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Introduction

This report defines and presents the Integrated Management System Assessment Model. The model is composed of a set of markers and indicators for the analysis of Integrated Natural Resource Management Systems, defined as the governance structure and related corpus of legislation, policies, plans, programmes (PPP) for the management of water resources, land use, coastal zones, and biodiversity and ecosystem services.

The model developed under this assignment has been used in the context of the Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management in Caribbean Small Island Developing States (GEF-IWEco Project), and in particular during the early phases of the Project’s Component 3: Strengthening of the Policy, legislative and institutional reforms and capacity building for SLM, IWRM/WUE and ecosystem services management, taking into consideration climate-change-resilience building.

The consultancy team has used this set of markers and indicators to guide the literature review and a number of National Focus Groups with selected stakeholders in all Participating States of the project.

How to use the Assessment Model

The Assessment Model was used to guide a process of literature review and primary data collection (e.g. through interviews, focus groups, and workshops with governance actors) in order to:

- assess the current capacity of the system to develop sound policies and interventions;
- promote horizontal and vertical coordination among the private, public, and third sectors; and
- implement such policies.

The indicators are explored through a set of qualitative research questions that, if answered in the positive, delineate an integrated system that implements the key principles of natural resource management, as derived from the analysis of available literature and best practice.

The markers and indicators offer a conceptual model for a sound Integrated Natural Resource Management System, providing a clear focus on the key aspects to be analysed when reviewing such a system in its entirety. The set of qualitative research questions offers an instrument to review in more detail the corpus of legislation and PPPs, and the interaction and synergy between different actors.

The research questions have been further revised and summarised in a template for the analysis of, respectively, legislation and PPPs, available in the appendices for the perusal of the reader.

The objective and related research questions can also be used as a starting point for the development of more sophisticated, quantitative tools, if additional quantitative indicators are attached to those questions.

Methodology

The Methodology for the definition of markers and indicators was based on the selection, comparison, and synthesis of available assessment methods for governance assessment currently used within the four management systems that are part of the conceptual framework of analysis.
The conceptual framework of analysis is the synthesis of the following natural resource management approaches:

- Integrated Water Resource Management;
- Sustainable Land Management;
- Ecosystem Services Management; and,
- Integrated Coastal Zone Management.

Although they all look at different natural resources (water, land, biodiversity and ecosystem, coastal areas, etc.) and have specificities in the way these resources should be managed (and, therefore, specific requirements in terms of legislation, policies, governance arrangements, etc.), the four approaches overlap and share commonalities in the definition and markers of good governance.

Thanks to these synergies and commonalities, it was possible to identify markers and indicators of good governance that were common to different natural resource-specific governance assessment methods. Using a comparative analysis, a manageable number of markers has been selected, and indicators have been developed from the synthesis of common traits. The Integrated Benchmark Natural Resource Management System is, by consequence, a system (corpus of legislation, policies, plans and programmes, network of governance actors, etc.) that discloses the majority (if not all) of the indicators when dealing with the management of water, land, biodiversity and ecosystem.

The set of four markers was derived from the UNEP report “Ecosystem-based management Markers for assessing progress”\(^1\). The Report provides a framework for analysing governance of ecosystem services, composed of four Orders of Outcomes. The First Order (which is the one used for this Integrated Benchmark System and set of indicators) is achieved by assembling the enabling conditions for the sustained practice of ecosystem-based management. The enabling conditions (or markers) are:

1. **Unambiguous Goals** - unambiguous goals (including S.M.A.R.T. objectives) have been adopted in the corpus of legislation and PPPs;
2. **Well-informed Stakeholders** - stakeholders from the private and public sectors and civil society sector are meaningfully engaged in the decision-making and implementation process; vertical and horizontal coordination mechanisms exist; information is spread to stakeholders and citizens;
3. **Formal Commitment** - governmental commitment to the goals is expressed through adequate resources and implementation;
4. **Institutional Capacity** - sufficient capacity is present within the institutions to implement PPPs and projects.

While specific to ecosystem services management, it was agreed, based on a comparative analysis, that they not only are good markers for all the other natural resource management approaches, but that they could include different indicators identified in the literature.

