



# Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

## Proposed Revised Indicators: Consultation Document

August 2017

### About this document

In 2016, the second program evaluation of the FCPF outlined several recommendations for strengthening the FCPF's M&E Framework. In response to those recommendations the M&E Framework is currently being reviewed, with a view to adopting a revised Framework in late 2017. This document represents a first step in the review and revision process, and provides **initial proposals for revisions to the FCPF's indicators**. The document aims to provide a starting point for consultations on the M&E Framework with FCPF stakeholders, particularly during the Participants' Assembly in Laos, to be held in late September 2017. The document contains:

- Outline of the **principles** guiding the indicator revision process
- **Indicator-by-indicator overview** including rationale for proposed indicator, potential measurement approaches, implications (pros and cons), reporting responsibilities, alignment with other REDD+ mechanisms
- **Summary comparison** of original (2013) indicators and proposed indicator revisions

## 1.1 Introduction

Indicators are at the core of the M&E Framework, a central means through which the Facility's progress, achievements and shortcomings will be measured, reported and understood. They go beyond just being a measurement tool though, helping to define and communicate the purpose of each FCPF activity, and of the Facility overall. The indicators are also foundational to the broader M&E Framework: indicators define the targets that will be worked towards, the measurement methodologies that need to be implemented, the reporting templates that will be used, and the evaluation approaches that will be adopted. Consequently, identifying the need for indicator revisions will be the first substantive step in the broader FCPF M&E Framework revision process.

This document sets out initial proposals for revisions to the FCPF's indicators. It should be viewed as a **starting point** for discussions and consultations with FCPF stakeholders on potential indicator revisions, and on strengthening of the broader M&E Framework.

These initial proposals have been developed through the following processes:

- Comprehensive review of the current M&E framework, including review of how current indicators have been applied, measured and reported on to date, and of the indicator-specific recommendations presented within the second program evaluation of the FCPF
- Comparative review of M&E approaches and indicators applied by other major REDD+ initiatives
- Review of relevant external developments (e.g. Agenda 2030) and their M&E approaches
- Limited consultations with the FCPF's Facility Management Team (FMT) and Evaluation Oversight Committee (OC)

## 1.2 Principles for indicator revisions

The M&E Framework revision process was largely initiated to address recommendations made by the second program evaluation of the FCPF in 2016. While the FCPF's core stakeholders generally agreed with the evaluation recommendations and the need to revise the M&E Framework, any revisions will have implications for monitoring approaches, reporting processes and – potentially – resource allocations. Consequently, Framework revisions should clearly not be arbitrary and need to be well justified. The following **guiding principles** for revising the M&E Framework are therefore proposed:

1. **Keep it simple:** revisions should minimise monitoring and reporting burdens, without compromising the depth or quality of data gathered.
2. Revisions should be **closely informed by the learning and experience** accrued since the current Framework was adopted in 2013: any revisions should be firmly grounded in an assessment of the strengths, shortcomings and utility of current indicators.
3. The FCPF has its own objectives and operating model, and the M&E framework, data requirements and reporting mechanisms are designed to meet the FCPF's mandate in accordance with its Charter. However, the revised M&E Framework should – to the extent possible – align **with other relevant REDD+ initiatives**, and with the World Bank's Indicators. Further alignment at country level should also help to (i) reduce the reporting burden for countries involved in more than one initiative, and (ii) improve comparability of results across REDD+ interventions, particularly if indicator definitions and measurement approaches can be aligned.
4. As the FCPF moves from delivery of the Readiness Fund (RF) towards implementation of the Carbon Fund (CF), there should be a corresponding **shift towards measurement of the CF and the changes that it aims to bring about**. This implies that M&E should now have an increased emphasis on outcome

and impact measurement in the areas of – for example – emissions reductions, payments secured, and other benefits being realised within CF participant countries.

