

# **Appendix 4:**

# **Annual Monitoring Plan Template**

*prepared for*

*Babine Monitoring Trust Governance Design Group*

*by*

*Karen Price and Dave Daust*

*January 27, 2005*

# **[year] Annual Monitoring Plan for the Babine River Watershed**

## ***Introduction***

Effectiveness monitoring assesses whether following planned management strategies achieves desired objectives. The Babine Monitoring Trust is responsible for guiding effectiveness monitoring in the Babine River Watershed (xxxx ref). The Trust allocates funds to monitoring projects based on a process for determining priorities and costs prescribed in the Trust Agreement and described in the Babine Watershed Monitoring Framework (xxxx ref).

The Annual Monitoring Plan lists high-priority monitoring topics, identifies those topics chosen for funding (new and continuing projects) in [year] and provides a rationale for each funding decision. It also provides a summary of past monitoring projects.

## ***Monitoring Priorities for [year]***

The Trust supports monitoring projects, maintains the Babine Watershed Monitoring Framework and administers the monitoring programme. Table 1 shows how available funds are allocated for this year.

**Table 1. Allocation of available monitoring programme funds.**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Projected allocation (\$)</b>
Administration	[xx,xxx]
Framework reviews and updates	[xx,xxx]
Continuing projects	[xx,xxx]
New projects	[xx,xxx]
<b>Total</b>	<b>[xxx,xxx]</b>

The priority for maintaining the Monitoring Framework increases with time since the last revision. The Knowledge Base and Monitoring Priority Tables, found in the Monitoring Framework, were last reviewed (to incorporate general scientific advances) in [year] and updated (to incorporate monitoring results) in [year]. Elapsed time and new information [warrant/do not warrant] a review or update of the Knowledge Base and Monitoring Priority Tables. This activity takes priority over additional new projects.

Tables, generated by the Monitoring Framework, show priorities and associated costs for three different types of monitoring: collecting indicator data, monitoring to improve knowledge and reduce uncertainty, and monitoring to detect negative consequences (Appendix 1). Tables 2 – 4 below provide a synopsis of funding decisions for high-priority monitoring topics. The order within the list indicates relative priority.

**Table 2. Funding decisions for high-priority topics for collecting indicator data.**

Objective	Indicator	Decision	Project #	Funding	Project length
[From monitoring framework; show all topics with monitoring priority of 1 or 2]	[From monitoring framework]	[Options:] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Funding initiated</u></li> <li>• <u>Funding continued</u></li> <li>• <u>Funding discontinued</u></li> <li>• <u>Project completed</u></li> <li>• <u>Not funded</u></li> </ul>	[xxxx]	[This year and total]	[xxxx-xxxx]

**Table 3. Funding decisions for high-priority topics for monitoring to improve knowledge and reduce uncertainty.**

Objective	Indicator	Decision	Project #	Funding	Project length
[From monitoring framework; show all topics with monitoring priority of 1 or 2]	[From monitoring framework]	[Options:] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Funding initiated</u></li> <li>• <u>Funding continued</u></li> <li>• <u>Funding discontinued</u></li> <li>• <u>Project completed</u></li> <li>• <u>Not funded</u></li> </ul>	[xxxx]	[This year and total]	[xxxx-xxxx]

**Table 4. Funding decisions for high-priority topics for monitoring to detect negative consequences.**

Objective	Indicator	Decision	Project #	Funding	Project length
[From monitoring framework; show all topics with monitoring priority of 1 or 2]	[From monitoring framework]	[Options:] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Funding initiated</u></li> <li>• <u>Funding continued</u></li> <li>• <u>Funding discontinued</u></li> <li>• <u>Project completed</u></li> <li>• <u>Not funded</u></li> </ul>	[xxxx]	[This year and total]	[xxxx-xxxx]

### ***Decision Rationale***

Tables 5 – 7 provide a brief rationale for each decision described in Tables 2 – 4 above. Not all topics can be funded. Higher-priority topics will usually be funded preferentially. Whenever a lower-priority topic is selected over those higher in the ranked lists in Tables 2 – 4, a rationale is provided for why each of the higher-priority topics was not chosen. It is assumed that all non-funded topics lower on ranked lists are not funded because of insufficient funds.

**Table 5. Rationale for funding decisions for collecting indicator data.**

Objective	Indicator	Rationale
<u>[From Table 2; omit unfunded topics having lower priority than funded topics]</u>	<u>[From Table 2]</u>	<u>[Examples:]</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Insufficient funds to complete adequately-designed project—requires 10-year commitment</u></li><li>• <u>Local experts suggest costs may be higher than projected in Knowledge Base</u></li><li>• <u>Potential for collaboration with planned WLAP project—wait until next year</u></li><li>• <u>MoF likely to provide summary without assistance</u></li><li>• <u>Consultation with local experts indicates that a project is feasible</u></li></ul>

**Table 6. Rationale for funding decisions for monitoring to improve knowledge and reduce uncertainty.**

Objective	Indicator	Rationale
<u>[From Table 3; omit unfunded topics having lower priority than funded topics]</u>	<u>[From Table 3]</u>	<u>[Examples:]</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Insufficient funds to complete adequately-designed project—requires 10-year commitment</u></li><li>• <u>Local experts suggest costs may be higher than projected in Knowledge Base</u></li><li>• <u>Potential for collaboration with planned WLAP project—wait until next year</u></li><li>• <u>MoF likely to provide summary without assistance</u></li><li>• <u>Consultation with local experts indicates that a project is feasible</u></li></ul>

**Table 7. Rationale for funding decisions for monitoring to detect negative consequences.**

Objective	Indicator	Rationale
<u>[From Table 4; omit unfunded topics having lower priority than funded topics]</u>	<u>[From Table 4]</u>	<u>[Examples:]</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Insufficient funds to complete adequately-designed project—requires 10-year commitment</u></li><li>• <u>Local experts suggest costs may be higher than projected in Knowledge Base</u></li><li>• <u>Potential for collaboration with planned WLAP project—wait until next year</u></li><li>• <u>MoF likely to provide summary without assistance</u></li><li>• <u>Consultation with local experts indicates that a project is feasible</u></li></ul>

## **Summary of Monitoring to Date**

This section provides an overview of monitoring work undertaken since the start of the monitoring program (Table 8).

**Table 8. Monitoring projects to year.**

Objective	Indicator	2005	2006	2007	2008
<u>From monitoring framework</u>	<u>From monitoring framework</u>	✓	✓		
		✓		✓	

---

## **Project Synopsis (one page per project)**

Type of monitoring (collecting data, reducing uncertainty, detecting consequences,):

Project Title:

Leaders:

Partners:

Status (initiated, ongoing, complete):

Abstract:

Consequence for knowledge base (recommends changes to risk function, uncertainty function, risk estimate, uncertainty estimate):

Consequence for management (presents options for management strategies or goals and objectives):