Indicators were selected from a comparison of governance assessment models and methods in the literature, in particular:


---

\(^1\) UNEP. (n.d.). Ecosystem-based management Markers for assessing progress.


https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/content/documents/introduction_to_the_nrgf_version_1_july_2019.pdf
• Bennett, N. J., & Satterfield, T. (2018). Environmental governance: A practical framework to guide design, evaluation, and analysis\(^3\).
• OECD. (2018). OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework\(^4\).

The consultancy team also identified a set of common gaps based on the experience of different experts, such gaps being capable of being “positively spun” to turn them into outcomes and, therefore, characteristic of a good Integrated Management System. The comparison of these outcomes with the indicators identified through the literature review highlighted many similarities, providing a form of validation to the process.

The research questions attached to each indicator are a combination of questions identified in the literature and questions developed by the consultancy team to capture the specific indicator.

The markers, indicators and research questions have also been used to develop two templates, respectively meant for the literature review of legislation and the literature review of Policies, Plans, and Programmes (see Appendix 1: Legislative Review Template and Appendix 2: PPPs Review Template). Although simplified to facilitate the process, the questions in the Template link directly to the Indicators and Research Questions and, together with other forms of direct engagement with stakeholders, allow capturing of the current state of the Integrated Management System and gaps existing with the benchmark.

---


System of Objectives, Indicators and Research Questions

Marker 1: Unambiguous Goals

The first marker of a well-functioning integrated natural resource management system is the presence of **Unambiguous Goals**, intended as a clear Vision and set of Objectives that place natural resource management as a key component of any socio-economic development strategy and initiative. Although the vision and objectives do not need to be presented in a single document, they must be recognisable from the analysis of the corpus of legislation and plans, policy, and programmes.

The objectives should be S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-based, and Time-bound), prioritised, clearly assigned to specific responsible actors, and guided by clear and transparent indicators of success and implementation. They should define the desired quality of life of the human population in the areas of interest as well as the desired attribute of the natural resource.

Unambiguous Goals should also be informed by good international practices in the management system approaches included in the conceptual framework, as well as other principles included in MEAs and the SDGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The corpus of legislation and PPPs is guided by a common vision and set of objectives, and principles for the management of the natural resource(s). | • Can a strategic vision for the integrated management of natural resources be identified in a single document?  
• Are different natural resource management laws and PPPs guided by a clear set of principles and goals?  
• Are these goals linked to the Objectives?  
• Are the Objectives S.M.A.R.T.? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The corpus of legislation introduces all necessary policy tools (e.g. a spatial development or management plan); and management units (e.g. Marine Management Area comparable to IUCN Category Ia) necessary for the Natural Resource Management System. | • Do governance actors have the mandate to prepare relevant policy, plans, and programs for the management of natural resources?  
• Do governance actors have the mandate to define management and planning areas?  
• Does this instrument recognise the need to downscale natural resource management to fit local realities? |
| The corpus of legislation gives adequate powers to governance actors to make decisions, develop and implement PPPs, and enforce their provisions. | • Is there a set of natural resources management laws, indicating goals, duties, resources required?  
• When they exist, are regulatory agencies subject to bylaws or internal regulations that clearly state their mandate and powers?  
• Are these powers and responsibilities adequate, avoiding overlaps and underlaps?  
• Have applicable binding and non-binding international or supranational frameworks and regulations been transposed at national (or subnational) level(s)? |
| Regulation setting is adequate, i.e. guidelines and standards exist.     | • Is the legislation supported by regulations that clarify processes and standards?  
• Do regulations that support and clarify the decision-making process exist?  
• Is there a systematic requirement to consider existing international standards and norms in the development and revision of national and/or subnational legal frameworks? |
| A clear implementation plan exists for the unambiguous goals, defining necessary resources, responsibilities and timescale. | • Do clear sets of prioritised actions and activities exist for the achievement of the natural resource management goals?  
• Do they indicate responsible actors, timescale for implementation, indicative costs, potential sources of funding and financing?  
• Are they linked to clear KPIs or other indicators of success? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance actors are accountable and transparent in the management of  | • Are the means and rationale for making decisions shared and transparent?  
| natural resources.                                                       | • Do governance actors share open and accessible information on their actions?  
|                                                                          | • When roles and responsibilities for natural resource management are delegated to dedicated public or private entities, are there contractual arrangements between organising and executive bodies?  
|                                                                          | • Are there evaluation tools to track budget transparency?  
|                                                                          | • Are there mechanisms/tools to track transparency, accountability and participation?  
|                                                                          | • Are procedures present to hold governance actors accountable for their performance?                                                                                                                                 |
Marker 2: Well-Informed Stakeholders