5. In support of an increased emphasis on outcome and impact measurement, the FCPF Framework should develop a **greater balance of quantitative and qualitative indicators**. The present Framework is primarily based on quantitative indicators, which is understandable given the Facility's initial focus on delivering RF-associated milestones. However, introducing more qualitative indicators will help to deepen the analysis and support a more rounded understanding of how the FCPF is contributing to results.
6. A starting assumption for the Framework revision process is that **the FCPF's results (impacts, outcomes, outputs) remain unchanged**. These results were directly derived from – and are clearly aligned to – the FCPF Charter, and provide the long-term vision and operating basis for the whole Facility. The revision process will therefore focus on strengthening *measurement* of these results, rather than *redefinition* of these results. However, if potential opportunities for strengthening the FCPF's results statements are identified, these will be highlighted accordingly.

### 1.3 Consultation questions

When reviewing the proposed indicator revisions, stakeholders should consider the following questions:

- Would the data gathered through the indicators **improve understanding of the FCPF's performance**?
- Considering the potential measurement approaches identified, will it be feasible to measure progress against each indicator?
- If any indicators are inappropriate, what **alternatives** could be used? Closely related to this, are any important elements of the FCPF **not covered** by the proposed indicators?

### 1.4 Next steps

Once revised indicators have been agreed, the following supporting material will be developed:

- **Detailed reporting guidance** for Countries and Delivery Partners, including **revised progress reporting templates**
- **Revised portfolio-level dashboards** for the Readiness Fund and Carbon Fund
- **Options paper for future FCPF evaluations**, taking into account the demands of the revised indicators, and the evaluation plans of other major REDD+ initiatives

## 2.1 Impact 1 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>IMPACT I.1:</b> The FCPF has contributed to the design of a global regime under or outside UNFCCC that provides incentives for REDD+
---------	---

Current Indicators:	<del>I.1.A: Actual design of the global regime that includes REDD+</del>	-->	Proposed Indicators:	I.1.A: Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences the design and implementation of other ER schemes
	I.1.B: Examples of how FCPF learning and experience has fed into UNFCCC REDD+ decisions			I.1.B: Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences UNFCCC REDD+ decisions

Rationale:	<p>As noted in the second program evaluation, it has been difficult to assess FCPF’s contribution against the current indicators. Further consultation has suggested that current indicator I.1.A has been particularly problematic, mainly due to its unclear definition.</p> <p>The proposed qualitative indicators aim to measure the extent of the FCPF’s <b>influence</b> and <b>transformative impact</b>, looking in particular at whether – and if so how – the FCPF has influenced (i) the design, development and implementation of other REDD+ ER schemes, and (ii) UNFCCC processes as they relate to REDD+.</p>
Potential measurement approaches:	<p>The indicators could be measured through periodic qualitative evaluations / case studies that assess progress against <b>all</b> the proposed ‘learning and evidence’ and influence indicators, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>I.1.A:</b> Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences the design and implementation of other ER schemes</li> <li>- <b>I.1.B:</b> Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences UNFCCC REDD+ decisions</li> <li>- <b>I.4.B:</b> Extent to which FCPF leverages other (non-FCPF) REDD+ benefits</li> <li>- <b>2.3.a:</b> Extent to which CF pilots influence private sector engagement with deforestation and REDD+ processes</li> <li>- <b>3.1.d:</b> Extent to which the involvement of various stakeholder groups influences national REDD+ processes</li> <li>- <b>3.2.a:</b> Extent to which FCPF processes support Participant country efforts to sustain and enhance livelihoods within REDD+ intervention areas.</li> <li>- <b>3.2.b:</b> Extent to which FCPF processes support Participant country efforts to conserve biodiversity within REDD+ intervention areas.</li> <li>- <b>4.A:</b> Extent to which learning and evidence generated through the FCPF influences other REDD+ programs and practice</li> </ul> <p>However, the FMT could support this process by continuing to gather examples of FCPF influence on an ongoing, ad-hoc basis.</p>
Responsibility:	External evaluation / review, supported by ongoing ad-hoc monitoring by FMT
Implications:	Resources will be required to conduct periodic qualitative evaluations / progress reviews against these and the other proposed ‘learning and evidence’ / influence indicators.
Alignment with other initiatives:	N/A. These indicators are focused solely on the FCPF’s influence (although other initiatives have similar indicators measuring <i>their</i> own influence).

