

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Fund

Selection of New REDD+ Countries in the FCPF

December 13, 2013 (revised from December 3 version to include updated Tables 1 and 3 and Annex 1)

Introduction

1. At PC14 in March 2013, the Participants Committee (PC) adopted a Resolution on the “Status of REDD Country Participants and Inclusion of Qualified Eligible REDD Countries” (Resolution PC/14/2013/2) which, among other things, laid out criteria and a process to use to select new REDD+ countries into the FCPF. The Resolution also included decisions on funding to existing REDD Country Participants, as a factor in determining the amount of funds available to select new countries. The key relevant decisions in this Resolution are:

For existing REDD Country Participants:

- Deadlines were set for REDD Country Participants who have been allocated Readiness Preparation Grant funding by the PC, to submit their Revised R-PP and sign their Readiness Preparation Grant Agreement (or equivalent). Any such REDD Country Participant that is unable to do so will lose guaranteed access to Readiness Preparation Grant funding, unless the PC decides otherwise on an exceptional basis.

For the selection of new countries:

- Qualified Eligible REDD Countries were requested to submit complete R-PPs to the FMT by July 31, 2013, to be considered for selection into the FCPF.
- The Qualified Eligible REDD Countries that meet the above deadline may present their R-PP for formal assessment and consideration for selection at PC16. Any Countries that are not formally assessed or not selected for funding at PC16, may (re)submit their R-PP for formal assessment and consideration for selection at PC17. Any Qualified Eligible REDD Countries that have not been selected at or before PC17 will not be selected into the FCPF for funding, unless the PC decides otherwise.
- The PC will use the following key criteria to help guide the selection of the Qualified Eligible REDD Countries at the relevant PC meeting:
 - a. The quality of the submitted R-PP, as informed by the TAP review;
 - b. The commitment of a Delivery Partner specified by the Qualified Eligible REDD Country to support that Country; and
 - c. The availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve to provide support to the Qualified Eligible REDD Country, at the time of the formal assessment of the submitted R-PP.
 - d. In addition to the key criteria listed in (a)-(c) above, the PC may take into account other factors it considers relevant, such as the availability of funding from non-FCPF sources and the demonstrated level of commitment to REDD+.

- Two-thirds of the Estimated Reserve will be designated for support to existing REDD Country Participants and any other activities that may be approved as part of the annual budget approval process. One-third of the Estimated Reserve will be designated for support to Qualified Eligible REDD Countries that are selected into the FCPF in accordance with the process outlined in the Resolution. These designations of the Estimated Reserve only apply until the end of PC17 (indicatively June 2014); thereafter, the whole Estimated Reserve will be used to support REDD Country Participants (both currently existing at the time of this resolution and those that will have been selected into the FCPF at the time of PC17) and any other activities that may be approved as part of the annual budget approval process, unless the PC decides otherwise.

2. This FMT Note provides the PC with the information needed to discuss and decide on 1) which new REDD+ countries to select into the FCPF, and 2) if relevant, on what terms. At PC16, the PC may adopt a resolution on which Countries to select into the FCPF. The PC may also adopt a separate resolution on each of the selected Countries, to allocate Readiness Preparation grant funding to each Country and identify the key issues to be addressed in their Revised R-PP before signing a Grant Agreement, if relevant.

Status of existing REDD Country Participants in the FCPF and their eligibility to access FCPF grant financing

3. As of November 22, 2013, 33 of 36 REDD Country Participants have submitted R-PPs for assessment by the PC,¹ of which 31 have been allocated Readiness Preparation grants.² Of these 31:
- a. All 18 Countries that were requested to submit their Revised R-PP by September 30, 2013 did so, and retain guaranteed access to Readiness Preparation Grant funding.
 - b. 7 of 10 Countries that were requested to submit their Revised R-PP by December 31, 2013 have done so. 3 have not, and will lose guaranteed access to Readiness Preparation Grant funding if they do not do so by December 31, unless the PC decides otherwise on an exceptional basis.
 - c. 3 Countries were not required to submit a Revised R-PP (though 1 of these Countries voluntary submitted one), and retain guaranteed access to Readiness Preparation Grant funding.³
 - d. All 31 Countries were requested to sign their Readiness Preparation Grant Agreement (or equivalent) by May 31, 2014. 12 have done so. 19 have not, and will lose guaranteed access to Readiness Preparation Grant funding if they do not do so by May 31, unless the PC decides otherwise on an exceptional basis.

