



RESTRUCTURING PAPER
ON A
PROPOSED PROJECT RESTRUCTURING
OF
LA-SCALING-UP PARTICIPATORY SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT
APPROVED ON MAY 31, 2013
TO
LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

ENVIRONMENT & NATURAL RESOURCES

EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC

Regional Vice President:	Victoria Kwakwa
Country Director:	Ellen A. Goldstein
Senior Global Practice Director:	Karin Erika Kemper
Practice Manager/Manager:	Christophe Crepin
Task Team Leader:	Stephen Danyo



ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CD	Country Director
CIF	Climate Investment Fund
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
DOF	Department of Forest
FIP	Forest Investment Program
FIPD	Forest Inventory and Planning Division
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FLM	Forest Landscape Management
FMP	Forest Management Plan
GIS	Geographical Information System
IDA	International Development Association
ISR	Implementation Status and Results Report
Lao PDR	Lao People’s Democratic Republic
LED	Law Enforcement Dossier Database (LED)
LSSWG	Land working group (LSSWG)
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MS	Moderately Satisfactory
MTR	Mid-Term Review
OPP	Office of Public Prosecutor
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PFA	Production Forest Areas
SFMA	Sub Forest Management Areas
SPiRiT	Smart Phone Information Reporting and Intelligence Tracking System
SUFORD SU	Scaling-Up Participatory Sustainable Forest Management Project
SUFORD	Participatory Sustainable Forest Management Program
PSFM	Participatory Sustainable Forest Management
PDO	Project Development Objective
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PSU	Project Support Unit
S	Satisfactory
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
VFMA	Village Forest Management Agreement
VLD	Village Livelihood Development



Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

BASIC DATA

Product Information

Project ID P130222	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing
Original EA Category Full Assessment (A)	Current EA Category Full Assessment (A)
Approval Date 31-May-2013	Current Closing Date 31-Aug-2018

Organizations

Borrower Ministry of Finance	Responsible Agency Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
---------------------------------	--

Project Development Objective (PDO)

Original PDO

To execute REDD+ activities through participatory sustainable forest management in priority areas and to pilot forest landscape management in four provinces

Summary Status of Financing

Ln/Cr/Tf	Approval	Signing	Effectiveness	Closing	Net Commitment	Disbursed	Undisbursed
IDA-H8520	31-May-2013	08-Aug-2013	30-Aug-2013	31-Aug-2018	19.00	15.91	2.08
TF-15286	08-Aug-2013	08-Aug-2013	08-Aug-2013	31-Aug-2018	12.83	10.61	2.22

Policy Waiver(s)

Does this restructuring trigger the need for any policy waiver(s)?

No



Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.

I. PROJECT STATUS AND RATIONALE FOR RESTRUCTURING

A. Project Status

1. Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) continues to show strong commitment and leadership to its Participatory Sustainable Forest Management Program implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF). The World Bank support to the Program is the Scaling-Up Participatory Sustainable Forest Management Project (SUFORD-SU), financed by International Development Agency (IDA) and the Forest Investment Program (FIP) through the Climate Investment Fund (CIF). SUFORD-SU was declared effective on August 30, 2013 and total disbursement of all external financing source for IDA grant is currently 87.40 percent, and for the FIP grant is 81.71 percent. Village development and forest restoration grant making processes have recently commenced and are mostly not yet spent.
2. The December 2017 Implementation Status Report (ISR) concluded that project implementation is on track toward achieving the PDO. SUFORD-SU covers 13 provinces containing 41 of the country's 51 production forest areas (PFAs), comprising 2.3 million ha and an estimated 1090 villages. These areas are designated to maintain a supply of forest products for development and poverty reduction benefits. SUFORD-SU is piloting a planning approach to forest landscape management (FLM) in four provinces, and village forestry in 30 villages within this area. The project also continues to give assistance to forest and wildlife law enforcement activities in all provinces, as well as to work on key relevant policy, legislative, and regulatory issues. The project aims to improve participation of women, all ethnic groups, and vulnerable people in its project activities. The project social and environmental safeguards are interwoven into the project's Community Engagement Framework (CEF), its operating procedures, and are being monitored.
3. Through SUFORD-SU, linkages are developed with the REDD+ Readiness process including issues related to forest dependent communities, access natural resources, land tenure, customary rights, benefit sharing, conflict resolution mechanisms, and law enforcement. Collaboration includes analytical work, capacity building, and strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for forest-dependent communities. SUFORD-SU is also linked to a parallel Development Policy Financing series on Green Growth (P166839) that is supporting key forest sector policy reforms including timber legality and forest certification.
4. The December 2017 Implementation Status Report (ISR) retained Moderately Satisfactory (MS) ratings for overall implementation of the project, but some of the work is behind schedule (except for component 3). Inventories and management plans are complete for 40 of the 41 PFAs under component 1, which is a significant achievement. However, the Prime Minister's logging ban has precluded the initiation of harvesting and therefore benefit sharing with villagers for timber.
5. Project management by the Project Support Unit (PSU) in MAF/DOF has improved on many levels, and is focusing support on the project's Financial Management team to better plan and manage funds flow and complete replenishments in a timely manner. Due to the change in government fiscal year, the next audit report will cover the



period from October 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017 and due for submission no later than June 30, 2018. M&E has been an area for improvement, which this restructuring addresses, as well as support being provided to the PSU through a firm that has since shifted staff to part time support after the Government of Finland closed its financial support to SUFORD. M&E was rated MS nonetheless, and the recent improvements in results indicators proposed in this restructuring will help the project consolidate and report on its achievements. The PSU and its partners have also generated knowledge and communication products that qualitatively document achievements. Below are highlights of project results:

6. The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to execute REDD+ activities through participatory sustainable forest management in priority areas and to pilot forest landscape management in four provinces. The original PDO indicators are:
 - Forest area brought under management plans;
 - Forest area brought under forest landscape management;
 - People in forest and adjacent community with monetary/non-monetary benefit from forest;
 - Rate of forest cover loss/gain in target areas compared to untreated areas;
 - Enhanced carbon storage from improved forest protection and restoration in selected PSFM areas;
 - Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in selected PSFM areas.
7. **Status of Component 1: Strengthening and Expanding PSFM in Production Forest Areas.** This component includes two subcomponents: (i) Developing partnerships to increase implementation capacity, and (ii) Community engagement in Participatory Sustainable Forest Management (PSFM) and Village Livelihood Development (VLD).
8. Forest inventories and management plans required for PSFM in 40 PFAs and 198 SFMAs were carried out in accordance with the PAD, Operations Manual and Annual Work Plan. There are 3 SFMAs in one PFA which cannot be inventoried because of security concerns in the area. All other Forest Management Plans were approved in December 2016.
9. Under Village Livelihood Development (VLD), the progress is incomplete. All the 675 VLD grant proposals of the 678 proposals have been approved at the village and district levels, and authorized by MAF Department of Forest (DOF). The VLD grants have been disbursed to 70% of districts 56% of villages, however constraints to funds flow continue to delay disbursements to other villages. Late delivery of VLD grants may lead to delays in technical and organizational support to individual and groups farmers/ cooperatives as well as participatory monitoring of VLD Grants activities and the grant disbursement needs to be further expedited. Forest Restoration Grants (FRG) for 59 sub-projects were approved for Assisted Natural Regeneration which will be mobilized in the 2018 dry season. Training has been completed for 9 central level, 40 provincial level and 529 district level staff in various aspects of VLD planning and management.
10. **Status of Component 2: Piloting Forest Landscape Management.** The component includes developing methodologies and frameworks for forest landscape management for four northern provinces; Bokeo (BK), Louangnamtha (LM), Oudomxai (OU) and Xaiyaboury (XA) by facilitating consultative/participatory processes and strengthened interagency coordination.
11. The development of the FLM planning approach has been completed. The approach includes two phases where the total area of the three official Forest Categories is divided into zones with different targets and restrictions. In the Mapping Phase, the Forest Categories area of the target district is divided into preliminary zones based on interpretation of satellite imagery and auxiliary data by Geographical Information System (GIS) officers at the Forest