A well-functioning Integrated Natural Resource Management system presents structured and clear mechanisms for horizontal and vertical coordination. Horizontal coordination is the process through which governance actors:

- create synergies and coordinate the preparation of policies, plans, and strategies;
- implement such policies; and
- monitor and evaluate results.

Horizontal coordination should involve not only institutional stakeholders, but also NGOs, CBOs, and the private sector. Vertical coordination is the process through which institutional stakeholders at national level interact and share responsibilities with supranational stakeholders (e.g. OECS, CARICOM, etc.) and sub-national stakeholders, such as local level governance actors or NGOs and CBOs that are active in a specific, sub-national area. The creation of commissions, working groups, user organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) dedicated to the advancement of a plan of action are an important marker of a functioning integrated natural resource management system.

“Well-informed stakeholders” also refers to the need for stakeholders and rights-holders to be involved in every step of the decision-making and implementation process, and for mechanisms to be in place to generate understanding and support toward sustainable natural resource management practices within local communities and the groups that will be most affected by the implementation of policies and programmes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| There is good cooperation between governance actors in the Integrated Management System. Ambiguity and confusion over the separation of responsibility across different organisations are minimised. | • Are there horizontal co-ordination mechanisms across subnational authorities to manage interdependencies for policy design and implementation?  
• Are there vertical co-ordination mechanisms to combine territorial scales for natural resources management?  
• Is there a national multi-stakeholder co-ordination platform including representatives from public, private and non-profit sectors and different categories of users?  
• Does the platform promote inclusion of rights-holders as well as stakeholders?  
• Do governance actors take account of the views expressed through consultation/participation processes? |
| Governance actors cooperate to address conflicts and promote synergy and complementarity. | • Are there mechanisms or incentives that foster policy alignment, complementarities and cooperation across central and subnational governments?  
• Are there conflict mitigation and resolution mechanisms to manage trade-offs across natural resource-related policy areas?  
• Are there mechanisms to solve natural resource-related disputes? |
| Decision-making authority and responsibility are conferred to the lowest level possible. Self-organization is encouraged and supported. | • Do legislation and policy frameworks devolve natural resource management to capable institutions closest to natural resources, including forms of community-based management? |
| Governance actors have adequate knowledge of good practices and solutions that could help them perform their role. | • What repositories of good practices, guidelines/methodologies, and knowledge transfer platforms are available to the governance actors?  
• Are they used in practice? |
Local communities and the general public are engaged, adopt recommended practices and support a paradigm shift.

- Are processes in place to support network development, to develop social relations and to support mutual learning?
- Was stakeholder mapping carried out to make sure that all those who have a stake in the outcome or that are likely to be affected are clearly identified?
- Are there mechanisms or regular assessments of stakeholder engagement costs or obstacles at large?
- Are the type and level of engagement customised and the processes sufficiently flexible to adjust to changing circumstances?

Citizens are aware and well-informed on the consequences and impacts of unsustainable practices.

- Do rights-holders and stakeholders have access to information concerning the environment and natural resources?
- Do tailored communication strategies exist to inform relevant stakeholders, including the general public, and to explain the benefits and results of plans, policies and programmes?
- Are the results of the monitoring and evaluation process shared with the wider public?

**Marker 3: Formal Commitment**

The commitment by government or political will to implement policies, plans and programmes is a key marker of a successful Integrated Natural Resource Management System. Governance actors must be provided with the necessary authority to:

- allocate natural resources;
- regulate their use;
- mediate conflicts; and
- provide the necessary human and financial resources to implement the programme.