See Table 1 and the FCPF Dashboard for further details on countries' status.

¹ 3 countries – Bolivia, Gabon and Paraguay – have not submitted any R-PP, losing their guaranteed access to Readiness Preparation funding. They remain eligible for Readiness Preparation funding subject to the availability of funding at the time their R-PP is formally assessed.

² Madagascar's R-PP has not yet been formally assessed by the PC. Tanzania's R-PP was formally assessed by the PC, but Tanzania has not requested grant funding from the FCPF.

³ Guyana, Indonesia and Panama are not required to submit a Revised R-PP given the type of PC Resolution that was adopted for their R-PPs.

Table 1: Status of REDD Country Participants' milestones, to maintain guaranteed access to Readiness Grant funding

REDD Country Participant	R-PP Assessed	Deadline to submit Revised R-PP	Revised-R-PP Submitted	R-PP Preparation Grant Signed
Argentina	✓	September 30, 2013	✓**	
Bolivia				
Cambodia	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Cameroon	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Central African Republic	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Chile	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Colombia	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	
Costa Rica	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Dem. Rep. of Congo	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
El Salvador	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	
Ethiopia	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Gabon				
Ghana	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Guatemala	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Guyana*	✓	N/A	N/A	
Honduras	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Indonesia*	✓	N/A	✓	✓
Kenya	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	
Lao PDR	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	
Liberia	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Madagascar	By PC17 (June 2014)			
Mexico	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	
Mozambique	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Nepal	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Nicaragua	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	
Panama*	✓	N/A	N/A	
Papua New Guinea	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Paraguay				
Peru	✓	December 31, 2013		
Republic of Congo	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Suriname	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Tanzania ***	✓		✓	
Thailand	✓	December 31, 2013		
Uganda	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓
Vanuatu	✓	December 31, 2013	✓	
Vietnam	✓	September 30, 2013	✓	✓

* Guyana, Indonesia and Panama are not required to submit a Revised R-PP given the type of PC Resolution.

** Argentina submitted a Revised R-PP in May 2013. They have since requested support from UN-REDD, so are updating their Revised R-PP to be in the version 6 template jointly agreed by UN-REDD and FCPF.

*** Tanzania submitted an R-PP for assessment at or before PC14, so retains guaranteed access to Readiness funding. They have not formally requested grant funding from the FCPF so no deadline was set for them to submit a Revised R-PP. They have since indicated their intention to request funds in their progress sheet submitted in November 2013.

Status of Qualified Eligible REDD Countries

Which Countries are eligible to be selected into the FCPF?

5. 11 countries met the requirement of submitting a complete R-PP to the FMT by July 31, 2013, to be considered for selection into the FCPF. Previously, they had also been requested to provide supplemental information by January 31, 2013. See Annex 1 for relevant information provided by the interested countries.

- 1) Belize
- 2) Bhutan
- 3) Burkina Faso
- 4) Cote d'Ivoire
- 5) Dominican Republic
- 6) Fiji
- 7) Nigeria
- 8) Pakistan
- 9) Republic of the Sudan
- 10) Togo
- 11) Uruguay

6. All eleven countries will present their R-PPs for formal assessment and consideration for selection at PC16. Any Countries that are not selected for funding at PC16 may resubmit their R-PP for formal assessment and consideration for selection at PC17. Any Qualified Eligible REDD Countries that have not been selected at or before PC17 will not be selected into the FCPF for funding, unless the PC decides otherwise.