Inventory and Planning Division (FIPD). In the second phase, district officials, village and village cluster stakeholders are invited to a district consultation process where the preliminary zones are reviewed and finalized. The approach was piloted in Long District of Luangnamtha Province and Meun District of Vientiane Province. The pilots showed that the approach worked reasonably well and that it could be replicated in other districts of Luangnamtha and Bokeo. Work on forest landscape management was conceived to contribute to improved provincial-level land use planning, which will address some of the competing uses of forest land that are drivers of deforestation and degradation, such as infrastructure development and agricultural concessions.

12. **Status of Component 3: Enabling Legal and Regulatory Environment.** This component aims to strengthen the legal and regulatory frameworks for implementation of the PSFM and REDD+ at the national level and at the subnational level including land use planning at the community level that is critical to the management of forest resources.
13. Independent and project analyses and surveys indicate that law enforcement activities have been successful under the operation, particularly in regard to forest crime. Following the issuing of PMO 15 timber ban, enforcement actions has had a significant impact on logging and it is estimated by the Government (and verified by Forest Trends) that illegal trade has been reduced by 85% based on an analysis of the Viet Nam customs statistics for the imports of logs and sawn wood since 2010. Prosecutions and incarceration actions are now being undertaken. In 2016, 16 cases were referred to the Office of Public Prosecutor (OPP) and 32 prison sentences issued. For the first 6 months of 2017, 72 cases were referred to the OPP and 19 prison sentences imposed. During 2017, The project assisted in the drafting of the new Penal Code for Lao PDR. Once authorized it will expand and strengthen penalties and remove inconsistencies and gaps under current laws, including international agreements such as CITES.
14. SUFORD-SU also supports REDD Readiness process and the development of the emerging jurisdictional emissions reduction program of the GOL. Formulation of REDD+ Strategy started in late 2016. Under SUFORD-SU, FIP support in particular has contributed to the development of Reference Emission Level (REL) for the SUFORD-SU PFAs and worked to improve national forest information systems.
15. Component 3 has also supported the development and implementation of the following:
 - (i) Wildlife law enforcement structures to support coordinated, multi-agency responses at a provincial, national or international level. Multi-agency training is now standard, and investigations are carried out.
 - (ii) Supported DOFI's delivery in May 2018 of Prime Minister Order 5 on wildlife law enforcement, in particular CITES compliance.
 - (iii) A Risk Assessment procedure that incorporates assessments of scale, intensity, likelihood and consequence across 8 Areas at Risk (where is the risk of illegal activity occurring) and 8 Elements of Risk (what contribute to an illegal activity taking place). The risk matrix for each province identifies highest areas of risk, and that is where law enforcement efforts are focused operationally.
 - (iv) Developed and implemented a national, centralised Smart Phone Information Reporting and Intelligence Tracking System (SPIRIT system). Information collected includes the source of illegal goods and where these goods were to be sold, owners of vehicles, and middle men involved. It provides 'real time' reporting of illegal activities, and is the basis for an intelligence led response capacity. The system is open for use by all GoL agencies, NGOs, and members of the public.
 - (v) Developed and implemented a national Law Enforcement Dossier Database (LED) which establishes a central database for businesses and individuals engaged in illegal forest or wildlife crime. This provides a framework for developing targeted, intelligence led responses to crime. The successful systems and procedures developed and supported under Component 3 need to be moved toward full implementation. Despite



significant progress in the project, forest and wildlife crime continue which can result in the degradation of forests and enables Lao PDR to serve as a transit nation for international illegal wildlife trade.

16. Status of Component 4: Project Management

- (i) Overall, project management is rated Moderately Satisfactory.
- (ii) Overall, procurement performance of the project is considered Moderately Satisfactory, although there was recently an issue with procurement of vehicles that remains to be resolved, which could lower the rating.
- (iii) Notable improvement in the preparation and monitoring of annual work plan and budget.
- (iv) Good overall project management since the start of the project.
- (v) The social and environmental safeguards performance of the project continues to be Satisfactory.
- (vi) The Financial Management rating continues to be Moderately Satisfactory.

B. Rationale for Restructuring

- 16. The World Bank received restructuring requests from the Ministry of Finance on December 15, 2017 for the results framework and project extension on April 6, 2018 updating the extension request to one year until August 30, 2019.
- 17. The project proposed a 12-month extension to the project to ensure the village livelihood grants and forest restoration grants are fully supported. An action plan for completing any outstanding activities is a focus of the May 2018 implementation support mission. Despite some delays in implementation, the PDO is still achievable and the PDO statement is not being adjusted.
- 18. At the same time, the Government of Lao PDR has requested, and the Bank has agreed, on revision of the project's results framework to: (i) improve reporting of the project's physical achievements, (ii) introduce relevant new indicators or better define existing indicators, and (iii) amend baseline and target values as needed based on revised definitions and the project context on the ground. Ongoing dialogue with the PSU after the receipt of the request has resulted in the revisions to the indicators as presented below to meet standards for clarity and consistent reporting. These indicator revisions do not materially affect the scale, scope, or nature of the projects objectives, but rather help ensure that project achievements can be properly measured and reported leading up to the project closure, which is meant to facilitate a solid end of project evaluation (including migration of the improved indicators to the results framework in the Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) data sheet).

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CHANGES

- 19. **Revision in Loan Closing Date:** It is proposed to extend the project closing date by twelve (12) months, from August 31, 2018, to August 30, 2019. This will be the first restructuring of the project. The extension will allow time to technically complete the village livelihood grants and forest restoration grants, and report on physical achievements. It will also allow the Government time to complete the remaining agreed upon actions.
- 20. **Revision of Results Framework:** This revision aligns the indicators with the revised results matrix, which will help to improve measuring methodology, provide accurate definitions and add baseline and target values as promised to the



Bank Board at project approval. Revisions are summarized as follows: (i) revision of forest area brought under management plans; (ii) revision of people in forest and adjacent community with monetary/non-monetary benefit from forests; (iii) revision of reforms in forest policy, legislation or other regulations supported; (iv) revision of other indicators, or dropping/replacing some indicators, to address issues with clarity of wording and/or definitions and data collection and aggregation; and (v) adjusting targets and baseline values for ten indicators (four of which are PDO level) as promised to the Bank Board at approval. Specific changes to the PDO indicators and proposed changes to the intermediate results indicators are summarized in Table 1, definition of each indicator is included in Table 2, and the proposed methodology for each indicator is described in Table 3.

