| Result area | Component | Level 1 indicators<br><br>Intended to be assessed for all certificates through auditing and traceability processes<br><br>Indicators with * are ISEAL Common Core Indicators<br><br>**Bold indicators are Smart Meter indicators (mandatory)**<br><br>*Indicators in italic are new indicators (compared to former UTZ and RA)*<br><span style="color:orange">**Indicators in orange are currently collected as level 1 indicators**</span> | Level 2 and 3 indicators<br><br>Intended to be assessed for a sample of certified operations, or theory of change results theme as part of impact studies<br><br>Indicators with * are ISEAL Common Core Indicators<br><br>**Bold indicators are Smart Meter indicators (self-selected)**<br><br>*Indicators in italic are new indicators (compared to former UTZ and RA)*<br>*(Unintended effects in italic between brackets)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **IMPACT** | | |
| Impact:<br>People and nature thrive in harmony | Livelihoods are improved and human rights are fully respected for farmers and farm workers, their families, and local communities | | .- Perceived change in quality of life*<br>- *Perceived change of the economic situation since entry to the certification program* *<br>- Change in household livelihoods assets index |
| | Forests and natural ecosystems are protected and restored, biodiversity and ecosystem services are conserved, and climate change is mitigated | | |
| | Key agricultural crop sectors are transformed to enable, support, and scale up sustainability in production landscapes | | |
| | **INTERMEDIATE AND LONG TERM OUTCOMES** | | |
| | Farm resilience is increased through climate change adaptation, diversification, and other measures | | .- # of farmers that diversify their income (M/F)<br>- *(Unintended: Lower income as a result of lower yields due to implementing environmental practices)*<br>- Food security (Months and days of inadequate access to food) *<br>- *(Unintended: Reduced food security and resilience as a result of the focus on certified crop)* |
| | Reduced environmental and health risks from pesticides | . - **Pesticides: Active ingredients per ha (a.i. kg/ha)**<br>- **Active ingredients used that are listed in the Exceptional Use list and Risk Mitigation list** * | .- *Practice adoption: IPM measures*<br>- EIQ (environmental Impact Quotient)<br>*(Unintended: Need for more labor and descrease in productivity as a result of reduced/no use of herbicides)* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Farming Outcomes | Farmers have optimized crop productivity, input use efficiency, and profitability | .- **Yield of certified crop (Kg/ha or stems/ha)**<br>- **Total harvested production of the certified crop (Kg or stems)**<br>- **% of group members that adequately prune**<br>- **Fertilizers: Volume of N, P and K per ha (kg/ha, per year or per cropping cycle ***| .- **% of group members that applied renovation practices**<br>- **% of farm area with certified crop where renovation is implemented**<br>- *Efficiency of fertilizer use ** |
| | Soil fertility, water resources, and other ecosystem services are maintained or enhanced | *(included in environmental outcomes)* | .- Adoption of specific practices to foster soil conservation and health<br>- Sediment load in receiving water bodies on or near certified farms<br>- Chemical and biological properties of receiving water bodies on or near certified farms<br>- Soil health * |
| Social Outcomes | Child labor, forced labor, discrimination and workplace violence and harrassment are effecively assessed, prevented and remediated | .- *The number of potential cases identified by the monitoring system and referred to the Grievance Mechanism (by gender, age, and type of issue)*<br>- *Number and percentage of confirmed child labor, forced labor, discrimination and workplace violence and harassment cases remediated per the Remediation Protocol (by gender, age, and type of issue)*<br>- **Scores on the assess-and-address system elements** | .- School attendance for children of certified farmers of school going age (versus school attendance for children of non-certified farmers)- by gender<br>- *Level of awareness of group members and workers on child labor, forced labor, discrimination, workplace violence and harassment*<br>- *Functioning of the grievance mechanism ** |
| | Other human rights of farmers, workers, and communities are fully respected | .- *The number of potential cases identified by the monitoring system and referred to the Grievance Mechanism (by gender, age, and type of issue)* | .- *Level of worker satisfaction*<br>- *Implemented measures to enhance rights of communities* |