## 2.2 Impact 2 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>IMPACT I.2:</b> Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation from FCPF, especially CF portfolio countries
---------	---

Current Indicators:	I.2.A: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced in CF supported interventions	-->	I.2.A: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced <b>and avoided</b> in CF supported interventions
	I.2.B: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced in all FCPF supported countries	-->	I.2.B: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced <b>and avoided</b> in all FCPF supported countries
			I.2.C: Total forest area re/afforested or restored through CF supported interventions (ha)

Rationale:	Arguably, this impact is – at least from an external perspective – the most important and tangible FCPF results area. Consequently, it is proposed that the current indicators be deepened in order to provide more detail, measuring <b>avoided emissions</b> (i.e. not just reduced emissions) and <b>total forest area</b> affected. Crucially, introducing these new data requirements will bring the FCPF into alignment with other major REDD+ initiatives.
Potential measurement approaches:	Measurement approaches should be as defined by the FCPF Methodological Framework and UNFCCC reporting processes (NDCs, BURs).
Responsibility:	Participant Countries
Implications:	There should be limited additional reporting burden, as countries will already be monitoring and reporting on avoided emissions and land area restored through the national UNFCCC processes (NDCs, BURs).
Alignment with other initiatives:	The introduction of <b>avoided emissions</b> and <b>total forest area</b> affected will bring the FCPF into alignment with UNFCCC reporting processes, FIP, BioCarbon Fund ISFL, Norway’s ICFI, the UK’s ICF, and the SDGs.  The proposed <b>total forest area</b> indicator (I.2.C) will feed directly into <b>World Bank Indicators</b> .

## 2.3 Impact 3 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>IMPACT I.3:</b> FCPF has catalyzed the creation of recognized global standards for REDD+
---------	---

Current Indicators:	<p><b>I.3.A:</b> Examples of non-participant countries that have adopted FCPF standards in their own REDD+ process</p> <p><b>I.3.B:</b> Common approach successfully implemented</p>	-->	Proposed Indicators:	<p><b>I.3.A:</b> Number of non-participant countries that have adopted FCPF standards <u>approaches</u> in their own REDD+ process</p> <p><b>I.3.B:</b> Participant countries' assessment of FCPF's role within and contribution to REDD+</p>
---------------------	--	-----	----------------------	---

Rationale:	<p>The proposed indicators are slightly SMARTer, but also provide a broader evidence base by bringing in the perspective of Country Participants. Countries – and particularly those involved in more than one REDD+ initiative – will have valuable insight on the extent to which the FCPF, its standards and its requirements are aligned with other initiatives.</p> <p>The current indicator I.3.B should be removed as it was formulated more as a target than an indicator and – in any case – was achieved early on in the FCPF process.</p>
Potential measurement approaches:	<p>For a more detailed view, monitoring and reporting against I.3.A could also be disaggregated by, for example, Methodological Framework element (i.e. Are some elements of the Framework taken up more frequently than other elements? If so, why?).</p> <p>The proposed indicator I.3.B will require the gathering of periodic assessments from Participant Countries. This would be achieved through the introduction of direct questions and/or rating scales within FCPF country progress reporting templates.</p>
Responsibility:	<p><b>I.3.A:</b> External evaluation / review, supported by ongoing ad-hoc monitoring by FMT</p> <p><b>I.3.B:</b> Participant Countries</p>
Implications:	<p>The TORs for future FCPF evaluations will need to include a corresponding evaluation question to ensure that I.3.A is adequately measured. Ongoing FMT monitoring of I.3.A would continue as at present, although potentially on a more granular level (i.e. identifying examples by Methodological Framework element).</p> <p>Country progress reporting templates will need to be revised to support measurement of I.3.B</p>
Alignment with other initiatives:	<p>The proposed indicators are internally focussed and aren't aligned with other initiatives' monitoring processes. However, these indicators provide the basis for a direct assessment of the FCPF's harmonization with other initiatives, particularly from the perspective of Country Participants.</p>

## 2.4 Impact 4 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>IMPACT I.4:</b> FCPF has catalyzed investment in REDD+ (CF, and grants)
----------------	--