Table 1: Summary of Changes to PDO Indicators in the SUFORD SU Results Framework

Original PDO Level Indicators (Approved PAD)	Indicator Changes	Rationale for changes
1. Forest area brought under management plans (Ha)	No change in indicator wording. (Revision of initial baseline and target indicator)	Baseline set to 0 and the target has been adjusted to take into consideration the area that is inaccessible for security reasons (in Xaysomboun province).
2. Forest area brought under forest landscape management plans (Ha)	No change in indicator wording, but the definition is adjusted (Ha) (Revised) (Revision of measurement target)	The definition is adjusted to add clarity and to align with the government’s approach to “Re-delineation of 3 Forest Categories” which essentially aimed to define the future forest area. In the government’s approach the future forest area was to include the current area under 3 Forest Categories and the “good” forests outside of them. For consistency, the end target for measurement unit has been changed to hectares.
3. People in forest and adjacent community with monetary/ non-monetary benefit from forest (Number) Sub-indicator 3a. People in targeted forest and adjacent community with increased benefits from forest-female (Number)	People in forest and adjacent communities with monetary/ non-monetary benefit from project interventions (Number) (Revised) (Revision of wording and change of baseline) Sub-indicator 3a. People in targeted forest and adjacent community with increased benefits from interventions-female (Number) (Revised)	Originally included as a “Core Sector Indicator” (CSI) that, with the retirement of the CSIs, was automatically converted to a custom indicator. This presented an opportunity to better tailor the indicator formulation to capture the benefits deriving from both forest and livelihoods interventions supported under the project. The target remains unchanged except that the baseline is set to zero. The beneficiaries are limited to people who receive direct benefits from Village Livelihood Development Grants. This makes the benefit more tangible and the measurement can be done in a more precise manner. First



<p>Sub-indicator 3b. People in targeted forest and adjacent community with increased benefit from forest-Ethnic minority/ indigenous (Number)</p>	<p>(Revision of wording, baseline and end target indicator)</p> <p>Sub-indicator 3b. People in targeted forest and adjacent community with increased benefit from interventions -Ethnic minority/ indigenous (Number) (Revised) (Revision of wording, baseline and target indicator)</p>	<p>measurement is done in year 4, which is when the first VLD Grants became available, and at close.</p>
<p>4. Rate of forest cover loss/gain in target areas compared to untreated areas (Ha) (Percentage)</p>	<p>Rate of annual forest cover loss in targeted Production Forest Areas (Percentage) (Revised) (Revision of wording, baseline and measurement unit)</p>	<p>The indicator has been revised because the parameters applied in deriving the baseline and targets are unknown, and the indicator is regarded as no longer appropriate for measuring project activities. For the revised indicator, the baseline is set historically using the 2010-2015 period forest loss rate as assessed in the 2016 PFA Forest Cover Change Assessment study carried out by the project (including 2.5-km wide bands around the targeted PFAs that serve as a counterfactual). The new end of project target is set to be consistent with targets for PDO indicators 5 and 6.</p>
<p>5. Enhanced carbon storage from improved forest protection and restoration in selected PSFM areas (tCO₂e)</p>	<p>Enhanced carbon storage from improved forest protection and restoration (tCO₂e) (Revised) (Revision of wording)</p>	<p>The main activity for increasing biomass and carbon storage are the agroforestry sub-projects funded with VLD Grants. As part of them are located outside the PFAs the qualifier “in selected PSFM areas” was dropped. Interim targets were dropped because the first agroforestry sub-projects started only in year 4, and the results need time to mature. Accordingly, the end target remains unchanged, but the assessment of the result will be done only at project completion. The indicator and methodology were also defined in a more precise manner.</p>
<p>6. Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in selected PSFM areas (tCO₂e)</p>	<p>Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (tCO₂e) (Revised) (Revision of wording)</p>	<p>The wording of “selected PSFM areas” is dropped because project implements forest law enforcement in the entire country. If the geographical scope for estimating the reduction of emission is limited to “selected PSFM areas”, or even all Production Forest Areas (= PSFM areas) targeted by the project, only 12% of the results attributable to the project would be accounted for. Interim</p>



		targets are dropped because interim assessments cannot be done due to budget constraints. End target remains the same, but measuring will be done only at project completion.
Original Intermediate Level Indicators (Approved PAD)	Indicator Changes	Rationale
1.1. Percentage of beneficiaries who receive technical services of adequate quality (Percentage)	Beneficiaries who receive technical services of adequate quality (Percentage) (Revised) (Revision of wording)	No change except for small modification of the wording and that achievements will be measured only in year 5 and at close. Earlier surveys were cancelled because the delivery of technical services had not yet started. The end target remains relevant.
Sub-indicator 1.1a. Percentage of VFCL who receive services of adequate quality in Forest Management (Percentage)	Sub-indicator 1.1a. VFCL who receive services of adequate quality in Forest Management and Village Livelihood Development (Percentage) (Revised) (Revision of wording)	The sub-indicator 1.1a. "Village Livelihood Development" added because it is an essential component of village activities managed by the VFCLs. Measuring only in year 5 and at project completion, the end target remains relevant.
Sub-indicator 1.1b. Percentage of production groups who receive services of adequate quality in Livelihood Support (Percentage)	Sub-indicator 1.1 b. Production groups who receive services of adequate quality in Livelihood Support (Percentage) (Revised) (Revision of wording)	The sub-indicator 1.1b. There is no change except for a slight modification of the wording and that achievements will be measured only in year 5 and at close. The end target remains relevant.
1.2. Percentage of participants who perceive the CEF process is adequate (Percentage)	Participants who perceive the CEF process is adequate (Percentage) (Revised) (Revision of wording)	No change except a revision of wording and that achievements will be measured only in year 5 and at close. The end target remains relevant. Earlier surveys were cancelled because it was considered financially more efficient to conduct them together with surveys on indicators under 1.1, 1.1a, and 1.1b. Those surveys were, however, cancelled because the delivery of technical services had not yet started.
1.3. Aggregate forest area brought under strengthened tenure (km ²)	(Dropped) Sub-indicator 1.3a Forest area under MoU-PSFM (km ²) (Revised)	The indicator is proposed to be dropped as it duplicates the information under 1.3a and 1.3b. Sub-indicator 1.3a The MoU is the instrument selected by the government to strengthen