| | Farm workers and their families enjoy healthy and safe living and working conditions | | .- *Changes in living and working conditions for farm workers and their families*<br>- *Measures implemented to improve living and working conditions ** |
| | Farmers, workers and their families have an improved standard of living [toward the living wage or living income level] | .- **Average size of LW gap for men (%) and women (%)**<br>- **# and % of workers (per gender and type of worker) whose wage plus in-kind-benefits are below Living Wage benchmark** | .- **Production costs per Kg of harvested product ***<br>- Gross income and net income from certified crops *<br>- Gross income and net income from all farm activities *<br>- **The total net income as assessed against the Living Income Benchmark ***<br>- *# and % of group members that have access to financial services (M/F)*<br>- *Hours of household unremunerated labor invested in the certified crop ** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental outcomes | Forests and other natural ecosystems on certified production units are effectively protected and restored | | .- *Relation of certified lands to areas of high social and environmental risk (various spatial indicators)*<br>- *Rate of ecosystem destruction or restoration compared to surrounding areas* |
| | Effective group management and supporting field intervention contribute to protection and restoration of forests and other natural ecosystems in the surrounding landscape | .- Relation of certified lands to areas of high social and environmental risk (various spatial indicators)<br>- Rate of ecosystem destruction or restoration compared to surrounding areas | .- *Area in conservation management area or set aside \**<br>- *Measures taken to protect and restore forests and other natural ecosystems in the surrounding landscape*<br>- *Change in forests and natural ecosystems in the surrounding landscape* |
| | Natural vegetation on farms is maintained and enhanced | **.- % of total farm area under natural vegetation cover**<br>**- % shade cover averaged over the portion of the farm or group of farms growing shade-tolerant crops \*;**<br>**- Average number of native tree species per hectare growing shade-tolerant crops \*** | .- *Area in conservation management area or set aside \**<br>- *Perception of change in quality of natural resources on which household depends \**<br>- *Perception of change in access to natural resources on which household depends \** |
| | Increased protection of wildlife and biodiversity | | .- *Quantity and diversity of on-farm vegetation*<br>- *Presence, abundance, or survivorship of species in key taxa around certified farms* |
| | Increased efficiency in water and energy use and reduced wastewater and solid waste pollution | **.- Water used for irrigation in total and per unit of product**<br>**- Water use for processing (L/Kg)**<br>**- Amounts of renewable and non-renewable energy used, by type** | .- *Water quality and habitat quality characteristics in aquatic natural ecosystems*<br>- *Efficiency of water use \** |
| | Reduced on-farm greenhouse gas emissions | | **.- Total annual net greenhouse gases emissions from the indicated sources (tons of CO2e)**<br>**- Net greenhouse gases emissions from the above indicated sources per unit of the final product (tons of CO2e per unit)** |
| | Group management is more effective at providing services and supporting improvement based on group members' needs and risks | **Score on the Management Capacity Assessment tool** | .- *Characteristics of the group management structure*<br>- *Perception of group members (M/F) that the group acts in the benefit of its members \** |
| | Farmers & workers are more knowledgeable about sustainability issues and practices | **# of trainings and topic of trainings provided to farmers \***<br>*# of trainings and topics of training provided to workers*<br>*# and % of members/workers attending training activities (M/F) \**<br>*# and type of services (other than training) provided to members/workers \** | .- *Farmer perception of training quality and utility*<br>- *Level of knowledge of farmers on farming, social & environmental topics*<br>- *level of knowledge of workers on human rights topics*<br>- *Existence of an active committee to represent worker or group concerns to management \** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Farm and group management outcomes | Strengthened position of young and female farmers and young and female workers | .- # of registered female group members *<br>- # and % of female members/workers attending training activities compared to male members<br>- # and kind of human rights grievances reported, disaggregated by gender<br>- # and % of group members that are young farmers (under 35 years) | *.