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	<p><b>I.4.A:</b> Amount of non-FCPF investments under R-PP process in Participant countries and for implementation of ER Programs (e.g. FIP, bilateral donors, private sector)</p> <p><b>I.4.B:</b> Examples of other mechanisms that have adopted and/or scaled up the approach piloted under FCPF</p>	-->	<b>Proposed Indicators:</b>	<p><b>I.4.A:</b> Amount of finance mobilized (private, public) to support delivery of RF and CF objectives: Grants; Loans; Equity; ERPs</p> <p><b>I.4.B:</b> Extent to which FCPF leverages other (non-FCPF) REDD+ benefits</p>
----------------------------	---	-----	-----------------------------	---

<b>Rationale:</b>	<p>The proposed indicators are broadly similar to the current versions, albeit slightly SMARTer. In order to improve data consistency and comparability, they (particularly I.4.A) will be supported by clearer definitions and measurement guidance than available at present.</p> <p>I.4.B will bring in qualitative data, with a view to identifying whether and how involvement in the FCPF has helped Participant Countries to leverage investment for other (non-FCPF) REDD+ activity.</p>
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	<p>Reporting against I.4.A should continue to be undertaken by Country Participants within FCPF progress reporting templates. As at present, the FMT would consolidate all country-level data within FCPF Annual Reports.</p> <p>I.4.B could be measured through periodic qualitative evaluations / case studies that assess progress against all the proposed 'learning and evidence' and influence indicators (I.1.A, I.1.B, I.4.B, 2.3.a, 3.1.d, 3.2.a, 3.2.b, 4.A). Potential evaluation questions to address for I.4.B could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have Participant Countries attracted REDD+ investment for non-FCPF activity? Have Countries gained other (non-financial) benefits related to their involvement in FCPF?</li> <li>- If so, how did the standards, processes, infrastructure and capacities developed through FCPF contribute to the country securing REDD+ investment?</li> </ul> <p>The FMT could support this process by continuing to gather examples of FCPF influence on an ongoing, ad-hoc basis.</p>
<b>Responsibility:</b>	<p><b>I.4.A:</b> Participant Countries, supported by clearer definitions, measurement guidance and reporting templates</p> <p><b>I.4.B:</b> External evaluation / review, supported by ongoing ad-hoc monitoring by FMT</p>
<b>Implications:</b>	<p>Participant Countries are already required to report on financial mobilization. The revised I.4.A may require some countries to provide more detail than at present, but this will be supported by new guidance material.</p> <p>For I.4.B, resources will be required to conduct periodic qualitative evaluations / progress reviews against this and the other proposed 'learning and evidence' / influence indicators.</p>
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	<p>With the exception of FIP, all other major REDD+ initiatives have high-level indicators for measuring finance mobilization. As far as possible, FCPF definitions and measurement approaches should be in line with those other initiatives.</p> <p>Indicator I.4.A will feed directly into <b>World Bank Indicators</b>.</p>

## 2.5 Impact 5 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>IMPACT I.5:</b> The FCPF has generated momentum to address governance and transparency issues and policy reforms related to sustainable forest resource management and REDD+
---------	---

Current Indicators:	<b>I.5.A:</b> Degree to which decision making processes related to emission reductions and forest resource management in participant countries allow for active multi-stakeholder participation including CSOs, IPs and local communities	-->	Proposed Indicators:	<b>I.5.A:</b> Extent to which FCPF builds momentum for sustainable forest resource management in Participant countries
	<b>I.5.B:</b> Number of policy reforms initiated, completed or underway complying to REDD+ standards in Participants' country, potentially include issues of land tenure	-->		<b>I.5.B:</b> Number of policy reforms initiated, completed or underway complying to REDD+ standards in Participant countries potentially include issues of land tenure