<p>Sub-indicator 1.3a Forest area brought under strengthened tenure (MoU) (km²)</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.3b Forest area brought under strengthened tenure (Forest Lease) (km²)</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.3c Forest area brought under strengthened tenure (Community Land Title) (km²)</p>	<p>(Revision of wording, baseline and target indicator)</p> <p>(Dropped)</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.3b Forest area under MoU-VFMA (Ha) (Revised) (Revision of wording, target and unit measurement)</p>	<p>tenure in Production Forest Areas (see below). The baseline has been set at zero and the target has been reduced to account for the inaccessibility of some areas for security reasons (see PDO 1).</p> <p>The sub-indicator 1.3b is proposed to be dropped. Forest leases for village communities are not a form of tenure applied in Lao PDR.</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.3c The MoU or the Village Forest Management Agreement (VFMA) is the instrument selected by the government to strengthen tenure in village forests. The target was reduced because after the mapping done by SUFORD-SU the area of Village Use Forests in and around the PFAs of the two pilot provinces turned out to be significantly less than the original target. Measurement will be done in year 5 and at close because Village Forest Management Plans, which are the basis for preparing VFMA's became available only towards the end of year 4. VFMA's cannot be signed unless the Village Forest Management Plans are available.</p>
<p>1.4. Percentage of CAPs and Village Development Plans under implementation (Percentage)</p>	<p>VLD Grants disbursed to villages and under implementation (Percentage) (Revised) (Revision of wording and baseline change)</p>	<p>The Indicator has been revised to better reflect the activities directly financed and delivered by the project. The main activity is the preparation and implementation of VLD grants. The new indicator reflects the fact that Community Action Plans (CAP) are a broad village planning framework (only selected activities under CAPs are implemented using funds from VLD Grants), and Village Development Plans are not developed under the project but are part of broader local governance. The SUFORD-SU Project has supported the formulation of CAPs and finances priority community-selected activities within them. The target remains relevant.</p>
<p>1.5. Aggregate forest area under certification (km²)</p>	<p>Aggregate forest area under certification as a result of the project (Ha) (Revised) (Revision of</p>	<p>The word "as a result of the project" was added to the definition to make the indicator more specific. The indicator unit is now reported in hectares to allow easier</p>



<p>Sub-indicator 1.5a Forest area under certification (FSC Forest Management Standard) (km²)</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.5b Forest area under certification (FSC Controlled Wood Standard) (km²)</p>	<p>wording, unit measurement, baseline change and end target)</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.5a Forest area under certification (FSC Forest Management Standard) as a result of the project (Ha) (Revised) (Revision of wording, unit measurement, baseline change and end target)</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.5b Forest area under certification (FSC Controlled Wood Standard) as a result of the project (Ha) (Revised) (Revision of wording, unit measurement, baseline change and end target)</p>	<p>comparability of different efforts. Baseline is updated to reflect that actual situation at the beginning of SUFORD-SU. The end target has been reduced because the forest area suitable for commercial wood production is smaller than the estimate made at the time of preparing the project when full information was not available. As the cost of certification can be justified mainly in commercial forest areas where the cost can potentially be recovered through improved commercial opportunities, the target is reduced accordingly.</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.5a The same reason as per above.</p> <p>Sub-indicator 1.5b The same reason as per above.</p>
<p>2.1. Number of FLM Frameworks developed under the project that are assessed as complete (Text)</p>	<p>Number of FLM Frameworks developed (Number) (Revised) (Revision of wording and unit measurement)</p>	<p>Forest Landscape Management is a cross-sectoral effort. The phrase “under the project that are assessed as complete” is dropped because cross-sectoral development cannot be sufficiently completed by a single project or sector. The FLM framework must have an institutional home with the mandate and capacity to reach out across sectors and complete the framework in collaboration with several players in the government and the private sector. After looking into several options, the responsibility for implementing FLM frameworks was assigned to provincial REDD+ Task Forces which have a cross-sectoral outreach due to the nature of REDD+.</p>



		In addition, having the provincial REDD+ Task Forces in charge will enable the integration of FLM management into the implementation of provincial REDD+ strategies which have been developed by DOF with support from the FCPF project. While SUFORD-SU played a supporting role in REDD+ development, the FCPF project had the mandate to develop the national and provincial REDD+ strategies and associated policies including those related to benefit sharing and conflict resolution mechanisms.
2.2. Areas with FLM Annual Plans under implementation (Ha)	Areas with Forest Landscape Management implementation plans (Ha) (Revised) (Revision of wording)	The wording was changed to be more general to better accommodate the current framework for FLM in Lao PDR. The Forest Landscape Management area comprises areas managed by several entities and some of them may not have annual plans, but more general long-term plans combined with short-term operational plans. For instance, private sector companies may have planning systems of this type.
3.1. Reforms in forest policy, legislation or other regulations supported (Yes/No) Sub-indicator 3.2a Regulations required to support national sustainable sector financing and sub-national implementation of PSFM and REDD+ are identified, drafted and submitted for government review (text) Sub-indicator 3.2 b Number of breaches of forest law detected (Number)	Reforms in forest policy, legislation or other regulations supported (Yes/No) (No changes) (Dropped) (Dropped)	No changes suggested for the indicator level result, but changes made under the sub-indicator level result (see 3.2a and 3.2b) Sub-indicator 3.2a Proposed to be dropped because it largely duplicates the previous indicator. Sub-indicator 3.2b Proposed to be dropped because it is incorporated in the assessment done under the revised indicator 3.4.
3.4 Percentage of investigations of breaches of forest law initiated and successfully concluded (Percentage)	Investigations of breaches of forestry law and wildlife and aquatic law referred to criminal courts (Percentage) (Revised) (Revision of wording, baseline and end target)	The original indicator does not capture the salient points of investigative activity. It refers only to Forestry Law and excludes Wildlife and Aquatic Law which is a critical area of enforcement carried out under SUFORD-SU. Also, it does not distinguish between the types of investigative "conclusions". Administrative procedures are considerably easier to



		conclude than cases referred to criminal courts, which are considered more important in that they typically deal with more serious breaches. Accordingly, the indicator scope has been broadened to cover activities related to Wildlife and Aquatic Law. At the same time, it has been given a sharper focus by limiting it to cases that reach criminal courts. The outcome of the court cases is left out of the indicator scope as the project is not directly involved and cannot contribute to the outcome.
	STEPP field activities resulting in enforcement action (Percentage) (New)	In the past, forest law enforcement was emphasizing crime prevention through education. During SUFORD-SU, a new strategy putting more emphasis on enforcement has been adopted by DOFI. Enforcement activities include detection, disruption, dismantling, discouragement, and ultimately prosecution. Under SUFORD-SU the main tool for enforcement is STEPP (the Strategic and Tactical Enforcement Patrol Program) which is implemented through systematic patrolling. To indicate whether the proposed shift towards enforcement is taking place, the indicator measures the proportion of human resources dedicated to patrolling as opposed to education and administration.
	POFIs in compliance with DOFI best management practice operating procedures (Number) (New)	Law enforcement is a complex issue and available performance indicators tend not to be able to capture all relevant attributes of success. The proposed new indicator is based on DOFI best practices covering all key areas of work whose implementation is monitored through compliance audits.