Criteria for selecting new Countries into the FCPF

7. As noted above, Resolution PC/14/2013/2 identified three key criteria for selecting Qualified Eligible REDD Countries into the FCPF. The following section provides relevant information on each of these criteria.

Criterion a: The quality of the submitted R-PP, as informed by the TAP review

8. At PC14, the PC decided to use submission of an R-PP as a key criterion for eligibility into and selection into the FCPF, in order to establish a clear and straightforward way to encourage interested countries to demonstrate their commitment to REDD+ and capacity to initiate work on Readiness, and for the PC to select countries based on the quality and content of their Readiness work. This was also viewed to be consistent with the FCPF's objectives and existing work on Readiness in existing REDD Countries.

9. The FMT requested the eleven Countries that submitted complete R-PPs by the July 31, 2013 deadline, to submit revised R-PPs by September 13, 2013 if they so wished. As per the standard R-PP review procedure, the FMT then formed a Technical Advisory Panel of experts (TAP) to review each of the R-PPs that was submitted by then. The TAP reviewed the R-PPs and provided early feedback to the Countries, the Countries revised their R-PPs by November 8, 2013, and the TAP then finalized their reviews of the revised R-PPs. Table 2 presents an overview summary of the TAP's assessment of the R-PPs. The full R-PPs and TAP reviews are available at <https://forestcarbonpartnership.org/3687>.

Table 2. TAP assessment of whether R-PP standards have been met

Component	Belize	Bhutan	Burkina Faso	Cote d'Ivoire	Dominican Republic	Fiji	Nigeria	Pakistan	Sudan	Togo	Uruguay
1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met	Met	Largely Met
1b: Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Partially Met
1c: Consultation and Participation Process	Largely Met	Largely met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2a: Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2b: REDD+ Strategy Options	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
2c: Implementation Framework	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met
2d: Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
3: Reference Level	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially met	Met	Met
4a: Monitoring – Emissions and Removals	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met
5: Budget	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met
6: Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met

10. In line with the discussion at PC14, a Working Group of PC members was also formed and tasked with reviewing the R-PPs and, taking the TAP assessments into account, developing a recommendation to the PC on the selection of new countries. Table 3 presents an overview summary of the PC Working Group's assessment of the R-PPs. The full reviews are available on the FCPF website at <https://forestcarbonpartnership.org/3687>.

11. The PC may therefore take into account the TAP's assessments, the Working Group's assessments and recommendations, as well as any independent information that Participants may gather from other sources, when determining the quality of the R-PPs.

Table 3. PC Working Group assessment of whether R-PP standards have been met

	Belize	Bhutan	Burkina Faso	Cote d'Ivoire	Dominican Republic	Fiji	Nigeria	Pakistan	Sudan	Togo	Uruguay
1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
1b: Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met
1c: Consultation and Participation Process	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2a: Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2b: REDD+ Strategy Options	Partially Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met
2c: Implementation Framework	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Partially Met	Met	Largely Met
2d: Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met
3: Reference Level	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Not Met	Largely Met	Met
4a: Monitoring – Emissions and Removals	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met
5: Budget	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Met
6: Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Partially Met	Met	Met

Criterion b: The commitment of a Delivery Partner specified by the Qualified Eligible REDD Country to support that Country

12. Under the FCPF Readiness Fund, there are four approved Delivery Partners that may provide support to Countries: the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, UNDP, and FAO. It is important to recall though that Resolutions PC/9/2011/1 and PC/10/2011/4 on Multiple Delivery Partners limit the arrangement to a pilot in ten REDD Country Participants, subject to the gathering and application of lessons learned involving a mid-term review for at least two Pilot Countries per Delivery Partner (which will not happen for some time). Ten existing REDD Country Participants have been approved by the PC to work with Delivery Partners other than the World Bank. As a result, no new REDD+ country can work with a Delivery Partner other than the World Bank (unless the potential Delivery Partner of one of the ten already approved countries does not confirm it will act as such. The potential Delivery Partner is yet to confirm its role in CAR, Panama and Paraguay.)