- level of awareness of group members and workers on gender*<br><br>- # and % of participants in training that are young persons (under 35 years)<br>- # and % of young trainers (under 35 years)<br>- # and % of young internal inspectors (under 35 years)<br>- # and % of young farmers with access to land (under 35 years)<br># and % of young persons (under 35 years) in management positions<br><br>- # and % of female workers in workers committees compared to total # and % of female workers<br>- # and % of workers using child care facilities<br>- # and % of female workers with access to primary and reproductive health services<br>- # and % of female trainers, inspectors, supervisors or other functions related to group management<br>- # of female group members/workers that have access to financial services com-pared to male group members/workers<br>- # and % of female farmers with access to land |
| | Group management channels the sustainability differential effectively to group members and farm management spends Sustainability Differential in the benefit of workers | *.- Amount of Sustainability Differential received per kg at group member level by product type and origen*<br>*- Distribution of the sustainability differential as % of the total amount received on the topics: a) wages; b) working conditions; c) health and safety; d) housing;* | *(Unintended: Poor management or corruption of SD/SI money undermines farmer groups)* |
| | Sustainability Investment is effectively used by farms and groups to support key sustainability practices and improvements | *.- Investment needs specified per category in the Rainforest Alliance defined investment categories*<br>*- Sustainability investments received from buyers: In-kind and cash contributions received and the allocation of these investments for each of the investment categories* | *.- Capacity of farm groups to identify the investment needs and to manage the investment plans*<br>*- (Unintended: Buyers source from CHs with low investment needs and disengage from poorer farmers)* |
| | Reduction of environmental risks on operations within the supply chain of the certified crop | | *.- # of grievances on environmental topics on operations within the supply chain* |

| Supply chain outcomes | Human rights are fully respected on operations within the supply chain of the certified crop | | .- # of grievances on human rights on operations within the supply chain |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Responsible business practices are instituted through companies' entire supply chains | | .- Durability, transparency, and fairness of trading relationships<br>- Level of trust between actors in the supply chain<br>- Perception of satisfaction with the quality of trading relationships * |
| **DIRECT OUTCOMES** | | | |
| Direct outcomes farm level, field level and supply chain level | Farms implement more sustainable practices & continuously improve on sustainability outcomes | **# of Non-conformities on farm requirements – per topic**<br># and type of self-selected improvements implemented | .- Improvements measured with indicators<br>- Support received to implement standard<br>- Factors influencing implementation of sustainable practices |
| | Increased supply of sustainably produced products | **Estimated certified production volumes by product type and origin***<br>**Total harvested production of the certified crop by product type and origen *** | Cost of certification *<br>(unintended: Farmers step out because of increased costs of certification ) |
| | Farms have better market access and receive benefits via better prices, Sustainability Differential, and Sustainability Investment | Amount of Rainforest Alliance sustainability differential received by product type and origin | .- Price received for certified crop * |
| | | .- Investment needs specified per category in the Rainforest Alliance defined investment categories<br>- Sustainability investments received from buyers: In-kind and cash contributions received and the allocation of these investments for each of the investment categories | .- Effect of SD/SI on the participation in the certification program<br>(Unintended: farmers step out of the program if the SD/SI is decreasing) |
| | Buyers provide support to producers via better prices, Sustainability Differential, and Sustainability Investment | Amount of SD paid per crop, per country | |
| | | Amount of sustainability investments contributed by buyers | |
| | | # of Non-conformities  on supply chain requirements– shared investments | .- Drivers and challenges for shared responsibility |
| | Increased credibility of assurance and tracebility | **Certified volume sold by producers**<br>**Certified volume bought by supply chain actors** | # of complaints received by RA on traceability and assurance |