Rationale:	The proposed indicators are broadly similar to the current versions, although I.5.A is revised to be more in line with the actual result (Impact I.5). The revised I.5.A also allows for a <b>broader assessment</b> of governance, transparency and policy reform. Multi-stakeholder participation will continue to be measured as part of that broader assessment, but it will no longer the sole element to be measured via I.5.A.
Potential measurement approaches:	Measurement of I.5.A could be based on the FIP's scorecard approach, whereby countries provide a periodic, self-assessed 'score' against a series of questions relating to (i) governance, (ii) tenure, rights and access, and (iii) capacity development. For example, FIP countries are currently asked to provide an annual self-assessed rating (scale 0-10) against questions such as " <i>To what extent has FIP contributed to the comprehensiveness and accuracy of documentation and accessibility of information related to forest tenure and rights?</i> ". Many FIP statements are perhaps too detailed, but the general approach (albeit simplified) could be applied for FCPF. <b>If the FCPF introduces stronger gender mainstreaming requirements, this scorecard approach would allow for relatively detailed measurement on gender performance by, for example, asking countries to measure various aspects of gender mainstreaming within their national REDD+ structures.</b>  For I.5.B, Participant Countries are already required to report on the number of policy reforms, but this would greatly benefit from clearer guidance and country reporting templates.  Both indicators would benefit from validation and broader analysis through external evaluation.
Responsibility:	Participant Countries, External Evaluation
Implications:	If the scorecard approach is adopted, appropriate statements / questions will need to be agreed, and country reporting templates will need to be adjusted accordingly. Detailed reporting guidance will need to be developed for both indicators.
Alignment with other initiatives:	All other major REDD+ initiatives measure both capacity development and policy strengthening, with the FIP applying perhaps the strongest and certainly most detailed approach.  Indicator I.5.B will feed directly into <b>World Bank Indicators</b> .

## 2.6 Outcome 1 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>OUTCOME 1:</b> Efforts successfully undertaken by countries with FCPF support to achieve emission reductions from deforestation and/or forest degradation, and to benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives for REDD+ (Readiness Fund)
---------	---

Current Indicators:	1.A: Number of Readiness Packages endorsed by PC. (R-Packages are in line with assessment framework)	-->	Proposed Indicators:	1.A: Number of Readiness Packages endorsed by PC. (R-Packages are in line with assessment framework)
				1.B: Number of countries with endorsed R-Packages that have secured REDD+ ER payments through non-FCPF ER schemes

Rationale:	<p>The targets for indicator 1.A have already been achieved, but Outcome 1 is still very much in progress: indeed, it may be several years before RF-supported countries are in a position to demonstrate ERs that were plausibly influenced by RF activity. Consequently, new indicators are required to measure longer-term progress against Outcome 1.</p> <p>The new indicator is squarely targeted at those <b>countries that received RF support, but did not subsequently sign an ERPA with the CF</b>. Outcome 1 is focused on the post-RF achievements of Participant Countries, in particular their ability to "<i>benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives</i>". Arguably, the most tangible "benefit" will be ERs and ER payments, hence the proposed indicator. However, non-financial benefits will also be covered through indicator <b>I.4.B</b></p>
Potential measurement approaches:	Unless they subsequently participate in the CF, Participant Countries are not obliged to report to the FCPF on their ER activities. Consequently, the FMT will need to review each country's UNFCCC submissions (NDCs, BURs) and/or reports from other REDD+ schemes in order to ascertain participation in ER schemes (indicator <b>1.B</b> ).
Responsibility:	FMT
Implications:	Although the data for the new indicator should be available within each country's UNFCCC submissions (and/or publicly available reports from other REDD+ schemes), scanning these submissions would represent an additional monitoring activity for the FMT.
Alignment with other initiatives:	The new indicator is inherently aligned with UNFCCC reporting processes, and/or reporting processes of other REDD+ initiatives that RF countries will eventually participate in.

## 2.7 Output 1.1 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTPUT 1.1:</b> Readiness Assessment Framework is agreed upon and disseminated
----------------	---

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	<b>1.1:</b> Existence of published assessment framework on readiness package	-->	<b>Proposed Indicators:</b>	<b>1.1:</b> Existence of published assessment framework on readiness package
----------------------------	--	-----	-----------------------------	--

<b>Rationale:</b>	The output has been delivered, so no amendments are required. However, the current output and indicator should be retained so that the M&E Framework still communicates the FCPF's overall 'journey'.
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	N/A
<b>Responsibility:</b>	N/A
<b>Implications:</b>	N/A
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	N/A. This was an internally focussed indicator.