13. Each of the eleven Qualified Eligible REDD Countries has confirmed their willingness to work with the World Bank as Delivery Partner, if selected into the FCPF. The FMT is confirming whether the World Bank will commit to acting as Delivery Partner in each of the candidate Countries should they be selected. The FMT will present this information to the PC at PC16, when the candidate countries present their R-PPs to the PC for formal assessment.

Criterion c: Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve

14. As mentioned above and as per Resolution PC/14/2013/2, two-thirds of the Estimated Reserve of the FCPF Readiness Fund is designated for support to existing REDD Country Participants and any other activities that may be approved as part of the annual budget approval process. One-third of the Estimated Reserve is designated for support to Qualified Eligible REDD Countries that are selected into the FCPF in accordance with the process outlined in the Resolution. These designations apply until the end of PC17 (indicatively June 2014).

15. *How much funding is available and for how many new countries?* Table 3 presents the sources and uses of FCPF Readiness funding. The uses include all previously agreed expenditures. Table 3 indicates a forecast reserve of approximately \$52.7 million, of which one-third (\$17.6 million) is designated to support new countries.

16. It is estimated that the full cost of including a new REDD+ country with access to a grant of \$3.8 million is approximately \$5.8 million, as indicated in Table 3. This includes \$650,000 per REDD Country Participant to the Delivery Partner to carry out its work in supporting the REDD Country Participant (e.g., time and travel to work directly with the country, contracting services or hiring staff if needed). It also includes time contributed by the FMT for country advisory services and secretarial support, including additional staff as needed, and support for countries to attend meetings of the PC and/or Participants Assembly (PA).

17. Table 3 shows that with the current amount of reserve funds, designating one-third of reserve funds for additional countries would allow three additional countries to be invited into the FCPF on the same terms as existing REDD Country Participants (\$3.8 million Readiness Preparation grant plus FMT and Delivery Partner support).

**Table 3. Summary of Long Term Sources and Uses of Readiness Funding
(in \$ million, as of November 2013)**

Explanation	of which	Totals
Committed Funding (Currently no pledges)		258.5
Committed Uses for funds		
Commitments (grants) to REDD+ Countries (36 @ \$3.8 million) ^{1,2}	136.8	
Additional grant funding to DRC (for REDD+ Countries that demonstrate significant progress on readiness) ³	5	
Less grants to REDD+ Countries who did not submitted R-PPs by PC14 (3 @ \$3.8) ⁴	(11.40)	
Net Grant Commitments		130.4
Administrative, Operations, and Country Support of which:		75.4
FY09-13 Actual costs	29.2	
FY14 Budgeted costs	10.6	
FY15-20 Projected costs ⁵	33.6	
Reserve for Delivery Partner capacity for dispute resolution	2	
Total Uses		205.8
Estimated Reserve: Committed funding less Total Uses		52.7
Reserve allocation for new countries (1/3 of reserve)⁶		17.6
Proposed Commitments	Per country	Totals
Potential reopening of the FCPF to new countries (\$5.8 million per country ⁷ , assuming 3 new countries)	5.8	17.4
Remaining reserve for new countries		0.2

1. Expecting grants to 36 REDD Countries Participants. All 37 originally selected in to the FCPF but excluding Equatorial Guinea (PA not signed by February 1, 2012).

2. Due to the current political situation Madagascar's R-PP has not yet been formally assessed. Resolution PC14/2013/2 The PC Decides that for those REDD Country Participants who submitted their R-PP by PC14 but whose R-PP was not formally assessed by PC14, Readiness Preparation Grant funding will be available to them only if their R-PP is formally assessed by the PC at or before PC17.

3. The additional \$5 million for DRC is already committed per PC Resolution

4. Per Resolution PC/10/2011/1.rev, includes Bolivia, Gabon and Paraguay

5. Steady operational budget through FY16 (including an estimate for continuing additional activities, with 20% annual cuts thereafter.

