



Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

Completeness Check of Costa ER-PIN

Fifth Meeting of the Carbon Fund (CF5)

Paris, France

October 16 -17, 2012

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)

Carbon Fund

ER-PIN Internal Review Template

- **“Per Resolution CFM/4/2012/1, the ER-PIN selection criteria as referred to in 1 (iii) above are as follows:**
 - **Progress towards Readiness**: The Emission Reductions Program (ER Program) must be located in a REDD Country Participant that has signed a Readiness Preparation grant agreement (or the equivalent) with a Delivery Partner under the Readiness Fund, and that has prepared a reasonable and credible timeline to submit a Readiness Package to the Participants Committee;
 - **Political commitment**: The REDD Country Participant demonstrates a high-level and cross-sectoral political commitment to the ER Program, and to implementing REDD+;
 - **Methodological Framework**: The ER Program must be consistent with the emerging Methodological Framework, including the PC’s guiding principles on the methodological framework;
 - **Scale**: The ER Program will be implemented either at the national level or at a significant sub-national scale, and generate a large volume of Emission Reductions;
 - **Technical soundness**: All the sections of the ER-PIN template are adequately addressed;
 - **Non-carbon benefits**: The ER Program will generate substantial non-carbon benefits; and
 - **Diversity and learning value**: The ER Program contains innovative features, such that its inclusion in the portfolio would add diversity and generate learning value for Carbon Fund.”

Section 1: Entity responsible for management of ER Program

Guidance	Reference	Ok/No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Submitted by the government, or government-approved entities	Requirement (ii)	OK	Clear letter from Minister of Environment, Energy and Telecommunications
Signed Readiness Preparation grant agreement	Selection criteria (i)	OK	
Making progress towards readiness. Timeline for submitting R- Package communicated to FMT	Selection criteria (i)	OK	R-PP work accelerating now that grant signed. National consultation plan workshop with IP territories, Sept. 2012. WB missions to about 5 sites assessed IP and campesino land tenure, rights, consultation issues. MRV workshop June, 2012, resolved issues; financial strategy workshop, Sept. 2012. New staff hirings underway. SESA work underway. R-Package proposed during WB mission for

Section 2: National REDD+ focal point contact information

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
REDD Country endorses . . . And authorized to submit ER Program	Requirement (ii)	OK	
Demonstrates high-level political commitment to ER Program	Selection criteria (i)	OK	Clear letter from Minister of Environment, Energy and Telecommunications. Interagency coordination bodies being established.

Section 3: Partners involved in proposed ER Program

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Partners involved represent a wide range of sectors	Requirement (ii)	OK	Strong private sector & IP territories role as land owners in program, wood industry, campesino and other agricultural land owners. Role of other ministries needs to be clarified and enhanced.

Section 4: ER Program location and lifetime

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Scale and location of the ER Program is clearly identified	Selection criterion iv	OK	Builds on existing PES program, adding new private & IP lands, new land uses. Land parcels recorded, and digitally mapped, in national PES registry.

Section 5: Description of activities planned under ER Program

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Drivers of deforestation, degradation, and carbon stock enhancements clearly described and are consistent with the R-PP. Have potential to address the drivers.	Requirement (iv). Selection criteria (v)	OK	6 different mitigation options address specific land use drivers (illegal logging, conversion to crops, invasion of IP territories) and land tenures. PES program has largely successful history of maintaining forest cover.
Sustainability of emission reductions over time (and avoid reversals) clearly described.		OK	ER-PIN + presentation address what happens after program, shift to Carbon neutrality in 2021; and illegality of harvest without MINAET permit.
Described how ERP will minimize risk of displacement of emissions, and proposed leakage activities		OK	Arguments that leakage will be low, as domestic wood supply increases via wood products option F activities

Section 6: Consistency with national REDD+ strategy and governance arrangements

Guidance	Reference	Ok/No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
How the scale of ER Program fits in national REDD management framework & Strategy	Requirement (iv), Selection criteria iv	OK	Clear relationship to national program of PES.
Governance and institutional arrangements clearly described. All relevant stakeholders are part of arrangements.	Selection criteria iii and v	OK	Clear graphics with roles of institutions. How IP territories participate is being discussed in upcoming additional consultation workshops. Private sector and campesino roles need further clarity over time.