Table 2: Definition of Each Indicator in the Restructured SUFORD-SU Results Framework

<i>PDO indicator</i>	<i>Indicator definition</i>
1. Forest area brought under management plans (Ha)	This indicator measures the Production Forest Area where government-approved PSFM plans prepared with support from SUFORD-SU are under implementation.



	The project aims to meet the target by preparing PSFM plans for Production Forest Areas inside the project area. No other forestland areas such as Protection Forests will be covered by PSFM plans, as they are excluded from project scope.
2. Forest area brought under forest landscape management plans (Ha)	This indicator measures the area under plans for Forest Landscape Management (FLM) in Bokeo, Luang Namtha, Oudomxay and Xayaboury provinces. FLM refers to all forest management and land use activities done in the FLM area in a manner where activities impacting across management entities are conducted in a coordinated manner. The Forest Landscape Management Area (FLMA) comprises the total area of three Forest Categories and the “good” forests outside them. The FLMA is defined at the provincial level. The three Forest Categories include Production Forest Areas (PFA), Protection Forests (PF) National Protected Areas (NPAs), Protection Forests at Provincial and District Levels as well as Protected Areas at Provincial and District Levels. “Good” forests are defined as areas with (i) a clearly detectable canopy in aerial photographs, and (ii) no signs of large-scale shifting cultivation or deforestation since 2000. In addition, small unconnected forest patches surrounded by other land uses (fallow, agriculture, shifting, etc.) are excluded. “Pilots” refers to planning FLM in the first four provinces.
3. People in forest & adjacent community with monetary/ non-monetary benefit from interventions (Number)	The number of people in households implementing village sub-projects with funds available from Village Livelihood Development Grants provided by SUFORD-SU.
Sub-indicator 3.a People in targeted forest & adjacent community with increased benefits from interventions-female (Number)	The number of people in households implementing village sub-projects with funds available from Village Livelihood Development Grants provided by SUFORD-SU.
Sub-indicator 3.b People in targeted forest & adjacent community with increased benefit from interventions -Ethnic minority/ indigenous (Number)	The number of people in households implementing village sub-projects with funds available from Village Livelihood Development Grants provided by SUFORD-SU.
4. Rate of annual forest cover loss in targeted Production Forest Areas (Percentage)	The rate of annual forest cover loss in Production Forest Areas targeted by the project.
5. Enhanced carbon storage from improved forest protection and restoration (tCO ₂ e)	Enhanced carbon storage (i.e., removal of carbon from atmosphere and storage in biomass) from improved forest protection and restoration (i.e., planting, regeneration) in Production Forest Areas covered by the project.
6. Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction of emissions from deforestation in the Production Forest Areas targeted by the project, and from forest degradation in the entire country.
Intermediate indicator	Indicator definition



1.1. Beneficiaries who receive technical services of adequate quality (Number)	Percentage of the direct beneficiaries among the village population who perceive that they receive technical services of adequate quality. Direct beneficiaries include members of the Village Forest and Livelihood Committee, and those who receive VLD Grants.
Sub-indicator 1.1a VFLC who receive services of adequate quality in Forest Management and Village Livelihood Development (Percentage)	Percentage of VFLCs who perceive that the project has delivered services of adequate quality in Forest Management and Village Livelihood Development.
Sub-indicator 1.1b Production groups who receive services of adequate quality in Livelihood Support (Percentage)	Percentage of production groups who receive services of adequate quality in Livelihood Support. Relevant production groups include those which have as members one or more villagers benefiting from VLD Grants provided by SUFORD-SU.
a. Participants who perceive the CEF process is adequate (Percentage)	Percentage of participants who perceive the Community Engagement Framework (CEF) process is adequate. Participants refer to all villagers who have participated in various stages of the CEF process.
Sub-indicator 1.3a Forest area under MoU-PSFM (Ha)	MoU-PSFM refers to PSFM Forest Management Agreement signed between the villages (located fully or partially inside PFAs) and the government. The area refers to the portion of village territory that is inside PFA boundaries.
Sub-indicator 1.3c Forest area under MoU-VFMA (Ha)	MoU-VFMA refers to Village Forest Management Agreement signed between the villages and the government. The area refers to the portion of village territory allocated as Village Forests inside or outside PFAs comprising Village Use Forests, Village Protection Forests and Village Protected Areas.
1.4. VLD Grants disbursed to villages and under implementation (Percentage)	VLD Grants disbursed to villages and under implementation. Each village receives one VLD Grant which is divided among several village sub-projects. Disbursement refers to releasing VLD Grant funds to villagers for implementing their sub-projects. They are under implementation once the villagers have started to spend funds. The percentage indicates the proportion of village sub-projects under implementation compared to the total number of proposed village sub-projects. VLD Grants are funds provided under SUFORD-SU for village livelihood development.
1.5. Aggregate forest area under certification as a result of the project (Ha)	Total forest area under certification as a result of technical or financial support provided by the project. Forest area refers to 3 zones inside PFAs: production forest, HCV zone, and the Village Use Forest. Forest certification is a mechanism for forest monitoring, tracing and labeling timber, wood and pulp products and non-timber forest products, where the quality of forest management is judged against a series of agreed standards. The standards applied in Lao PDR are the FSC Forest Management Standard and the FSC Controlled Wood Standard. FSC Forest Management certification confirms that a specific area of forest is being managed in line with the FSC Principles and Criteria (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/what-we-do/mission-and-vision). FSC Controlled Wood Standard confirms that wood products do not originate from unacceptable sources (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/certification/controlled-wood).
Sub-indicator 1.5a	Total forest area under certification as a result of technical or financial support provided by the project. Forest area refers to 3 zones inside PFAs: production forest, HCV zone, and the Village Use Forest. Forest certification is a