## 2.8 Output 1.2 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTPUT 1.2:</b> Countries demonstrate an adequate plan to achieve preparedness for REDD+ funding
----------------	---

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	<b>1.2.a:</b> Number of R-PPs endorsed by PC <b>1.2.b:</b> Number of Readiness Preparation Grant agreements signed	-->	<b>Proposed Indicators:</b>	<b>1.2.a:</b> Number of R-PPs endorsed by PC <b>1.2.b:</b> Number of Readiness Preparation Grant agreements signed
----------------------------	---	-----	-----------------------------	---

<b>Rationale:</b>	The output has been delivered, so no amendments are required. However, the current output and indicators should be retained so that the M&E Framework still communicates the FCPF's overall 'journey'.
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	N/A
<b>Responsibility:</b>	N/A
<b>Implications:</b>	N/A
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	N/A. These were internally focussed indicators.

## 2.9 Output 1.3 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>OUTPUT 1.3:</b> Countries progress adequately on implementation of their R-PP and Grant Agreements
---------	---

Current Indicators:	1.3.a: Number of mid-term progress (MTRs) reports presented by countries that follow agreed reporting standards and are presented in a timely manner	-->	1.3.a: Number of mid-term progress (MTRs) reports presented by countries that follow agreed reporting standards and are presented in a timely manner
	<del>1.3.b: Percentage of countries that are achieving planned milestones according to approved Readiness Preparation grant (&gt;USD 3.4 m)</del>		1.3.b: Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 1: Organize and Consult
	<del>1.3.c: Percentage of countries that are overall achieving planned milestones for sub-component as per country-annual reporting scale Sub-Component 1 to 9</del>		1.3.c: Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 2: Prepare the REDD+ Strategy
	<del>1.3.d: Percentage of countries with a disbursement rate that is in line with agreed Readiness Fund Preparation grant (&gt;3.4 million USD) disbursement plans of grant agreement (up to 10% variance with plans)</del>	-->	1.3.d: Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 3: Develop a National FREL
			1.3.e: Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 4: Design systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards
			1.3.f: Readiness Fund disbursement rate (\$ disbursed; amount disbursed as % of RF), disaggregated by RF grants disbursed through WB, and RF grants to other DPs

Rationale:	The revised indicators allow for a more granular, nuanced overview of portfolio-level R-PP progress. This will in turn help to identify (e.g.) components that are proving to be particularly problematic or – conversely – are generally being delivered on schedule. A revised disbursement rate indicator (1.3.f) is proposed, as the current indicator does not have a sufficient baseline: RF participants are not actually required to provide a "disbursement plan", so payment plans are often arbitrary, and are frequently subject to revision.
Potential measurement approaches:	For indicators 1.3.b-e, Participant Countries should report component-level progress via FCPF reporting templates. For 1.3.f, the FMT should – in consultation with all Participant Countries – establish annual portfolio-level disbursement rate targets (absolute \$ to be disbursed, <u>and</u> amount to be disbursed as a proportion of the whole RF value) up to the RF close date in 2020. Progress against these targets will then be routinely reported via the FCPF Annual Report.
Responsibility:	1.3.b–e: Participant Countries      1.3.f: FMT
Implications:	Indicators 1.3.b-e should be straightforward for Participants to report on, but will need to be supported by clear definitions (i.e. what does "completed" actually mean?) and revised reporting templates. The new disbursement rate indicator (1.3.f) will require the FMT to adopt a different measurement and reporting approach, but this portfolio-level indicator will be significantly easier to measure than the current indicator.
Alignment with other initiatives:	N/A. Individual R-PP components (e.g. FREL, REDD+ Strategy) will be foundational to each country's participation in other REDD+ initiatives, but the actual indicators are focussed on internal FCPF milestones.