| | Increased demand of sustainably produced products | **Supply - Demand ratio: % of estimated production volumes sold as RA certified by product type and origen** | .- trends in prices, SD and SI paid per supply chain, context |
| | Supply chain actors identify and mitigate potential negative impacts of the business practices in their supply chain (due diligence) | | # of grievances from producers related to buyers' practices<br># of companies that use supplier code of conduct |

| | Supply chain actors address social and environmental risks in the operations within the supply chain of the certified crop | .- # of Non-conformities on supply chain requirements – social and environmental topics<br>- Number of supply chain actors that contribute to the wage improvement plans | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **PROGRAM REACH AND OUTPUTS** | | | |
| Reach and outputs Farmers and farm groups | Join the RA certification program and use standard to implement sustainable practices | **.- Total # of certificate holders ***<br>**- # farmers per group ***<br>**- Size of certificate holder: # Large; # small**<br>**- Type of certificate holders *: a) Farm - Supply chain actor; b) Group - Individual - Multisite;**<br>**- Year of certification**<br>**- Duration of participation in the program / Year of entry to the program* / Year when certification terminated ***<br>**- # of Certificate holders covered by multiple certifications***<br>**- # of farmers ***<br>**- # of male and female farmers ***<br>**- # of workers (Male/Female, Permanent/Temporary) ***<br>**- Age of farmers ***<br>**- Household size ***<br>**- Total area with certified crop production ***<br>**- Total farm area under certification** | *.- Farm certificate holders' satisfaction with participation in the program ***<br><br>*- Farm certificate holders' motivation to stay in the program or to leave the program*<br>*- Factors influencing the participation and duration in the certification program*<br><br>*(unintended: Exclusion of poor and remote farmers because of high costs of implementation)*<br>*- # of household members working on the certified crop ** |
| | Use training, tools and guidance to implement sustainable practices | *.- # of users (producer groups, farms, estates) of the RA training modules (Data collected through RALN)* | *level of satisfaction with the RA Learning Network* |
| | Groups use tools to strengthen group management and to improve quality of internal inspections | *.- % of group members whose internal inspection data is collected and used by the group management in a digitized format*<br>*- # of groups/producers that use the Farm Intelligence App*<br>*- % of farm units with geolocation data* | |
| | Use data to evaluate risks & performance and inform continuous improvements | | *Use of smart meters and other data to inform improvements* |
| Outputs Certification bodies | Conduct effective audits based on the standard and its guidance | # of auditors, certifiers and scheme managers trained (data collected through RALN)<br># and % of CBs that perform well + trends over time + reasons for not improving<br># of CBs authorized<br># of times licenses are submitted/rejected<br>(Data collected through CB monitoring) | Quality of audits |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Use training and tools to increase the rigor and efficiency of audits | | Level of knowledge/skills increase as a result of trainings |
| | Use data and risk maps to increase the rigor and efficiency of audits | *Relation of certified lands to areas of high risks of deforestation and enclosure in protected area (various spatial indicators)* | Audit duration and costs |
| Reach and outputs Brands and supply chain actors | Join the RA program and use the standard to improve the sustainability of their operations and financially support and reward sustainable practices at farm level | **# of registered supply chain actors by type** **Trends in RA certified volumes bought by companies** | *Supply chain certificate holders' satisfaction of participation in the program* *% of companies that are likely to recommend RA to others* |
| | Use tools and guidance to support farmers/groups implementing sustainable practices | | *.- Supply chain actors level of satisfaction with tools RA offers* |
| | Use traceability and supply chain performance data to target and enhance support for producers and to leverage this support down the supply chain | | *Use of the data to drive improvements* |
| Outputs Consumers | Use information to make better choices about the products they buy | **# of SKUs with RA logo/claim** *# of brands actively communicating about RA* | *Level of consumer awareness on RA & sustainability topics* *Consumer preference for RA certified products* |