

Collaborative Monitoring Diagnostic



About your group

Please select your collaborative or region (mark an X next to it):

<input type="checkbox"/>	4 Forest Restoration Initiative, Arizona
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accelerating Longleaf Pine Restoration, Florida
<input type="checkbox"/>	Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group Cornerstone Project, California
<input type="checkbox"/>	Burney-Hat Creek Basins Project, California
<input type="checkbox"/>	Colorado Front Range, Colorado
<input type="checkbox"/>	Deschutes Skyline, Oregon
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project, California
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grandfather Restoration Project, North Carolina
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative, Idaho
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lakeview Stewardship Project, Oregon
<input type="checkbox"/>	Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration and Hazardous Fuels Reduction, De Soto National Forest, National Forests in Mississippi
<input type="checkbox"/>	Northeast Washington Forest Vision 2020, Washington
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ozark Highlands Ecosystem Restoration, Arkansas
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pine-Oak Woodlands Restoration Project, Missouri
<input type="checkbox"/>	Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater, Idaho
<input type="checkbox"/>	Shortleaf-Bluestem Community Project, Arkansas and Oklahoma
<input type="checkbox"/>	Southern Blues Restoration Coalition, Oregon
<input type="checkbox"/>	Southwest Jemez Mountains, New Mexico
<input type="checkbox"/>	Southwestern Crown of the Continent, Idaho
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tapash, Washington
<input type="checkbox"/>	Uncompahgre Plateau, Colorado
<input type="checkbox"/>	Weiser-Little Salmon Headwaters Project, Idaho
X	Zuni Mountain Project, New Mexico
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 1
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 2
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 3
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 4
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 5
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 6
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 8
<input type="checkbox"/>	Region 9
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: _____

How many people are participating in this diagnostic in your group?

What are their roles and/or organizations?

Gabe Kohler (FSG): organizer

Matt Piccarello (FSG)

Tyler Wysner (FSG)

Shawn Martin (USFS)

Kent Reid (New Mexico Forest and Watershed Research Institute)

John Williams (USFS)

Susan Ostlie (Great Old Broads for Wilderness)

Jim McGrath (Native Plants Society)

Larry Winn (Lava Soil and Water Conservation District)

Matt Allen (Mt. Taylor Millworks and Manufacturing) would like to be part of a meeting with NWTF




Dena Holmes (National Wild Turkey Federation)

Collaborative monitoring diagnostic




In this section, you will find the 42 success factors organized into several categories. Please discuss each success factor with your group and then decide on the best response with regard to **current conditions** in your CFLRP project or region using a "stoplight" assessment.

- RED:** no, little to no progress, not in place
- YELLOW:** somewhat, some progress, not fully in place
- GREEN:** yes, implemented, in place




Mark an "X" in the appropriate column. After you select the response, there is a place to note discussion points to provide further insight into your selection. Please feel free to use as much space as needed.

FLR SITE AND PLANNING	 RE D	 YELLOW	 GREEN	NA
<p>1. The entire geographical area expected to be impacted from the FLR project is defined. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>2. All relevant stakeholders are involved in FLR project planning and help decide what constitutes FLR, FLR success and FLR goals.</p>		X		


<p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Not bringing everyone on board with the same pace; people getting information late and feeling left out of the decision process.</p> <p>Not everyone is in agreement with this.</p> <p>WEG & CBD involved, but not satisfied with results. Miscommunication within FS w/attorneys.</p>				
<p>3. The FLR goals are simple, and stakeholders generally agree on them.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Goals are not that simple, but stakeholders generally agree on them.</p>			X	
<p>4. FLR goals have been transformed into feasible objectives and (insofar as possible) measurable targets.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>There is room for more collaboration between contractors and management organization. EA documents tend to be lengthy and not practical to read.</p>			X	
<p>5. Monitoring is considered essential to FLR success.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Answerable questions are required; with some wildlife (MSO) monitoring the goals can be lofty and hard to measure.</p> <p>Impeding factors might include short-sightedness/time commitment, funding, skilled staffing, alternative priorities.</p>			X	

LOCAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE FLR PROJECT				NA
	RE D	YELLOW	GREEN	
<p>6. There are specific strategies to involve women and marginalized groups in all phases of the FLR project.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors may include involvement of minority groups in early stages/formation of the project, planning, etc. Strategies may need to be reworked so that participation from these groups is higher, especially in the early stages.</p>			X	