<p>Forest area under certification (FSC Forest Management Standard) as a result of the project (Ha)</p>	<p>mechanism for forest monitoring, tracing and labeling timber, wood and pulp products and non-timber forest products, where the quality of forest management is judged against a series of agreed standards. The standards applied in Lao PDR are the FSC Forest Management Standard and the FSC Controlled Wood Standard. FSC Forest Management certification confirms that a specific area of forest is being managed in line with the FSC Principles and Criteria (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/what-we-do/mission-and-vision). FSC Controlled Wood Standard confirms that wood products do not originate from unacceptable sources (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/certification/controlled-wood).</p>
<p>Sub-indicator 1.5b Forest area under certification (FSC Controlled Wood Standard) as a result of the project (Ha)</p>	<p>Total forest area under certification as a result of technical or financial support provided by the project. Forest area refers to 3 zones inside PFAs: production forest, HCV zone, and the Village Use Forest. Forest certification is a mechanism for forest monitoring, tracing and labeling timber, wood and pulp products and non-timber forest products, where the quality of forest management is judged against a series of agreed standards. The standards applied in Lao PDR are the FSC Forest Management Standard and the FSC Controlled Wood Standard. FSC Forest Management certification confirms that a specific area of forest is being managed in line with the FSC Principles and Criteria (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/what-we-do/mission-and-vision). FSC Controlled Wood Standard confirms that wood products do not originate from unacceptable sources (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/certification/controlled-wood).</p>
<p>2.1. Number of FLM Frameworks developed (Yes/No)</p>	<p>FLM framework at the provincial level comprises the conceptual plan for managing the FLM area, the map defining the FLM area, and the organization coordinating FLM management by involved entities following on the national REDD+ strategy. The target in each province is met once the conceptual plan and the FLM map are available, the organization to be in charge has been identified, and the conceptual plan and the FLM map have been introduced to the representatives of the said organization.</p>
<p>2.2. Areas with Forest Landscape Management implementation plans (Ha)</p>	<p>Forest landscape (as defined under PDO 2) covered by implementation plans. These may include annual plans, general long-term plans or short-term operational plans depending on the planning approach in the involved entities.</p>
<p>3.1. Reforms in forest policy, legislation or other regulations supported (Number)</p>	<p>Description of reforms in forest policy, legislation or other regulations supported by the project. Support comprises formulation of proposals for policies, legal acts or guidelines, conducting relevant analyses, and contributing to relevant working groups.</p>
<p>3.4. Investigations of breaches of forestry law and wildlife and aquatic law referred to criminal courts (Percentage)</p>	<p>Percentage of investigations of breaches of forestry law and wildlife and aquatic law referred to criminal courts.</p>
<p>3.5. STEPP field activities resulting in enforcement action (Percentage)</p>	<p>Percentage of person-days spent on STEPP field activities resulting in enforcement action. Enforcement activities include detection, disruption, dismantling, discouragement, and ultimately prosecution. Field activities refer to activities undertaken by provincial and district staff. Enforcement includes patrolling but excludes education and administration.</p>



3.6. POFIs in compliance with DOFI best management practice operating procedures (Number)	Number of provinces (out of the total of 18 provinces) that pass the DOFI annual compliance audit.
---	--

Table 3: Methodology for each Indicator in the Restructured SUFORD-SU Results Framework

<i>PDO indicator</i>	<i>Methodology</i>
1. Forest area brought under management plans (Ha)	The total area under PSFM plans will be determined by summing up the areas provided in individual PSFM plans prepared with support from SUFORD-SU.
2. Forest area brought under forest landscape management plans (Ha)	The forest landscape management area will be defined through remote sensing, field checks and consultations with stakeholders.
3. People in forest & adjacent community with monetary/ non-monetary benefit from interventions (Number)	The number of beneficiary households is derived from project records. The number of people is estimated by multiplying the number of beneficiary households with the average number of people in rural households according to 2015 census. The number of beneficiaries will be cumulative until the maximum number of beneficiaries allowed by the available funds is reached. Thereafter the number of beneficiaries is expected to remain largely unchanged since they continue to benefit each subsequent year. The theory of change of the project centers on the need for both benefits from PSFM and alternative livelihoods that can reduce pressure on forest and land.
Sub-indicator 3.a People in targeted forest & adjacent community with increased benefits from interventions-female (Number)	The number of beneficiary households is derived from project records. The number of people is estimated by multiplying the number of beneficiary households with the average number of people in rural households according to 2015 census. The number of beneficiaries will be cumulative until the maximum number of beneficiaries allowed by the available funds is reached. Thereafter the number of beneficiaries is expected to remain largely unchanged since they continue to benefit each subsequent year. The theory of change of the project centers on the need for both benefits from PSFM and alternative livelihoods that can reduce pressure on forest and land.
Sub-indicator 3.b People in targeted forest & adjacent community with increased benefit from interventions -Ethnic minority/ indigenous (Number)	The number of beneficiary households is derived from project records. The number of people is estimated by multiplying the number of beneficiary households with the average number of people in rural households according to 2015 census. The number of beneficiaries will be cumulative until the maximum number of beneficiaries allowed by the available funds is reached. Thereafter the number of beneficiaries is expected to remain largely unchanged since they continue to benefit each subsequent year. The theory of change of the project centers on the need for both benefits from PSFM and alternative livelihoods that can reduce pressure on forest and land.
4. Rate of annual forest cover loss in targeted Production Forest Areas (Percentage)	The achievement will be assessed in a PFA Forest Cover Change Assessment to be conducted in the 1st half of 2018 establishing the rate of annual forest loss during 2015-2017.



<p>5. Enhanced carbon storage from improved forest protection and restoration (tCO₂e)</p>	<p>The potential to enhance carbon storage is estimated based on theoretical models of biomass growth and carbon sequestration in agroforestry sub-projects established with funds from VLD Grants. Based on the available models the sequestration with all agroforestry sub-projects under implementation is established at 2,500 tCO₂e per month. The total sequestration is established by multiplying the monthly sequestered amount by the average duration of agroforestry sub-projects and percentage of sub-projects that are under implementation at the time of estimation. The average duration and percentage of sub-projects under implementation are estimated by project staff drawing on project records.</p>
<p>6. Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (tCO₂e)</p>	<p>The emissions from forest degradation are established by estimating changes in the volume of illegal logging and the associated emissions due to more efficient law enforcement.</p> <p>The amount of illegal logging is established by working backwards from the changes in customs statistics in key export countries (Vietnam and China) to theoretical logging sites. The proportion of the change attributable to SUFORD-SU (40%) is assumed to be proportionate to the amount of funds provided by the project of the entire forest law enforcement budget in the country in 2016, which is when the key piece of legislation the Prime Minister’s Order No. 15 (PMO 15) on <i>Strengthening the Strictness of Timber Harvest Management and Inspection, Timber Transport and Business</i> was issued.</p> <p>The amount of emissions is estimated using standard conversion factors. The emissions are estimated to occur fully at time of harvest following an established international practice (committed emissions). The amount is estimated to be 4.5 million tCO₂e nationwide, of which SUFORD-SU’s contribution is established at 1.8 million tCO₂e (40 %, see above).</p> <p>The emissions from deforestation are estimated by establishing the reduction in forest area by remote sensing and multiplying it by average carbon content (as per available literature) in the deforested areas. The potential increase of forest area is excluded from the analysis due to lack of reliable assessment methodologies. The assessment will be carried out in the first half of 2018.</p>
<p>Intermediate indicator</p>	<p>Methodology</p>
<p>1.1. Beneficiaries who receive technical services of adequate quality (Number)</p>	<p>The indicator will be measured by conducting a perception-based survey among project beneficiaries.</p>
<p>Sub-indicator 1.1a VFLC who receive services of adequate quality in Forest Management and Village Livelihood Development (Percentage)</p>	<p>The indicator will be measured by conducting a perception-based survey among selected VFLCs.</p>



