summary** | **Score** |
| 1 | Defra to issue a promissory note for the value of £12.75m, upon the signing of the agreement. | A Promissory Note for this value was issued in March 2018. | A+ |
| 2 | Defra to disburse £2,530,000 to the IDB no later than 15th April 2019.[[3]](#footnote-3) | Defra disbursed funds in May 2019; the project proposal was submitted in early April. Defra fed back comments, and the IDB submitted an updated proposal. Defra then approved the proposal in early May. All of this was within the timeframes agreed below.  | A |
| 3 | Defra to respond to project proposals within 10 working days, the IDB to respond to comments within 10 working days, and Defra to provide a final response within a further 10 working days. | These timeframes have been adhered to with both of the projects that have been approved by Defra so far. The second Defra-approved project was re-submitted, after the IDB received Defra’s initial feedback.  | A+ |
| 4 | To produce an indicative results framework, including a log frame and theory of change for the Fund, within 6 months of the agreement being signed.  | A log frame and theory of change were developed during business case formulation. The log frame was updated in August 2019, and a workshop to update the theory of change is scheduled for November 2019. Both of these products will be updated as necessary, as project proposals are approved. | A+ |
| 5 | To undertake an evaluation plan within 1 year of signing the agreement. | An evaluation plan will be completed as soon as possible, ahead of the next annual review (June 2020).  | B |
| 6 | For the Advisory Board (made up of Defra, the IDB and other relevant stakeholders) to meet every 6 months, to review the progress of the Fund, discuss issues of mutual interest, and share information as needed. | Defra and the IDB have agreed to delay the first Advisory Board meeting until November 2019, instead of September 2019. This is to enable discussions to focus on the project approval process, and this annual review process. | B |

# **Process**

**Business case**

Defra and the IDB worked together to produce a business case for the £12.75m investment, which was approved by Defra Ministers in September 2018. In this, the project was referred to as ‘the Sustainable Management, Conservation and Restoration of Mangrove Habitats’, a title which has since changed to the UK Blue Carbon Fund. The proposal was approved by the IDB Board on March 21, 2019.

*Recommendations and lessons learned*

* To explore, with the IDB, the possibility of designing in-evaluations and real-time evaluations for future projects. In-evaluations would involve identifying a group of beneficiaries, and a group of people who are not expected to benefit from the project, at the start of the process. These groups would be monitored throughout the project’s lifetime. Findings would help to demonstrate the project’s impact, compared to what would have happened had the project not been implemented. Real-time evaluations would provide immediate feedback on how well processes are working. In future, Defra will discuss, with delivery partners, building these evaluations into business cases.

**Administration agreement**

In December 2018, the two parties prepared and signed an administration agreement, formally establishing the Fund.. The parties first agreed the technical cooperation component of the programme (worth £7.775m) and committed funds for this in the agreement. The parties then went on to agree the blended finance element, and committed the full £12.75m through a superseding administration agreement, in March 2019. This agreement referred to the project as ‘the UK Blue Carbon Fund’.

The disbursement schedule was initially set up so that £2,534,000 would be paid in 2019, to fund one project in that financial year. In March and again in September 2019, the agreement was amended via a side letter, to make changes to this schedule. The final amendment made it possible for IDB to drawdown funds to finance two projects (rather than the one anticipated) in the 2019 financial year. The IDB require funds to be transferred to their account, before they can put project proposals to their Board for approval. To ensure value for money, Defra monitor the disbursement schedule to assess if the IDB are ahead or behind schedule, and will revise the disbursement schedule if necessary.

**Project proposals**

The IDB submit project proposals to Defra for approval. As set out in the administration agreement, Defra has 10 days to comment on proposals, and the IDB then has 10 days to respond to these comments. If Defra does not respond within 10 days, their approval will be assumed, and the IDB will proceed to allocate funds to the project.

Once Defra’s approval has been granted, the project is submitted for formal eligibility within the IDB Group, following the eligibility process of the IDB Group entity and financial instrument of the project. This eligibility ensures the project is aligned with country priorities. Once a project receives eligibility, it goes on to enter the formal design phase, where it undergoes quality revision by various IDB Group teams representing country, technical, and financial (if required) views. Once this has been completed, the project is submitted to the appropriate approval process internally, within the IDB. In the unlikely event that Defra approves a project which is not subsequently approved by the IDB, the IDB’s project team can either work with the concerned IDB Group party to seek approval, or the project can be removed from the pipeline, with Defra being informed of this.

