

Valle de Bravo Watershed Monitoring Plan

Fondo Procuencia de Valle de Bravo
Jorge Rickards

Introductory Statement/Rationale

Process monitoring (biological, social, economic) is necessary to determine the impact of actions taking place as a part of management plans within designated areas.

Monitoring generates necessary data for constant evaluation and to be able to apply adaptative management approaches. It is a crosscutting need between all countries and regions and can therefore be shared and enriched with and by others.

Goal

To acquire the information and necessary basic data that may allow stakeholders make adequate decisions in the management of the Valle de Bravo watershed in relation to the Nevado de Toluca National Park, within a one year period.

Barriers

1. Lack of in-country watershed management experience.
2. Fragmented or incompatible information on the VB watershed actual state.
3. Low collaboration among stakeholders (government, NGOs, academia)
4. Limited financial resources.
5. Limited technical skills at a local level and available material resources.

Benefits

1. Creation of a watershed monitoring plan and methodology for an important region in central Mexico.
2. Creation of an integrated database and information center for watershed management neighboring a National Park.
3. Promotion of a collaborating scheme among stakeholders within the watershed.
4. Establish the monitoring system for the local watershed conservation fund (Fondo Procuencia de Valle de Bravo).

<u>Actions</u>	<u>Indicators of success</u>	<u>Resources needed</u>
1. Identify information sources and current data, in general and specific for the watershed	List of information sources. Number of established relationships with experts and information provided.	Human: FMCN-FPCVB staff. Financial: Travel expenses Telephone expenses, internet, etc. Material: software and hardware

2. Strengthen the FPCVB technical committee. Ensure adequate representation and expertise.	Ensured committee membership. No. of successful meetings vs. planned. No of fulfilled agreements vs. reached. Frequency of attendance within committee.	<u>Human: committee members.</u> Financial: travel and office expenses. Material: meeting room and equipment.
3. Develop a strategic plan for watershed monitoring, its methodology and specific indicators.	Strategic plan document and acceptance by technical committee	Human: FPCVB staff and committee members.
4. Strengthen relationships with stakeholders and the FPCVB	No. of agreements signed with identified parties. No. of community outreach activities performed vs. planned.	Human: Staff and technical committee members. Financial: travel expenses and office materials. Material. Database, hardware and software.
5. Ensure financial resources to design and apply the monitoring system	System in place and operating. Specific projects and actions identified within watershed	Human: FPCVB FMCN staff. Financial: operative costs and funds for specific projects. Material: database software, GIS.

Stakeholders

Key stakeholders	Positive impact	Negative impact
1. Municipal govmnt.	3	2
2. State govmnt.	3	1
3. Federal govmnt.	2	1
4. Local NGOs.	3	1
5. Local communities (indigenous)	3	2
6. Outside interested private parties (weekend home owners)	3	0
7. FMCN	3	0
8. Local fund (FPCVB)	3	1
9. Water Tech. Institute	3	1
10. State university	3	0
Total	29/30	9/30