6. Per resolution PC/14/2013/2, one-third of the Estimated Reserve will be designated for support to Qualified Eligible REDD Countries that are selected into the FCPF. These designations of the Estimated Reserve only apply until the end of PC17 (indicatively June 2014)

7. This estimate of \$5.8 million per country includes the grant of 3.8 million plus the agreed Delivery Partner support costs of \$650,000 and all other additional costs (FMT support costs, meeting costs, REDD Methodology support, etc).

18. Since there is currently funding to select three new Countries into the FCPF on the same terms as existing REDD Country Participants, the remaining eight eligible Countries will not be selected unless sufficient additional funding becomes available by PC17. Foreseeing this, at PC14 in March 2013, the PC considered the possibility of a) allocating smaller grants to some Countries to allow for selecting a greater number of Countries, or b) allowing Countries to be observers with no access to funding, in order to allow them to attend meetings to learn from other Countries' experiences. However, the FMT does not recommend either of these approaches.

- a) In terms of grant funding, the FMT recommends that the PC treat all REDD Country Participants equally, with equal access to the same amount of grant funding. To date, the PC has allocated "up to \$3.8 million" to each REDD Country Participant. It is then the responsibility of the Country and the Delivery Partner to work together to determine the exact amount of the Grant Agreement that is eventually signed, based on the Country's needs. (To date, all Grant Agreements have been for the maximum amount.) It is important to maintain this distinction between the PC's allocation of funds and the Country and Delivery Partners' agreement on the amount and use of those funds, to ensure that Countries' needs are best met. As such, it is recommended that the PC allocate the same amount of "up to \$3.8 million" to any new Countries selected into the FCPF.

Furthermore, a Delivery Partner incurs a minimum level of costs regardless of the size of a grant, and the cost of preparing and supervising the grant can quickly outweigh the size of a very small grant.

- b) In terms of selecting some Countries as observers with no access to funding, this would pose additional costs if the FCPF were to support their attendance at meetings (an estimated \$7,000 to attend one Participants Assembly/Participants Committee meeting), and would also pose operational challenges for the FMT when organizing meetings. While it is true that the Countries have gone through the process of developing an R-PP with the expectation that they may be selected into the FCPF, there would be limited benefit to the Countries in observing discussions once a year with no further support from or engagement with the FCPF. Each of the Countries has benefited from significant feedback on their Readiness process and vetting of their R-PP with the TAP and PC, which is one of the key benefits of engaging with the FCPF. They are in a strong position to continue their Readiness process and to seek support from other sources.

Consideration of other criteria

19. As agreed in the PC14 Resolution, in addition to the key criteria a-c above, the PC may take into account other factors it considers relevant, such as the availability of funding from non-FCPF sources and the demonstrated level of commitment to REDD+.

Summary Recommendation

20. Based on the above, there are sufficient funds available in the FCPF Readiness Fund (Criterion c) to support three new countries in the FCPF on the same terms as existing REDD Country Participants (\$3.8 million Readiness Preparation grant plus FMT and Delivery Partner support), and there is limited benefit in and even additional challenges in including Countries on any lesser terms. All eleven Qualified Eligible REDD Countries have confirmed their willingness to work with the World Bank as Delivery Partner should they be selected, and the FMT is in the process of confirming that the World Bank is

willing to work with each of the Countries should they be selected (Criterion b). The FMT therefore recommends that the PC select up to three of the Qualified Eligible REDD Countries into the FCPF at PC16 on the same terms as existing REDD Country Participants, based on the quality of the submitted R-PP (Criterion a).

21. As agreed at PC14, any of the Qualified Eligible REDD Countries that is not selected at PC16 may revise its R-PP and present it for formal consideration at PC17 (indicatively June 2014). The PC may select another round of countries based on 1) the quality of the formal R-PPs, 2) the commitment of Delivery Partners to support the countries, and 3) the availability of reserve funding for additional countries. Any countries not yet selected into the FCPF at PC17 will no longer be considered and the FCPF will be closed to additional REDD Country Participants until further notice. Any funding that is secured after PC17 will be used to finance the REDD Country Participants (both existing and those that will have been selected into FCPF by that time), and for other activities as may be approved by the PC as part of the annual budget approval process.