Defra have so far approved 2 project proposals. The first was submitted by the IDB in April 2019Defra submitted feedback on the proposal, and the IDB responded, within the agreed timeframes. The project was subsequently approved, and funding to enable the project to begin implementation was released. The project is now awaiting clearance from the IDB Board. A second proposal was submitted in May 2019. Within the 10 day period Defra provided comments on the proposal which included a request for the addition of a further project component focusing on alternative livelihoods. In July 2019 the IDB re-submitted the proposal to Defra with the additional component included, triggering a new 10 day period for comments. Defra approved the project within the required timeframe and are currently facilitating the drawdown of funds by IDB. Approval by the IDB Board is required before implementation can begin.

A pipeline of future projects for 2020 is under development in countries such as Ecuador, Costa Rica, Suriname, Haiti and Colombia.

*Recommendations and lessons learned*

* Project proposals should be explicit in setting out how they will tackle the underlying drivers of mangrove deforestation/degeneration. This will help to ensure that interventions succeed in bringing about transformational change.
* Clarity of expectations has been key in shaping the level of detail provided by the IDB to Defra on each project. In future project proposals Defra would expect to see an outline theory of change, a projected budget breakdown (including administration costs), and background information (e.g. about the region’s population and key industries, the wider drivers of deforestation, and the condition of the ecosystem/s in question).

# **Value for Money and Financial Performance**

Key cost drivers and performance

Administrative costs are capped, at the programme level, at 5%. At the project level, administrative costs are considered on a case-by-case basis, in line with DFID guidance. They are based on the local needs of the executor, the type of executing agency, and the local cost structure (e.g. some countries have higher costs for labor or services, foreign or domestic travel). Defra and the IDB have worked to lower administrative costs to ensure best value for money; the administration fees for project 1 are set at 10%, while for project 2, they are at 13.3% (this disparity reflects the fact the local cost structure in the Caribbean is generally higher than in other countries).

VfM performance

*Economy*

Project-level costs will be minimised through the IDB’s use of in-country expertise and existing delivery frameworks. Projected budget breakdowns are provided at project conception, to enable Defra to identify and mitigate any areas of potential financial risk. Projects will make use of the incentive-based instruments of the IDB Group (e.g. technical cooperation grants, loans, high-risk investment grants and equity). In order to maximise value for money, instruments will be tailored to the individual intervention.

*Efficiency*

Efficiency in project design is being driven through the use of innovative financial and technical instruments, leveraging IDB expertise in the Natural Capital Lab and Sustainable Islands Platform. At this stage in programme life, however, it is too early to assess the effectiveness of different paths, from inputs to outputs, at the project level.

*Effectiveness*

At this stage of programme implementation, it is too early to assess the path from outputs to outcomes at the project level.

*Equity*

Relevant indicators at the project and programme level will be disaggregated by gender, to robustly monitor the gender impacts of programme implementation. Further assessment of equity considerations across the programme will be undertaken once projects reach implementation.

*Auditing standards and frequency*

The administration agreement states that the IDB will audit financial statements and return these to Defra no later than June 30 of every second year of the Fund, and upon the termination of the agreement. The first audited financial statement is due in June 2020. Unaudited financial statements should be shared by the IDB, no later than April 30, each year. The first is expected in April 2020.

# **Risks**

**Overall risk rating:**

The programme risk maintains a **moderate** rating at the end of its first year.

Overview of programme risk

Two overarching risks were originally identified, but only one remains at this stage. These risks are outlined below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Mitigation** | **Contingency** | **Open/Closed** |
| New issues arise that make it difficult to deliver in target countries, e.g. a change in a country’s political situation. | Defra and the IDB agreed a set of eligible criteria, outlined in the administration agreement, which all projects must adhere to. Defra will work with partners across HMG to understand the risks of working in certain environments, and to identify the best means of mitigating these risks. HMG and the IDB will work closely together to implement actions to address any such risks. | If necessary, Defra and the IDB could agree to reroute funding to other ODA eligible countries. | Open |
| Delays in clearances and agreeing the administrative agreement results in Defra not being ready to make payment by the end of the financial year. This risks losing the money to pay for the remainder of the project.  | Ensure consistent communication with delivery partner, monitor timelines closely and begin discussions on the administrative agreement early on. | Find the £5m from elsewhere in the ODA budget for the 19/20 financial year. | Closed |

Project-specific risks are flagged by the IDB in project proposals. Risk registers are maintained by both Defra and the IDB, and are monitored regularly. As projects are developed, and as new projects are approved, risk registers are updated.