More specifically, governance actors must be empowered with the necessary incentive to promote compliance and voluntary adoption of the provisions of the plan or programme, and with disincentives to discourage detrimental actions or punish those that disregard the provision of legislation and PPPs. Appropriate enforcement powers given to governance actors is another key indicator of a functioning system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance actors have the necessary authority for the management of natural resources, including regulatory, planning and enforcement powers. | • Are there dedicated regulatory agencies bodies or capacities (e.g. within a ministry) in charge of enforcement and compliance for natural resource management?  
• Are analyses for supporting decision-making carried out in case of conflicting objectives across users, or geographical/social disparities in accessing water resources and services? |
| Governance actors have adequate power to enforce policies and decisions.  | • Do regulatory authorities take decisions that can also be legally binding?  
• Can regulatory decisions taken be repealed?                                                                                                              |
| Tenure rights for natural resource are recognised and respected.          | • Are tenure rights robust – enabling rights-holders to sustainably manage, use/benefit from and protect lands/resources from threats?  
• Are laws and policies present to protect local rights, with particular attention to customary (including collective) rights and women’s rights?  
• Are there adequate mechanisms ensuring that groups have access to justice?  
• Are overlapping tenure rights/claims clarified in law and resolved in practice? |
| Presence of adequate disincentives (monetary fines, requirement for remediation, compensation to affected parties, etc.), that act as a deterrent to unsustainable practices. | • Is a clear system of natural resource norms and sanctions defined in the legislation?  
• Do enforcement bodies have capacity to uphold established norms and sanctions?  
• Are impartial and effective grievance/dispute resolution mechanisms accessible to rights-holders and stakeholders, including vulnerable and marginalized groups? |
| Adequate incentives (financial or otherwise) for private and third sector actors to adopt certain practices are present. | • Are there environmental management practices incentives, for instance through tax exemptions, payment of ecosystem service, etc. present? |
Marker 4: Institutional Capacity

The implementation of any Integrated Natural Resource System depends on the human, technical and financial capacity the governance actor collectively and individually has in implementing, enforcing, monitoring and evaluating actions and provisions. The institutional capacity necessary to implement adaptive natural resource management approaches is typically the principle limiting factor that determines the success (or failure) of a system.

Human capacity, in this context, means the availability of an adequate number of staff members in relation to the set of responsibilities the governance actor has, which is often increasing due to MEAs and international projects.

Technical capacity is the availability of skills within the governance system, as well as equipment and instruments and platforms for data collection, organisation, sharing monitoring and evaluation.

Financial capacity is the most complex, as financial resources are often limited. Benchmark integrated natural resource management systems should present solutions to allow for adequate budgetary provision, as well as solutions to generate revenues, capture value to cross-subsidise actions and programmes, attract private investments, and take advantage of the available international funding opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governance actors have adequate human, technical and financial resources to perform their role. | • Based on the responsibilities of different governance actors, do they have the adequate human, technical, and financial capacity?  
• Are the roles, functions, and division of responsibilities of different actors coordinated according to their human, technical, and financial capacity?  
• Is a coordinating body present?                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Good and continuous system of monitoring and evaluation of results, including clear indicators of success. | • Do formal requirements and institutionalised processes exist for evaluation and monitoring of policy implementation as well as state of the environment?  
• Are there agreed-upon key performance indicators?  
• Are evaluation mechanisms in place to systematically and regularly monitor performance/effectiveness, gaps and overlaps in the regulatory framework?  
• Are there institutionalised processes for the reviews of the governance actors?                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Necessary data collection infrastructure is available to governance actors and the general public, and used in the decision-making and monitoring process. | • Are the necessary data and projections on the state of natural resources collected and made available in a clear and organised way?  
• Are planning and management decisions and actions informed by best available information and integrated with a diversity of knowledge types and systems?  
• Is the integrated natural resources management information system harmonised, integrated, standardised and co-ordinated across relevant agencies and responsible authorities?  
• Are key data on natural resources management publicly available and communicated to users?  
• Are there platforms for dialogue between data producers and users?  
• Are there incentives or forms of co-operation between primary and other data producers?  
• Do online platforms/tools/agreements exist for experience and knowledge sharing?  
• Do incentives exist to produce, disclose and use data and information, through innovative ways?                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| The Integrated Natural Resource Management System evolves through innovation and experimentation. | • Do platforms exist to draw lessons from failures, and to catalyse and scale-up best practices and success stories?  
• Are there reviews to evaluate the state of play of and potential for technical and non-technical innovation, costs/benefits of innovation, as well as regulations and standards hindering innovation?  
• Do governance actors incorporate ongoing monitoring, reflection and learning that enables responsiveness to changing conditions and needs? |
|---|---|
| The system is able to attract investments and generate revenue to support sustainable livelihoods or interventions. | • Do people responsible for natural resource governance have access to sources of revenue and/or livelihood activities that enable them to carry out management activities?  
• Are the resources/revenues provided sufficient to achieve financial sustainability of these activities? |
| The system includes mechanisms to capture value and use it to promote benefit sharing and compensation. | • Are losses stemming from restrictions to enable natural resource sustainability minimized and compensated where unavoidable?  
• Are there mechanisms to capture value for detrimental development or other activities to reinvest in remediation and compensation solutions? |
Conclusion