<p>7. Local people have access rights to the land and natural resources, and there are relatively few conflicts about access rights. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Impeding factors may include legislation and centralization of Easement-in the Forest Service, ROW and Easement is centralized at the Regional office with no local support.</p>		X		
<p>8. The FLR effort is a broad-based coalition of all relevant landscape users, who are involved in meaningful ways, whether they are marginalized groups/castes, women, young people, local leaders, local smallholders, large landholders, non-governmental organizations, companies or governments. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>9. There are strong local intrinsic motivations to participate in the FLR project, and local stakeholders perceive that there is a benefit to their participation. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Participation vs. Support; There is strong support, but not motivation to be involved and to do the work. “People should be involved, but land management is separate from people’s daily lives.”</p>			X	
<p>10. Participants are involved in elements of benefit sharing or activities related to the FLR project (e.g., tourism, reforestation, etc.). If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors Participation is low overall, there tends to be a core group of participants that are heavily involved.</p>		X		

LOCAL IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATION AND STAFF	 <small>RE D</small>	 <small>YELLOW</small>	 <small>GREEN</small>	<small>NA</small>
<p>11. There are skilled, motivated, appropriately compensated FLR staff to support collaborative monitoring. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>		X		




Impeding factors may include funding. Monitoring tends to fall short, especially in long term. More monitoring by experienced individuals over long term periods would be beneficial.				
<p>12. FLR staff recognize that time, negotiation and training are necessary parts of the monitoring process, and they embrace an ethos of learning, experimentation and participation.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>13. FLR staff have training with a diverse toolbox of relevant monitoring techniques that are locally appropriate.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors might include specialization/unique skills needed for different parts of the project, and using monitoring as youth learning experiences. Experienced volunteers could be given more responsibility.</p>		X		
<p>14. FLR staff are motivated and knowledgeable about facilitating participatory approaches to data collection, data analysis, information sharing and learning.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>15. Collaborative monitoring is written into FLR staff work plans, so that monitoring continues even when there is a staffing change.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>The Forest Stewards Guild monitoring agreement sees to this.</p>			X	

GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONS	 RE D	 YELLOW	 GREEN	NA
<p>16. There is a concerted, long-term commitment by stakeholders at the national and subnational level to get the collaborative monitoring system off the ground and see it through.</p>		X		




<p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors might include miscommunication/unstandardized monitoring approach on a national/regional level, and funding for CFLRPs.</p>				
<p>17. There are strong formal institutions and cooperation among informal institutions, transparent decision making, equitable distribution of power and low levels of corruption.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>18. The ‘community of practice’ – the group of people or organizations concerned about the FLR – is identified, and they create opportunities for exchanging information and ideas regularly through organizations, websites, meetings, workshops and conferences.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Enabling factors may include informal conversations between individuals and organizations.</p>			X	

BUDGETING FOR MONITORING	 RE D	 YELLOW	 GREEN	NA
<p>19. Investments in training, capacity-building and follow-up are included in the costs of collaborative monitoring.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors may include budgeting for proposals only including costs for plots; CFLR requires monitoring but funding for monitoring and training is not guaranteed.</p>		X		
<p>20. Resources are dedicated to data analysis and social learning activities (meetings, workshops, trainings, field trips) that support decision making and adaptive management cycles.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>More field trips could be useful.</p>			X	




<p>21. Costs related to quality control, data management and data storage are included in the budget. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Impeding factors may include lack of funding for personnel to manage and clean data, lack of use of data after monitoring is complete, and ease of access between organizations.</p>		X		
<p>22. A specific portion of the FLR budget has been dedicated to monitoring for the length of the FLR period (e.g., 10% of total FLR budget). If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Impeding factors may include funding for 5 years post CFLR monitoring.</p>			X	




PLANNING FOR MONITORING AND SELECTING QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS	 <small>RE D</small>	 <small>YELLOW</small>	 <small>GREEN</small>	<small>NA</small>
<p>23. Monitoring plans are made early in FLR planning stages, are closely matched to FLR goals and involve a range of stakeholders. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Impeding factors may include lack of indicators for fire risk reduction that link strongly to what we can measure.</p>			X	
<p>24. Monitoring indicators are closely aligned with management objectives in the short, medium and long term. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Enabling factors include alignment with the Ecological Indicator Report.</p>			X	
<p>25. The process of defining monitoring questions/indicators, including natural resource use, well-being and others, is collaborative and emphasizes mutual learning. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Impeding factors may include specialized volunteer utilization, tension between USFS and landscape collaborative needs.</p>			X	
<p>26. The indicators are not too technical and do not involve a lot of mathematical knowledge.</p>		X		

<p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors may include processing/utilizing/accessing national data requiring technical expertise.</p>				
<p>27. The indicators are not too time-consuming or too expensive to monitor, they are not too numerous, and they are easy to interpret.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors may include continually evolving legal situations; monitoring is time consuming, but it is relative. Some uncertainty in the question.</p>			X	




DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND TECHNOLOGY	 RED	 YELLOW	 GREEN	NA
<p>28. Data collection forms and protocols are designed together with local monitors, researchers and government staff, not developed in isolation.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors include necessity for independence in design per organization.</p>		X		
<p>29. The data collection tools and methods are geared towards quick and local processing and analysis without complicated calculations.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors may include public access to reports.</p>		X		
<p>30. The data collection tools and methods provide for sharing information with stakeholders at multiple levels and for application in future FLR efforts.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p> <p>Impeding factors may include outdated data systems and limited sharing abilities.</p>		X		
<p>31. Substantial regular training is provided to local people in the use of tools, forms and technology to collect data, and in interpreting the data to build understanding and answer questions.</p> <p>If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>		X		

Enabling factors include work with youth crews.				
32. Training is simple and adapted to the technical capacity of the participants. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?			X	

LOCAL INCENTIVES AND MOTIVATIONS	 RED	 YELLOW	 GREEN	NA
33. Participants feel that their needs are considered in the monitoring system, and the activities focus on attributes that are relevant to them rather than only fulfilling scientifically complete criteria. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?		X		
34. Data needs and goals of local stakeholders are considered early on and are matched with those of scientists and natural resource managers. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?		X		
35. Monitoring results – both of the local project and of the bigger picture – are regularly shared to motivate participation. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Enabling factors include monitoring updates and online information.			X	

MULTI-LEVEL MONITORING SYSTEM	 RED	 YELLOW	 GREEN	NA
36. To scale up to a national monitoring system, there is infrastructure in place for data registration, storage and processing. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? There is room for more centralization in information sharing and lack of infrastructure unique to CFRPs.		X		

<p>37. To scale up to a national monitoring system, there are standard procedures for monitoring processes to be consistent and transparent. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? No standardized monitoring approach for CFRP.</p>		X		
<p>38. There is a managing organization that is responsible for organizing and overseeing the monitoring and balancing of local needs with national and global needs. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors? Same as previous question.</p>		X		

INFORMATION COLLECTION, ANALYSIS AND LEARNING	 RE D	 YELLOW	 GREEN	NA
<p>39. Data are collected at the beginning of the project, at regular intervals throughout the project and well beyond project implementation to assess whether long-term goals have been met. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>40. Information on progress and desired endpoints is represented in a way that is visually understandable to stakeholders and is discussed in ways that local people can both interpret and apply. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>41. Local people feel comfortable about sharing their own impressions and what they learned in spite of differences in power with officials, and they feel empowered to effect changes. If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?</p>			X	
<p>42. To encourage learning and adaptation, build trust, build respect for diverse opinions and increase transparency, there are repeated learning</p>			X	

events, interactions, meetings and field trips to the FLR sites among diverse stakeholders.				
If green, what are the enabling factors? If red, what are the impeding factors?				

You have completed the diagnostic!

Please continue to the next section to provide us with feedback on your experience with it.

Feedback on the diagnostic

In this section, we would like to hear more about your group's experience with it.

Did the diagnostic help your group achieve the following? (Please mark the appropriate column with an X.)

	Not at all	Somewhat	Very much	NA
Stimulate discussion			X	
Identify issues or problems			X	
Identify areas for improvement		X		
Plan for the future		X		
Get ready for monitoring		X		
Think about issues at a landscape scale			X	
Learn something new		X		
Hear different opinions			X	
Other (note below)				

Please note anything else that the diagnostic achieved:

How might you use the diagnostic in your CFLRP project?

Gabe: We will use this to provide content for our next multiparty monitoring meetings.

Susan: Use feedback to focus on areas that need more work.

When would it be most useful to sit down with the group and use the diagnostic? (select all that apply)

- Before the project starts
- During project planning
- Every year
- Every two years
- Halfway through the project
- At project close
- Never (not useful)
- Other: 1, 3, and 5, and 10 years?

Who should participate in the diagnostic?

Susan: Anyone and everyone.

Much more useful in-person, maybe with more leadership presence in addition to ground-persons.

Overall, how useful was this diagnostic? (select one number on the scale below)

Not useful at all 1 2 3 4 5 Very useful
3.5 on average

Please provide us with suggestions on how we can improve the diagnostic:

Too long, repetitive; some questions too complex to answer simply, not very focused.

***Thank you. Please save this file, name the file with your CFLRP project and email it to:
lindsay.buchanan@usda.gov***

All responses will be compiled and shared at a future date.