## 2.10 Outcome 2 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTCOME 2:</b> Selected FCPF countries demonstrate key elements (carbon accounting, programmatic elements and pricing) of performance-based payment systems for emission reductions generated from REDD+ activities with a view to ensuring equitable benefit sharing and promoting future large-scale positive incentives for REDD+ (Carbon Fund)
----------------	---

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	2.A: Number of pilots where carbon accounting, programmatic elements and pricing are operating as planned	-->	<b>Proposed Indicators:</b>	2.A: Number of <u>CF</u> pilots where carbon accounting <u>and</u> programmatic elements <u>and pricing</u> are operating as planned <u>within ERPD</u>
	<del>2.B: Number of pilots in which the benefit sharing scheme is being implemented according to plans</del>			2.B: Volume of ERs purchased from CF pilots following ERPA signature
	2.C: Average % of monetary benefits shared with beneficiaries in approved pilots	-->		2.C: Volume of REDD+ ER payments secured by CF pilot countries through other (non-FCPF) transactions
				2.D: Average % of monetary benefits shared with beneficiaries ( <u>disaggregated</u> ) in <u>approved CF</u> pilots, <u>aligned to benefit sharing plan</u>

<b>Rationale:</b>	<p>Two of the original indicators are retained with only minor adjustments; the original 2.B is sufficiently covered by the original 2.C, so has been removed.</p> <p>However, given that these are outcome level indicators, it will also be important to measure the 'big' results that Outcome 2 is working towards. Consequently, new indicators are proposed to report progress on volume (\$) of ERs purchased, and volume (\$) of non-FCPF ER payments secured. The latter indicator (2.C) will provide important contextual data, could partly demonstrate the extent of the FCPF's influence beyond the CF, and could support a comparison between CF and RF countries: e.g. how do CF participants 'perform' on non-FCPF ER payments when compared to RF participants?</p>
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	<p>Measurement of 2.A, 2.B and 2.D should be covered by regular CF reporting requirements and approaches, as defined in the Methodological Framework. Data for 2.C will also be gathered by each country as a matter of course, albeit reported to different REDD+ initiatives and/or the UNFCCC.</p> <p>A comparative analysis of CF vs RF country performance on securing ER payment could be based on data collated through the new outcome indicator 2.C (for CF countries), and the new outcome indicator 1.C (for RF countries).</p>
<b>Responsibility:</b>	Participant Countries
<b>Implications:</b>	The revised indicator 2.D increases the original monitoring requirements to cover – at least – the proportion of beneficiaries that are women. While this addition should have only limited resource implications for CF countries, any further disaggregation (e.g. by age, by employment sector / status) will have corresponding resource implications.
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	Indicators 2.B, 2.C and 2.D are well aligned indicators applied by other REDD+ initiatives, the BioCarbon Fund ISFL in particular.

## 2.11 Output 2.1 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTPUT 2.1:</b> Standards and preparations in place for high-quality ER Programs discussed and endorsed by CF Participants and/or PC
----------------	---

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	<p><b>2.1.a:</b> Number and types of standards and management tools discussed and endorsed by CF participants and/or PC for ER programs including: a) Methodological framework and Pricing Approach</p> <p><b>2.1.b:</b> b) Business processes (ER-PD, ER-PIN, ERPA)</p> <p><b>2.1.c:</b> c) Legal documents (General Conditions, ERPA term sheet)</p>	-->	<p><b>2.1.a:</b> Number and types of standards and management tools discussed and endorsed by CF participants and/or PC for ER programs including: a) Methodological framework and Pricing Approach</p> <p><b>2.1.b:</b> b) Business processes (ER-PD, ER-PIN, ERPA)</p> <p><b>2.1.c:</b> c) Legal documents (General Conditions, ERPA term sheet)</p>
----------------------------	--	-----	--

<b>Rationale:</b>	<p>The output has been delivered, so no amendments are required. However, the current output and indicators should be retained so that the M&amp;E Framework still communicates the FCPF's overall 'journey'.</p> <p>However, it is plausible that stronger requirements could be introduced for mainstreaming gender within CF documentation (particularly ERPDs). If there was such a development, a new indicator could be introduced here.</p>
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	N/A
<b>Responsibility:</b>	N/A
<b>Implications:</b>	N/A
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	N/A. These were internally focussed indicators.