The Integrated Management System Assessment Model is intended to be used to analyse the natural resource management systems of the eight IWEco Participating Countries and to identify gaps wherever the current legislation, policies, plans, and programmes, or governance structure do not satisfy one or more indicators, either partially or in its entirety.

The literature has been analysed using the templates presented in Appendices 1 and 2, while the markers and indicators have been used to guide a set of focus groups with national stakeholders to highlight specific gaps.

The gaps will be explored in more detail to identify recommended actions and projects, which will be selected and prioritised for the preparation of specific Terms of Reference.

The Integrated Management System Assessment Model can be used outside the scope of this particular project for the analysis of other countries in a similar context, and can be further expanded and refined as part of future projects.
Appendix 1: Legislative Review Template

The following questions are based on the set of Indicators and Research Questions presented in the Benchmark System above, but they have been simplified and rephrased to work as a Template to analyse the corpus of acts, bills, and regulation. Although is a shorter and simplified set, they are closely related to the Integrated Management System Assessment Model, and in selecting relevant information from legislation the set of Indicators and Research Question remains central:

1. What are the main provisions in the law for the issues?
2. Are the requirements of the law clear and unambiguous?
3. Are obligations of both the regulated and the regulators clearly spelled out?
4. Does the law delineate responsibility across organisations, particularly in relation to enforcement? If so, who has responsibility for what?
5. Does the law delineate responsibility across organisations at different territorial scales? Does the law promote local devolution of responsibilities?
6. Does the law avoid regulatory overlap (i.e. more than one institution has authority over an issue, leading to potentially conflicting bureaucratic claims) and underlap (i.e. no institution has clear authority over an issue, resulting in an orphan issue or cause for which there is no effective government oversight)?
7. Does the law ensure that mechanisms for vertical and horizontal co-ordination across institutions are in place?
8. Does the law contain procedures and mandates necessary to carry out its requirements?
9. Is the law supported by clear implementable regulations and/or policy statements as necessary to provide specific criteria for interpretation of the law?
10. Does the law transpose binding and non-binding international or supranational frameworks to the national or subnational level?
11. Is the law based on approaches that are adapted to and effective in the institutional, cultural, and economic context of the country?
12. Is the law reasonably up-to-date in relation to the issues?
13. Does the law provide for:
   a. access to information?
   b. public participation?
   c. access to justice?
14. Does the law incorporate accessible, fair, and transparent mechanisms for dispute resolution?
15. Does the law provide for transparency and accountability in implementation, enforcement and reporting?
16. Does the law make use of effective remedies to address present violations and associated environmental harm, and to deter future violations?
17. Does the law make use of effective mechanisms to incentivise best practices and seeking prior consent?
18. Does the law present financing mechanisms or opportunities to raise finance to manage and conserve natural resources?

19. Does the law make use of effective mechanisms to implement mitigation hierarchy principles (favouring avoidance of impact, mitigation where avoidance is not possible, offsetting where mitigation is not possible, etc.)?