# **Commercial Considerations**

**Delivery against planned timeframe**

There have been some delays to progress against the delivery plan. These are:

* Project 1: The first disbursement was made in May 2019, one month later than scheduled. This was because Defra had comments on the IDB’s initial proposal, which meant that it needed updating. This process resulted in the project not being approved until early May, with the disbursement made soon after.
* Project 1: The IDB Board’s approval of this project has been delayed, due to negotiations with the executing agency. The IDB Board are now expected to approve this project in November 2019.
* The first Advisory Board meeting has been delayed until November 2019. This delay was by mutual agreement, as both parties felt it would allow them to reflect on project approval process.

**Performance of partnership**

The partnership between Defra and the IDB has worked well during the programme’s first year; the two parties maintain regular contact, and have good working relationships. Defra have found the IDB to be flexible, adaptable and quick to respond. For example, the IDB were eager to discuss Defra’s comments on the second project proposal, and to incorporate them into the re-submitted version. Both parties agreed that this collaboration strengthened the proposal, which was subsequently approved by Defra.

# **Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Programme Design**

*Theory of change*

A theory of change (Annex A) was collaboratively developed during the business case process, and will be refined further to reflect projects funded by the end of 2019. The theory of change will be tested and refined annually throughout programme lifetime, to ensure that assumptions continue to reflect the context of operations on the ground.

### **Evidence and evaluation**

An initial log frame (Annex B) for the programme was developed during the business case process. The log frame’s outcomes and outputs do not yet have impact weightings, and do not all have baseline data; the log frame will be updated in early 2020, as projects come into the implementation phase and as further projects are chosen for funding. The logical framework’s outcomes and outputs are set out below.

*Outcomes*

**Outcome Indicator 1:** Environment: ICF-IDB programme is successful in contributing to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of natural resources and climate change adaptation and mitigation. This creates the incentive for others to act towards these goals.

**Outcome Indicator 2:** Development:ICF-IDB programme delivers positive outcomes for communities at the local and national level, embedding a sustained change in attitudes towards mangrove restoration and/or protection.

**Outcome Indicator 3:** Finance: ICF-IDB programme is successful in mobilising the financial sector to address issues and drive transformational change in the protection and restoration of mangroves in Latin America and the Caribbean.

*Ouputs*

**Output 1:** Policy Frameworks: Assistance provided to develop and improve local and national frameworks for governance of mangrove forests in partner countries.

**Output 2:** Community Management: Capacity building to enable communities to fully realise the co-benefits of improved outcomes in mangrove protection.

**Output 3:** Alternative Livelihoods: Development of alternative livelihoods and improved economic outlook for local communities through community-management and training activities.

**Output 4:** Innovation Competition: ICF-IDB program supports businesses focused on technological or business-focused innovation in the field of mangrove protection or restoration, with direct benefits for local communities.

*Assumptions*

The assumptions for the indicator framework include:

* The availability of primary data on mangrove coverage, reforestation, degradation, health and sufficient data to calculate associated carbon and ecosystem service values. In cases where data is not available, projects will seek to collect this data or find a proxy.
* The availability of data on co-benefits, such as livelihoods, biodiversity and resilience.
* Sufficient institutional and human capacity to support programming.
* That policy makers, private sector and other stakeholders will be receptive to science-based and economic-based argumentation on the benefits of mangrove conservation
* That successful programmes will have a demonstration effect, and be scaled by public or private sectors.

*Evaluation plan*

Defra will carry out a second annual review in June 2020, when the IDB perform their first review of the project. Defra’s review will compare the available data to the outputs and outcomes outlined above. Defra and IDB officials will prepare a formal evaluation plan ahead of the first full review in June next year.

### **Disaggregation of Data (gender, age etc.)**

As discussed above, data will be disaggregated where relevant across the program as project implementation kicks off.