Sub-indicator 1.1b. Production groups who receive services of adequate quality in Livelihood Support (Percentage)	The indicator will be measured by conducting a perception-based survey among selected VFLLCs.
1.2. Participants who perceive the CEF process is adequate (Percentage)	Perception-based survey among villagers who have participated in the CEF process. The survey sample shall include representatives from Village Forest and Livelihood Committee and population groups such as women, and ethnic minorities, if present in the village.
Sub-indicator 1.3.a Forest area under MoU-PSFM (Ha)	The area under MoUs-PSFM is established based on reports provided by Provincial Forestry Sections.
Sub-indicator 1.3.c Forest area under MoU-VFMA (Ha)	The area under MoUs-PSFM is established based on reports provided by Division of Village Forestry and NTFPs of the Department of Forestry.
1.4. VLD Grants disbursed to villages and under implementation (Percentage)	The proportion of funding in sub-projects under implementation is estimated based on reports provided by provincial authorities.
1.5. Aggregate forest area under certification as a result of the project (Ha)	The forest area meeting the FSC requirements is determined through audits by a third-party certifying body. Before audits the certificate holder, in this case DOF, declares the area they propose for certification. After completing the audit, the certifying body confirms whether the area meets the requirements. The confirmed area of certified forest is sourced from the audit report.
Sub-indicator 1.5a Forest area under certification (FSC Forest Management Standard) as a result of the project (Ha)	The forest area meeting the FSC requirements is determined through audits by a third-party certifying body. Before audits the certificate holder, in this case DOF, declares the area they propose for certification. After completing the audit, the certifying body confirms whether the area meets the requirements. The confirmed area of certified forest is sourced from the audit report.
Sub-indicator 1.5b Forest area under certification (FSC Controlled Wood Standard) as a result of the project (Ha)	The forest area meeting the FSC requirements is determined through audits by a third-party certifying body. Before audits the certificate holder, in this case DOF, declares the area they propose for certification. After completing the audit, the certifying body confirms whether the area meets the requirements. The confirmed area of certified forest is sourced from the audit report.
2.1 Number of FLM Frameworks developed (Yes/No)	Reporting is based on DOF reports.
2.2 Areas with Forest Landscape Management implementation plans (Ha)	The information is collected from entities managing land units inside Forest Landscape Management area.
3.1 Reforms in forest policy, legislation or other regulations supported (Number)	Information collected through project reports.
3.4. Investigations of breaches of forestry law and wildlife and aquatic law referred to criminal courts (Percentage)	Data will be collected from DOFI records.
3.5 STEPP field activities resulting in enforcement action (Percentage)	Data will be collected from DOFI records.



3.6 POFIs in compliance with DOFI best management practice operating procedures (Number)	Compliance will be assessed based on DOFI evaluation audits done separately for each province on a monthly basis. The annual score is the average of monthly scores during the fiscal year. The evaluation is done by the DOFI Information Management Division whose initial assessment is endorsed by DOFI Director General. The evaluation is done on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 indicates full compliance and 5 poor performance. An average score of 4 or higher indicates failure to pass the audit. Evaluation covers eight areas of work including 1) Patrol Activity, 2) Timber Seizures 3) Wildlife Seizures, 4) NTFP, 5) Land illegally cleared, 6) Equipment, 7) Investigations, 8) Community Education Activity. In addition, the quality of written reports is evaluated. The limitation of the indicator is that it captures compliance with procedures but not the direct outcome.
--	--

Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

II. SUMMARY OF CHANGES

	Changed	Not Changed
Change in Results Framework	✓	
Change in Loan Closing Date(s)	✓	
Change in Implementation Schedule	✓	
Change in Implementing Agency		✓
Change in DDO Status		✓
Change in Project's Development Objectives		✓
Change in Components and Cost		✓
Cancellations Proposed		✓
Reallocation between Disbursement Categories		✓
Change in Disbursements Arrangements		✓
Change in Disbursement Estimates		✓
Change in Overall Risk Rating		✓
Change in Safeguard Policies Triggered		✓



Change of EA category		✓
Change in Legal Covenants		✓
Change in Institutional Arrangements		✓
Change in Financial Management		✓
Change in Procurement		✓
Other Change(s)		✓
Change in Economic and Financial Analysis		✓
Change in Technical Analysis		✓
Change in Social Analysis		✓
Change in Environmental Analysis		✓

IV. DETAILED CHANGE(S)

RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Development Objective Indicators

Forest area brought under management plans Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha) Indicator Type: Corporate				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	976211.00	975000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	17-Apr-2018	30-Aug-2019	
Forest area brought under forest landscape management plans Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha) Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	3380170.00	2680000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	
People in forest and adjacent community with monetary/ non-monetary benefit from interventions Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action



Value	0.00	71000.00	115000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	
People in targeted forest and adjacent community with increased benefits from interventions-female Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	32000.00	53000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	
People in targeted forest and adjacent community with increased benefit from interventions - Ethnic minority/indigenous Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	26000.00	80000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2018	
Enhanced carbon storage from improved forest protection and restoration Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	3500.00	14227.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	
Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	1800000.00	121407.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	
Rate of annual forest cover loss in targeted Production Forest Areas Unit of Measure: Percentage Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action



Value	0.27		0.23	New
Date	01-Jul-2013	21-May-2018	30-Aug-2019	

Intermediate Indicators

Beneficiaries who receive technical services of adequate quality				
Unit of Measure: Percentage				
Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	0.00	80.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	

VFLC who receive services of adequate quality in Forest Management and Village Livelihood Development				
Unit of Measure: Percentage				
Indicator Type: Custom Breakdown				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00		80.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Production groups who receive services of adequate quality in Livelihood Support				
Unit of Measure: Percentage				
Indicator Type: Custom Breakdown				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	0.00	80.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Participants who perceive the CEF process is adequate				
Unit of Measure: Percentage				
Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	0.00	80.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	19-Jun-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Forest area under MoU-PSFM



Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha)

Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00		975000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Forest area brought under strengthened tenure (MoU)

Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha)

Indicator Type: Custom Breakdown

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	982000.00	2301000.00	Marked for Deletion
Date	01-Jul-2013	19-Jun-2017	31-Aug-2018	

Forest Area brought under strengthened tenure (Forest Lease)

Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha)

Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	0.00	400.00	Marked for Deletion
Date	31-Jul-2013	27-Dec-2017	31-Aug-2018	

VLD Grants disbursed to villages and under implementation

Unit of Measure: Percentage

Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	40.00	100.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	19-Jun-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Aggregate forest area under certification as a result of the project

Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha)

Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	10949.00	175000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Forest area under certification (FSC Forest Management Standard) as a result of the project



Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha)
Indicator Type: Custom Breakdown

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	10949.00	85000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Forest area under certification (FSC Controlled Wood Standard) as a result of the project

Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha)
Indicator Type: Custom Breakdown

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	0.00	90000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	19-Jun-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Number of FLM Frameworks developed

Unit of Measure: Number
Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	4.00	4.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Areas with Forest Landscape Management implementation plans

Unit of Measure: Number
Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00		1080000.00	Revised
Date	01-Jul-2013	19-Jun-2017	30-Aug-2019	

Reforms in forest policy, legislation or other regulations supported

Unit of Measure: Yes/No
Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	No	Yes	Yes	No Change
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	31-Aug-2018	

Regulations required to support national sustainable sector financing and sub-national implementation of PSFM and REDD+ are identified, drafted and submitted for government review



Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	regulation partial; not regularly monitored	regulation complete with implementation monitored regularly	regulation complete with implementation monitored regularly	Marked for Deletion
Date	01-Jul-2013	18-Dec-2017	31-Aug-2018	
Number of breaches of forest law detected Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	638.00	650.00	Marked for Deletion
Date	01-Jul-2013	19-Jun-2017	31-Aug-2018	
Investigations of breaches of forestry law and wildlife and aquatic law referred to criminal courts Unit of Measure: Percentage Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	3.00	5.00	Revised
Date	31-Jul-2013	27-Dec-2017	30-Aug-2019	
STEPP field activities resulting in enforcement action Unit of Measure: Percentage Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	81.00	80.00	New
Date	31-Jul-2013	17-May-2018	30-Aug-2019	
POFIs in compliance with DOFI best management practice operating procedures Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00	17.00	18.00	New
Date	31-Jul-2013	17-May-2018	30-Aug-2019	
Forest area under MoU-VFMA				



Unit of Measure: Hectare(Ha)				
Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00		10000.00	New
Date	12-Aug-2013	21-May-2018	30-Aug-2019	

LOAN CLOSING DATE(S)

Ln/Cr/Tf	Status	Original Closing	Revised Closing(s)	Proposed Closing	Proposed Deadline for Withdrawal Applications
IDA-H8520	Effective	31-Aug-2018		30-Aug-2019	30-Dec-2019
TF-15286	Effective	31-Aug-2018		30-Aug-2019	30-Dec-2019

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.

ANNEX 1.

Glossary

3 Forest Categories	Three officially approved designations of state forest with specific regulations governing their management. The categories are Production Forest Areas, Protection Forests, National Protected Areas, Protection Forests at Provincial and District Levels as well as Protected Areas at Provincial and District Levels.
Certification Body	Independent organizations called certification bodies assess forest management and chain of custody operations against agreed standards
Community Action Plan (CAP)	Plan identifying potential activities that would contribute to livelihood development in the context of SUFORD-SU; formulation of CAPs precedes identification of village sub-projects and is supported by SUFORD-SU
Community Engagement Framework (CEF)	Set or procedure development by SUFORD-SU to engage and consult stakeholders involved in and impacted by project activities. The procedures have been documented in a CEF manual.



District Protected Area	Area designated and managed by district authorities usually for protection of biodiversity; documentation on these areas is fragmentary and incomplete
District Protection Forest	Area designated and managed by district authorities usually for protection of watershed areas; documentation on these areas is fragmentary and incomplete
DOF	Department of Forestry under Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
DOFI	Department of Forest Inspection under Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Forest Certification	Mechanism for forest monitoring, tracing and labeling timber, wood and pulp products and non-timber forest products, where the quality of forest management is judged against a series of agreed standards
Forest Landscape Management (FLM)	All forest management and land use activities done in the FLM area in a manner where activities impacting across management entities are conducted in a coordinated manner.
Forest Landscape Management Area (FLMA)	In the SUFORD-SU context, FLMA comprises the area of three Forest Categories and the “good” forests outside them. It is defined at the provincial level. The 3 Forest Categories include Production Forest Areas (PFA), Protection Forests (PF) and National Protected Areas (NPAs). “Good” forests are defined as areas with (i) a clearly detectable canopy in aerial photographs, and (ii) no signs of large-scale shifting cultivation or deforestation since 2000, (iii) In addition, small unconnected forest patches surrounded by other land uses (fallow, agriculture, shifting, etc.) are excluded.
FLM Framework	Comprises the conceptual plan for managing the FLM area, the map defining the FLM area, and the organization coordinating FLM management by involved entities (following on the national REDD+ strategy)
Forest Management Agreement	Agreement signed between relevant government agencies and village authorities regarding the management of Production Forest Area; the agreement defines the rights and responsibilities of villagers and government agencies
Forest Management Plan	Plan prepared for management of Production Forest Areas. The plan for one PFA consists of one or more separate plans prepared for sub-units called Forest Management Area.
Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)	International non-profit, multi-stakeholder organization established to promote responsible management of the world’s forests by setting standards on forest management, along with certifying and labeling them as sustainably managed.
FSC Forest Management Standard	FSC Forest Management Standard defines how forest is being managed in line with the FSC Principles and Criteria (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/what-we-do/mission-and-vision).
FSC Controlled Wood Standard	Compliance with FSC Controlled Wood Standard confirms that wood products do not originate from unacceptable sources (https://us.fsc.org/en-us/certification/controlled-wood).
MOU-PSFM	Forest Management Agreement, see above
National Protected Area	Areas designated to conserve key habitats and ecosystems. National Protected Areas usually have extensive forest cover (on average 80+ %)
Participatory Sustainable Forest Management (PSFM)	Model for managing Production Forest Areas where management is undertaken by government staff following a Forest Management Plan with participation of local villagers
PSFM Area	Production Forest Area, see above
PSFM Plan	Forest Management Plan, see above



Production Forest Area	Area designated to maintain a supply of forest products in support of national socio-economic development and poverty eradication; Production Forest Areas usually have a moderate forest cover (in SUFORD PFAs on average 73.8 %)
Protection Forest	Area designated to protect watersheds, other environmentally sensitive areas and strategic areas for national defense and public security. Protection Forests usually have moderately extensive forest cover (on average 50-60 %)
Provincial Protected Area	Area designated and managed by provincial authorities usually for protection of biodiversity; documentation on these areas is fragmentary and incomplete
Provincial Protection Forest	Area designated and managed by provincial authorities usually for protection of watershed areas; documentation on these areas is fragmentary and incomplete
(village) Sub-project	Livelihood Improvement activities implemented by villagers with funds becoming available from Village Livelihood Development Grants; the total number of sub-projects supported by SUFORD-SU is approximately 20,000
Village Development Plan	Overall development plan in a village; preparation is not supported by SUFORD-SU
Village Forest and Livelihood Committee	Village authority overseeing SUFORD-related activities
Village Forest Management Agreement (MOU-VFMA)	Agreement signed between village authorities and the relevant government agencies regarding the management of Village Forests; the agreement defines the rights and responsibilities of villagers and government agencies
Village Forest Management Plan (VFMP)	Plan for managing village forests
Village Forestry	Model for managing a forest area where management is undertaken by villagers following a Village Forest Management Plan and under the supervision of government staff
Village Forest	Area allocated for local villagers to protect and manage. May overlap and cut across all 3 Forest Categories and areas outside. Comprises Village Use Forests, Village Protection Forests and Village Protected Areas
Village Livelihood Development Grant (VLD Grant)	Funds provide to a village by SUFORD-SU for livelihood improvement. The amount per village is fixed, USD 4000 or USD 8000, and it is usually divided among several smaller sub-projects implemented by selected households
Village Protection Forest	Area allocated for villagers to protect and manage for the purpose of protecting watersheds. May overlap and cut across all 3 Forest Categories and areas outside.
Village Protected Area	Area allocated for village to protect and manage for the purpose of protecting biodiversity and culturally valuable sites. May overlap and cut across all 3 Forest Categories and areas outside.
Village Use Forest	Forest area allocated for villages to manage where they are allowed to harvest timber and NTFPs for household use. May overlap and cut across all 3 Forest Categories and areas outside.