20. Does the law allow for appropriate application of a range of enforcement tools (e.g., from warnings to sanctions to civil and criminal penalties to revocation of licences)?

21. Does the law articulate a rights-based approach to environmental protection?

22. Does the law recognise and respect local tenure and use rights, including customary rights and women’s rights?

23. Does the law explicitly protect the rights of future generations?

24. Does the law allow decision-making independent of political processes?
Appendix 2: PPPs Review Template

The following questions are based on the set of Indicators and Research Questions presented in the Integrated Management System Assessment Model, but they have been simplified and rephrased to work as a Template to analyse the corpus of Policy, Plans and Programmes (PPPs).

The definition of Policies, Plans or Programmes is not univocal in the literature, and the usage of the term changes in different countries; policies in one country may be called plans in other countries and vice versa. However, policies, plans and programmes can all be viewed as tools for forward planning and for natural resource management. However, these three types of documents often have a hierarchical and tiered relationship.

Policies provide strategic guidance and inspiration for actions, often in a single sector. Plans contain co-ordinated, measurable and timed objectives for implementing the Policies, combining several Policies through a multisectoral approach. Plans also contain provisions to achieve the objectives (which are, in a somehow confusing way, themselves called policies⁵). Finally, Programs contain a set of projects and actions for a particular area, using a proactive rather than prescriptive approach.

Although other names exist for these documents (e.g. Strategies) or sub-categories may exist (e.g. Action Plans, Management Plans, etc.) documents can be classed under one of these macro-categories.

It should be noted that, in some cases, a single document could incorporate all three elements. This is the case of Implementation Plans included in Land Use or Management plans: given the fact that the Implementation Plan contains a series of specific actions and projects with information on responsible actors, timeline, budget, etc., based on our definition they most closely resemble Programmes, irrespective of their name.

This tiered nature suggests that Policies, Plans and Programmes must be analysed in an integrated and systemic way, and assessed as a group rather than individually. It is in fact not particularly accurate to point out how a Policy lacks concrete and place-specific provisions, as that is not its role: instead, it is worth noticing how a specific Policy is not implemented through a Plan or a Programme. Although there are obvious differences between Policies, Plans and Programmes, the set of guiding questions has been kept univocal for simplicity: it is left to the experts to understand which questions apply to which type of document, and when to take a systemic and integrated view of different documents rather than a single-document approach.

Based on a general structure of PPPs, we have identified the following sections to facilitate the analysis and structure the Template:

- **Vision and Objectives**: PPPs tend to be introduced by a Vision (which could take different names, such as Goals, Aim, etc.) further articulated in Objectives (which again could be referred to as Strategies Objectives, but also Goals, resulting in ambiguity with the Vision component). While it may not be the case for Policies, Objectives in Plans and Programmes are often linked to KPIs and are time-bound. These Objectives should be analysed using a S.M.A.R.T. approach (Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Realistic, Time-bound);

---

⁵ For the purpose of our analysis, Policy will refer to policy documents, and policy to provisions within a Plan.
• **Provisions and actions**: Policies tend to contain general strategic guidelines and directions on the way forward to achieve the Objectives. Plans are more specific, containing regulatory provisions and policies with standards, requirements, and criteria that are meant to influence the actions of stakeholders and inform decision-making; Programmes (including Implementation Plans) contains specific actions and set of projects to be implemented to reach the objectives of the plan.

• **Implementation and Enforcement**: Plans tend to have specific provisions to ensure the actual enforcement of its policies: such provisions should consider enforcement difficulties and provide concrete and planned solutions (e.g. provision of adequate resources, capacity building programmes, etc.). Programmes are inherently more oriented toward implementation, as they contain pro-active actions rather than prescriptive policies. Implementation Plans should provide indications of responsible organisations, actions’ pre-requisites, resource and budget needed, financing solutions, timescale of interventions, risk, etc. Policies tend to be more strategic and therefore lack specific Implementation and Enforcement sections.

• **Monitoring and Evaluation**: As Objectives are linked to KPIs, PPPs should present strategies to monitor these KPIs and evaluate progress toward the achievement of Objectives.