Annex 1: FMT's summary of relevant supplemental information regarding candidate countries, submitted before January 31, 2013

For complete submissions made by countries go to <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/node/392>

Country	Existing financial and technical support for REDD+	Level of Participation in the FCPF requested; Potential Delivery Partner requested
Belize	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some financial support for R-PP preparation available from GTZ In process of preparing R-PIN for submission to the UN-REDD Programme via UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation Seeks technical support on MRV; creation and implementation of appropriate legal mechanisms
Bhutan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing discussions with UNDP Initial support of USD 60,000 for 2012 for setting up REDD+ Working Group received from UNDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation Seeks FCPF support on MRV and REDD+ strategy development, increasing role of community and private sector in natural resource management
Burkina Faso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FIP Investment Plan and funding have been approved, to support activities complementary to REDD+ process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial resources needed to implement R-PP are included in the country's Forest Investment Plan and other development projects Burkina Faso has approached the FCPF in order to align its approach with this global initiative and to take advantage of their technical expertise
Cote d'Ivoire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In discussions with UNDP and the World Bank Country Partner in UN-REDD Programme but no financial support as yet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation
Dominican Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received support from GIZ for preparation of initial draft R-PP, training and diagnostic work on REDD+ Above support is limited and FCPF resources will be required to sustain REDD+ work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation with full financial support for REDD+
Fiji	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GIZ is supporting the Fiji Forest Department in structuring and facilitating the process which has so far led to establishment of clear governance structures, capacity building, publishing of the Fiji National REDD+ Policy and preparation of demonstration activities in pilot areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation. A two-stage approach with formulation grant is not necessary
Nigeria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UN-REDD Programme has approved Nigeria's REDD National Programme with a funding allocation of USD 4 million. This fund is to support capacity building and readiness activities at the Federal level and more intense demonstration activities at Cross River State which will serve as the REDD Pilot State in Nigeria. More resources required in other states World Bank has prepared country-level forest sector review with a focus on forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation Presently working with UNDP as delivery partner for channeling resources from UN-REDD, but willing to work with World Bank as delivery partner for channeling FCPF resources

Country	Existing financial and technical support for REDD+	Level of Participation in the FCPF requested; Potential Delivery Partner requested
	<p>law enforcement and governance in Nigeria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Bank supported workshops on FLEG 	
Pakistan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pakistan is a member of the UN-REDD Programme • National Focal Point for UN-REDD has been designated • Preparing proposal to seek funding from UN-REDD • Other on-going efforts include active mobilization of ICIMOD and accessing GEF resources for SFM, REDD+ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation • Importance of REDD+ as a means to conserve and enhance forest cover, forest area and carbon stocks
Republic of the Sudan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forests National Corporation established a National REDD+ unit to develop framework for REDD+ strategic plan; work was done in collaboration with UNDP • Support for capacity building workshops and participation in UN-REDD Policy Board meetings by UNDP and UNEP • No financial resources for REDD+ as yet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation
Togo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical and financial support available from International Tropical Timber Organization to begin the process • Swiss Cooperation provided a consultant. This support covers (i) Capacity building of forestry staff on the issue REDD+, (ii) the development of R-PIN by a small multi-stakeholder representative group and (iii) the preparation of a REDD strategy and initial validation of R-PIN. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness preparation. Assistance needed for preparation of strategy includes REDD+ financial and technical support. • Community Development Project of High Intensity Labour (PDC-LI) with financial support from the World Bank is being implemented. The forestry component of this project involves the reforestation of 2015 ha in the five administrative regions in Togo. 923.69 ha are already planted in 2011. • Support required for the realization of the national forest inventory to define the reference line.
Uruguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing sources of funding not identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation with full financial support for REDD+ Readiness