**Annex A – Theory of Change (live document)**



**Annex B – Log Frame (live document)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IMPACT** | **Impact Indicator 1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| The IDB/ICF mangroves programme drives a transformational and sustained change in the approach and effectiveness of protection/restoration programs for mangrove forests globally, through development of community management and national policy frameworks, support for alternative livelihoods and backing of businesses that will engender a step change in the ability to monetise protection and sustainable use of mangroves. The program makes a specific and sustained contribution to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of natural resources, and climate change mitigation and adaptation.  | Change in mangrove deforestation rate within project intervention areas. | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Measured in ha, at baseline, mid-term and final evaluation.While this is impact-level, not clear that program of this scale can realistically claim this level of impact on the national scale. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |
|   |   |
| **Impact Indicator 2** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| ICF KPI 14: Level of institutional knowledge of Blue Carbon issues in partner countries | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Qualitatively measured at baseline, mid-term and final evaluation.Assumption that program outcomes increase institutional knowledge of the value of the blue carbon economy in partner countries. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |
|   |   |
| **Impact Indicator 3** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Improved economic livelihoods in intervention areas | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Qualitative measure: Captured at baseline, midterm and final review through survey of communities.  |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |
|   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **OUTCOME 1: Environment** | **Outcome Indicator 1.1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| ICF-IDB program is successful in contributing to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of natural resources and climate change adaptation and mitigation. This creates the incentive for others to act towards these goals. | ICF KPI 8: Number of hectares where deforestation and degradation have been avoided or restoration has occurred through ICF support | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, hectares.Assumption that ICF-IDB program is responsible (after additionality considerations) for changes in area of mangroves deforested or degraded in target program areas. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 1.2** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| ICF KPI 6: Changes in GHG emissions in target areas as a result of ICF support | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, tCO2e.Assumption that ICF-IDB program is responsible (after additionality considerations) for changes in GHG emissions in target program areas. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 1.3** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| ICF KPI 10: Value of ecosystem services protected or generated through ICF support | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported at end of program, £.Assumption that ICF-IDB program is responsible (after additionality considerations) for changes in ecosystem service provision in target program areas.**Reliant on data from outcome indicator 1.1** |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 1.4** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Usefulness for government of data produced on social and economic value of mangroves in target countries | **Planned** | 1 |   |   | Qualitative indicator (1-10), 1 = no data produced offering additionality, 10 = significant level of data produced providing additionality and underpinning further progress in assessing the social and economic value provided by mangroves in each of the target countriesMethod:Survey of government officials to be included in final evaluation.Assumption that data will be used to improve outcomes for ICF target priorities. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 1.5** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Communities adopting new sustainable practices of mangrove conservation | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported at end of the program. Qualitative measure: Captured at baseline, midterm and final review through survey of communities.  |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **OUTCOME 2: Development** | **Outcome Indicator 2.1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| ICF-IDB program delivers positive outcomes for communities at the local and national level, embedded a sustained change in attitudes towards mangrove restoration and/or protection | ICF KPI 3: Number of forest dependent people with livelihoods benefits protected or improved as a result of ICF support | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, number of people.Assumption that forest dependent people are benefitting directly as a result of ICF-IDB program. Aggregate of number of people directly supported + beneficiaries of ecosystem services/members of communities. Gender disaggregated. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 2.2** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Embedding of mangrove protection and/or restoration in national mangrove frameworks and/or global commitments. | **Planned** | 2 |   |   | Qualitative indicator (1-10), 1 = no frameworks in place, 10 = frameworks fully embedded in national policymaking process and being utilised to deliver positive outcomes in community-focused mangrove protection.Method: Biennial surveys of policy actors in countries where national mangrove policy frameworks are being attempted through the program.Assumption that national frameworks will be utilised by state actors once created. Also, assumption would add or track mangrove protection to environmental commitments such as NDC, SDGs. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 2.3** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Change in local awareness of the economic and social value of mangroves in local communities | **Planned** | 1 |   |   | Qualitative indicator (1-10), 1 = no appreciation, 10 = complete and sustained appreciation of the value of mangroves for local communities.Method: Survey of participants in community trainings. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  |  |  |   |   |   |   |
| **OUTCOME 3: Finance** | **Outcome Indicator 3.1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| ICF-IDB program is successful in mobilising the financial sector to address issues and drive transformational change in the protection and restoration of mangroves in Latin America and the Caribbean | ICF KPI 11: Volume of **public** finance mobilised for climate change purposes as a result of ICF funding | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually. Amounts leveraged by projects that receive financial support. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 3.2** |  | **Baseline** |  **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| ICF KPI 12: Volume of **private** finance mobilised for climate change purposes as a result of ICF funding | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually. Amounts leveraged by projects that receive financial support. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