• **Decision-making Process and Engagement**: This aspect relates to how the PPP has been prepared and how decisions have been reached, looking in particular at the meaningful engagement of all stakeholders and rightholders.

Although it is a shorter and simplified set, the Template is closely related to the Integrated Management System Assessment Model, and in selecting relevant information from PPPs the set of Indicators and Research Question remains central:

**VISION AND OBJECTIVES**

1. Is the main Vision of the PPP in line with Environmental Management principles and best practices?
2. Does the Vision of the PPP respond to the key issues identified in the DPSI analysis?
3. Are the Objectives in the PPP in line with Environmental Management principles and best practices?
4. Do the Objectives in the PPP respond to the key issues identified in the DPSI analysis?
5. Are the Objectives in the PPP
   a. Specific?
   b. Measurable (i.e. related to measurable KPIs)?
   c. Assignable? (Achievable?)
   d. Realistic?
   e. Time-bound?
6. Are the Vision or Objectives, or provisions in the PPP in conflict with the Vision or Objectives contained in other PPPs? Does the PPP manage trade-off and aim to resolve natural-resource related disputes?
7. Are Policies translated into Plans, and Plans implemented through clear Programmes?

**PROVISION AND ACTIONS**

8. Does the PPP contain the necessary provisions (including requirements, criteria, standards, zoning units, etc.) and actions to implement the Vision and Objectives, and achieve KPIs?
9. Do the provisions and actions respond to the key issues identified in the DPSI analysis?
10. Does the PPP make use of provision and actions according to international good practice in Environmental Management? Does it reflect binding or non-binding international or supranational frameworks and regulations?
11. Does the PPP contain provisions stemming from experimentation and innovation?
12. Are costs and benefits from the absence/presence of actions and provisions clear and available to stakeholders?
13. Does the PPP recognize the need to implement conservation and management models that fit local realities?
14. Do the provisions or actions provide the necessary standards and indicators to clarify the type of activity and development prohibited, permitted, or promoted in different parts of the country or under different circumstances?
15. Does the PPP’s provisions and actions promote sustainable livelihoods and activities capable of producing revenues and being self-sustaining?
16. Does the PPP consider compensation for losses stemming from restrictions and benefit sharing? Does the PPP’s provision consider tenure and resource rights, including customary rights?
17. Does the PPP include provisions to capture value from development proposals benefitting from ecosystem services, and reinvest this value into environmental management?

IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT

18. Is there a clear indication of the governance actors in charge of the implementation of specific actions or enforcement of specific policies?
19. Does the PPP consider the level of staff, budget and autonomy of different organization when assigning responsibilities for actions’ implementation and enforcement of policies?
20. Does it make provisions to provide responsible organisations with the necessary resources, including capacity building, training, acquisition of equipment, etc.?
21. Does the PPP consider vertical and horizontal co-ordination when assigning responsibility and planning implementation?
22. Does the PPP establish vertical and horizontal coordination mechanisms to manage interdependencies, foster policy alignment, resolve natural-resource related disputes, and manage trade-offs?
23. Does the PPP assign clear and realistic timescales to implementation of actions and enforcement of provisions?
24. Does the PPP contain incentives/disincentives to promote the implementation and enforcement of its provisions and actions?
25. Does the PPP provide information on the costs for the implementation of actions, and recommend financial mechanisms for the implementation?
26. Does the PPP consider and evaluate risks connected with the implementation programme?

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

27. Are formal evaluation mechanisms in place to systematically and regularly review KPIs?
28. Does the PPP consider the establishment/use of integrated natural resource management information systems? Are these data publically available and communicated to users?

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS AND ENGAGEMENT

29. Have rights-holders and stakeholders been meaningfully engaged in the preparation of the PPP?
30. Does the implementation of the PPP include meaningful engagement of rights-holders and stakeholders, to make sure that all those who have a stake in the outcome or that are likely to be affected have been clearly identified and engaged?

31. Are the Vision, Objectives and provisions in the PPP evidence-based, and do they make good use of available data and analytical methods?
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