|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Examples of community-developed indicators of the territory of life ‘building blocks’** | |
| **Example indicator** | **Reflections on the quality of the indicator** |
| **Territory of life building block: Integrity and strength of the custodian community** | |
| **Sense of common identity, connection, solidarity** to ‘one another’ and ‘being part of a community’ | Can be relatively easily assessed with focus groups, interviews, or discussions at normal community gatherings, though responses are subjective |
| Number of **activities decided on and carried out collectively and successfully** by the community in a given calendar year (e.g. refurbishing a local small dam, constructing the local school, replanting mangroves) | A valid indicator… but not very precise because such activities could be demanded or imposed by external circumstances |
| Capacity of the community to **speak with one voice** | A valid indicator… but difficult to assess |
| Frequency, attendance, and expressed enthusiasm for **community cultural events and celebrations** | Relatively easy to assess, but it is not very precise because people may participate for reasons not related to their sense of cohesion with the community |
| Number of people, from different families and groups, who **help one another** in times of need | May be a valid indicator if it is relevant to the community’s norms, but may not be very precise and may be difficult to assess |
| **Territory of life building block: Connection between the community and its territory** | |
| Number of **person-days worked as community volunteer** for the territory of life in a given time period | A good indicator that can be followed on a monthly basis; it is also possible to disaggregate it by village, by season, etc. |
| Percentage of people in the community who can **name and describe at least 10 different features** or sub sites within the territory of life | A good indicator, and not too difficult to measure, but not clear how valid it may be – i.e. whether it is measuring what it is intended to measure |
| Number/percentage of people from across community groups who participate in **efforts to ‘defend’ territory of life** when it is under threat | A very valid indicator, and not too difficult to measure. It may not be particularly precise, however, as participation may vary based on various factors (severity of threat, accessibility of the response measures, etc.) |
| Frequency, attendance, and expressed enthusiasm for community **cultural events and celebrations specific to the territory of life** | Relatively easy to assess, but it is not precise as people may participate for many reasons |
| Frequency, attendance, and expressed enthusiasm for opportunities for **inter-generational learning about the territory of life**, e.g., meetings between elders and youth | Relatively easy to assess, possibly not precise as people may participate for many reasons |
| **Sense of connection** to the territory of life | Can be relatively easily assessed with focus groups, interviews, or discussions at normal community gatherings, though responses are subjective |
| **Territory of life building block: Functioning of the governance institution** | |
| **Number and severity of infractions** to the territory of life rules in a given year | Neither precise nor specific and can be difficult to interpret (e.g. are infractions going up because governance is weakening, or because surveillance is improving?). |
| Number of serious intra-community conflicts related to the use of natural resources in the territory of life | Valid result indicator, although not very precise or specific. It could be strengthened by coupling it with qualitative information about the nature of the conflicts. Are they arising because of efforts to improve governance? Or because governance is weakening? |
| Demonstrated capacity to take **decisions under stress** | Valid indicator, but not precise and at times impossible to measure |
| Degree to which or ease with which community members can get **information** (documentation, description) about the territory of life from its governing institution | Can be relatively easily assessed with focus groups, interviews, or discussions at normal community gatherings, though responses are subjective |
| Degree to which institution has been able to effectively **respond to threats** and problems arising for the territory of life over a given period of time | Valid indicator, relatively easily assessed with focus groups, interviews, or discussions at normal community gatherings, though responses are subjective |
| Expressed level of **perceived legitimacy** of the governing institution | Can be relatively easily assessed with focus groups, interviews, or discussions at normal community gatherings, though responses are subjective |
| **Funding procured** by the governing institution to support ongoing surveillance operations | Valid and easy to assess indicator, but highly dependent on circumstances outside community control |
| Number of people taking an **active role** in the function of the governance institution | Relatively easy to assess, especially if the monitoring protocol is clear |
| **Territory of life building block: Ecological health and integrity of the territory** | |
| **Quality and quantity of fish catch** assessed under careful conditions, in specific locations in the territory of life, at specific times in the fishing calendar and by using a standard gear dedicated to the purpose only | Excellent, complete set of indicators—reliable, exhaustive and specific… but not simple or inexpensive to set up. Monitoring this requires dedicated resources. |
| **Quality and quantity of endemic plants** important to the community | Valid indicator if the protocol is carefully developed and followed |
| Number of **sights of an endangered animal species** under controlled conditions | Valid indicator if the protocol is carefully developed and followed |
| **Trends in soil quality, water quality, air quality and/or quality of forests, rangelands, coral reefs and other ecological indicators** measured under controlled conditions | Valid indicator if the protocol is carefully developed and followed and interference by external factors is taken into account |
| **Territory of life building block: Livelihoods and wellbeing of the community** | |
| Average **monthly frequency of eating good quality meals** among all families in the village | Very meaningful but it can be laborious to determine if it is assessed by carrying out interviews with all households. A simpler option might be to hold focus groups or interview a smaller but representative cross-section of families to reveal meaningful trends. |
| Trends in local **in-migration and out-migration** of villagers/community members | Meaningful but difficult to determine without ambiguity, and often not precise because such movements can occur for a wide number of reasons, including both increasing *and* decreasing wealth and livelihood opportunities. |
| **Community health indicators in general and child nutritional status in particular** | Meaningful indicator but requires expert support to develop the measuring protocol. It may also be difficult to know how much the territory of life specifically is impacting any change in community health and/or child nutrition. |
| Percentage of people who feel largely or fully **satisfied** with their life | Valid indicator, but may be laborious to assess and biases can be easily introduced in the measuring protocol. It may also be difficult to know how much the territory of life specifically is impacting this sense of wellbeing. |
| **Broader indicators to reveal main strengths and weaknesses of the territory of life** | |
| **Social awareness** of the territory of life in the custodian community and beyond | Valid and crucially important, requires a dedicated effort to assess |
| Availability of **human and financial resources** to support surveillance operations | Valid, crucially important and relatively easy to assess |
| Recognition by government authorities (municipality, region, representatives of central government; judiciary) | Valid, crucially important and relatively easy to assess |