Section 7: Preliminary assessment of ER Program re SESA & ESMF

Guidance	Reference	Ok/No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Links between the Program and the country's emerging ESMF clearly described.	Requirement (iv), Selection criteria (v)	OK	First major SESA workshop held for R-PP work; IP consultation national workshop began discussion of ER PIN, continuing

Section 8: Stakeholder Information Sharing, Consultation, and Participation

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Identification of stakeholder groups involved; description how group has been consulted and has been involved in designing the ER Program. Indication if consensus has been reached ... or outstanding disputes	Requirement (iv); Selection criteria iii,v	OK?	R-PP consultations are now accelerating, after IP national workshop in Sept. 2012. Only early discussion of ER-PIN this far, tho will be discussed in upcoming series consultations. No consensus yet
planned outreach and consultation process has been described		OK	IP national workshop proposed IP-driven consultation plan to FONFIFO
feedback and grievance redress mechanism clearly described		OK	Mechanism already exists; needs some modification for REDD, underway

Section 9: Additional Benefits

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Program to generate non-carbon benefits & MRV them	Req. (iv), Selection iii, vi	OK	Non-carbon benefits estimated, & addition of IUDAR enhances their MRV

Section 10 Benefit Sharing

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
<i>benefit sharing mechanism clearly described, technically sound, based on R-PP</i>	Requirement (iv), Selection criterion v	OK	Builds on existing PES system, extending to new landowners and IP territories, per R-PP

Section 11: Reference Level and Expected Emission Reductions

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
approach clearly described and technically sound, informed by national REL	Req. (iii), Selection iii, v	OK	Preliminary national REL given; relationship to MRV described;
first estimate of expected REL provided; seems realistic	Selection criteria iv	OK	Significant work defining first estimate; national context clear and reasonable

Section 12: Forest Monitoring System

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Approach for measurement and reporting clearly described and technically sound.	Selection criteria (v)	OK	Significant detail. MRV workshop held to refine. Further refinements to be made as ER Document is drafted.
consistent with IPCC Tier 2 standards; and with national REDD MRV system; partners' capacity assessed; MRV approach for non-C benefits is clear.	Selection criteria (iii, v, vi); Requirement iv.	OK	Appears to combines Tier 2 and 3. Most major experts & organizations in MRV included in MRV plan. Early estimates of co-benefits exist, & would be refined in ER Document.

Section 13: Summary of Progress on REDD+ Readiness

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
Showing progress on REDD+ Readiness; and information is consistent with the R-PP	Selection criteria (i)	OK	Summarized above

Section 14: Financing plan

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Section completed	Requirement (i)	OK	
financial arrangement of the proposed ER program are clearly described	Selection criteria (v)	OK	Detailed tables provided
no obvious funding gaps that might prevent ER Program from delivering a significant portion of the expected volume of ERs		OK	Key question is will national carbon neutrality policy be realized, and funding be obtained? Country demonstrates reasonable sources of funding besides FCPF

Learning value (overarching)

Guidance	Reference	Ok/ No	Justification / Remarks
Program is innovative, introduces new concepts and implements a variety of interventions	Requirement (i)	OK	national scale; uses PES, but expanded to new areas; strong private and IP role
design of the ER Program and activities are different from other ER Programs already in the pipeline	Selection criteria (vii)	OK	first ER-PIN, 6 activities proposed

Risk assessment (overarching)

Guidance	Risk	Rating	<i>Mitigating Measures</i>
Section completed			
Identify any risks that have not been discussed yet but might impact on the ER Program and its potential to deliver ERs	Inadequate funding available for national plans	L - M?	Carbon neutrality policy is attained more slowly, or not attained, but expanded PES program provides higher level of services
	Farmers do not change behavior for level of PES payment offered	L?	PES system already has 350,000 ha enrolled at similar premiums. If opportunity costs rise, then fewer ha be enrolled