| **Outcome Indicator 3.3** |  | **Baseline** |  **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Number new innovative businesses supported that are still operational at end of program | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported at end of program. Shows sustainablility of business. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **OUTPUT 1: Policy Frameworks** | **Output Indicator 1.1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)**  | **Assumptions** |
| Assistance provided to develop and improve local and national frameworks for governance of mangrove forests in partner countries | Number of policy and regulatory assessments undertaken through the program | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Aggregrate of number of policies and assesments undertaken. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output Indicator 1.2** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Number of people in national institutions trained mangrove protection and the value of these ecosystems | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Number of people trained |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)** | **Output Indicator 1.3** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
|   | Number of knowledge products or policy documents produced related to mangrove governance. | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Number of documents |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  | **RISK RATING** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **OUTPUT 2: Community Management** | **Output Indicator 2.1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)**  | **Assumptions** |
| Capacity building to enable communities to fully realise the co-benefits of improved outcomes in mangrove protection | Number of people trained in capacity-building techniques focused on long-term sustainable use of mangrove ecosystem services | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, gender disaggregated.M44 |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output Indicator 2.2** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Number of people trainers trained in "train the trainer" progams for capacity-building techniques focused on long-term sustainable use of mangrove ecosystem services | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, gender disaggregated. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  | **RISK RATING** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output Indicator 2.3** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
|  Number of financial products for sustainable use of resources implemented  | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  | **RISK RATING** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output Indicator 2.4** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Number of people using financial products developed | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, gender disaggregated. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  | **RISK RATING** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)** | **Output Indicator 2.5** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
|   | Number of community-based approaches implemented | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually. Aggregate of different approaches tested. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |  |  |  | **RISK RATING** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|   | **Output Indicator 2.6** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
|   | Number of NGOs/CBOs involved in program activities | **Planned** | - |   |   | Reported annually |
|   | **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** |  |  |  | **RISK RATING** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **OUTPUT 3: Alternative Livelihoods** | **Output Indicator 3.1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)**  | **Assumptions** |
| Development of alternative livelihoods an improved economic outlook for local communities through community-management and training activities | Number of people given training and support to undertake work in sustainable livelihoods | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, gender disaggregated. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output Indicator 3.2** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Blue economy sectoral breakdown of employment in target areas | **Planned** | - |   |   | Reported annually, %s of total employment. **Disaggregate by gender.** |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)** | **Output Indicator 3.3** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
|   | Number of people employed in environmentally sustainable livelihoods | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported annually, no. **Disaggregate by gender.** |
|   | **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** | **RISK RATING** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **OUTPUT 4: Innovation Competition** | **Output Indicator 4.1** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)**  | **Assumptions** |
| ICF-IDB program supports businesses focused on technological or business-focused innovation in the field of mangrove protection or restoration, with direct benefits for local communities | Number of businesses supported through ICF-IDB mangroves innovation competition | **Planned** | 0 |   | 7 | Reported annually, number.Assumption: technical and financial assistance from ICF-IDB has encouraged businesses to innovate in the field. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** | **RISK RATING Low** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **Output Indicator 4.2** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
| Value of businesses supported through ICF-IDB mangroves innovation competition | **Planned** | 0 |   |   | Reported at end of program - through impact evaluation.Assumption: technical and financial assistance from ICF-IDB has enabled businesses to grow and succeed. Either value of IPO of business or methodology used to evaluate a proxy based on market standards. |
| **Achieved** |   |   |   |
| **Source** | **RISK RATING High** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **IMPACT WEIGHTING (%)** | **Output Indicator 4.3** |  | **Baseline** | **Milestones 1-7** | **Target (date)** | **Assumptions** |
|   | Number of new business plans or technologies trialled due to ICF support | **Planned** | 0 |   | 7 | Reported annually. |
|   | **Achieved** |   |   |   |
|   | **Source** | **RISK RATING Low** |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |

1. The importance of mangroves to people: A call to action’, <https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/the-importance-of-mangroves-to-people--a-call-to-action> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Based on ICF analysis of the TEEB Ecosystem Service Value database, valuing coastal protection and food services offered by a hectare of mangrove forest - £1453/ha/yr. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The IDB require funds to be transferred to their account, before they can put projects to the IDB Board, for approval. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)