## 2.12 Output 2.2 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	OUTPUT 2.2: Countries have entered into the portfolio of the Carbon Fund
---------	--

Current Indicators:	2.2.a: Number of early ideas or ER-Programs presented by countries to the CF	-->	2.2.a: Number of early ideas or ER-Programs presented by countries to the CF
			2.2.b: Number of ER-PINs presented by countries to the CF
			2.2.c: Number of countries invited into CF pipeline
			2.2.d: Number of countries signing a CF letter of intent
			2.2.e: Number of ERPDs presented by countries to the CF
			2.2.f: Number of countries accepted into CF portfolio
	2.2.b: Number of REDD countries that have signed ERPA	-->	2.2.g: Number of REDD countries that have signed <u>an</u> ERPA <u>with the CF</u>

Rationale:	The revised indicators allow for a more granular, nuanced overview of portfolio-level CF progress. If stronger gender mainstreaming requirements are introduced for CF documentation, this output would also benefit from an additional indicator measuring the extent of gender mainstreaming (e.g. "Number of ERPDs incorporating a gender strategy assessed as high quality").
Potential measurement approaches:	The FMT's existing monitoring systems should be capable of tracking progress against all these indicators. A revised CF dashboard could be used to report on progress.
Responsibility:	FMT
Implications:	Monitoring against these indicators will require limited additional effort from the FMT.
Alignment with other initiatives:	N/A. These are internally focussed indicators.

## 2.13 Output 2.3 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTPUT 2.3:</b> Increased levels of private sector investment for incentivizing, testing, and supporting up-scale of ER activities
----------------	---

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	2.3: Number of private sector participants in CF	<b>Proposed Indicators:</b>	2.3.a: Extent to which CF pilots influence private sector engagement with deforestation and REDD+ processes
----------------------------	--	-----------------------------	---

<b>Rationale:</b>	The original indicator did not provide a sufficiently deep measure of progress against the Output. In any case, the FCPF is no longer focused on maximising the absolute number of private sector participants in the CF. Measuring private sector interest and participation is still important though, so the new indicator will monitor the extent of direct, tangible private sector involvement in the CF, including whether and how the FCPF has influenced private sector engagement with REDD+ and deforestation more broadly.
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	<p>The indicator could be measured through periodic qualitative evaluations / case studies that assess progress against all the proposed 'learning and evidence' and influence indicators (I.1.A, I.1.B, I.4.B, 2.3.a, 3.1.d, 3.2.a, 3.2.b, 4.A). Potential evaluation questions to address for 2.3.a could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How many private sector entities have engaged with REDD+ as a direct result of FCPF interventions? On what basis have they engaged?</li> <li>- How does FCPF-supported standards, systems, infrastructure facilitate (or act as a barrier to) the engagement of private sector entities?</li> <li>- What investment has been sourced from the private sector? To what extent have private sector entities engaged in ER schemes and ER purchases?</li> </ul> <p>The FMT could support this process by continuing to gather examples of FCPF influence on an ongoing, ad-hoc basis.</p>
<b>Responsibility:</b>	External evaluation / review, supported by ongoing ad-hoc monitoring by FMT
<b>Implications:</b>	Resources will be required to conduct periodic qualitative evaluations / progress reviews against this and the other proposed 'learning and evidence' / influence indicators.
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	N/A. This is an internally focussed indicator.

## 2.14 Output 2.4 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTPUT 2.4:</b> ER Programs are being implemented in a timely manner
----------------	---

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	<b>2.4.a:</b> Amount and date of disbursements for ER Programs according to plans	-->	<b>Proposed Indicators:</b>	<b>2.4.a:</b> % of CF pilot program budgets (as per ERPD) covered by secured finance
	<b>2.4.b:</b> Amount of ER purchases following ERPA signature	-->		<b>2.4.b:</b> Actual ERs as % of originally estimated ERs (as per ERPA)
		-->	<b>Covered by new outcome indicator 2.B</b>	

<b>Rationale:</b>	<p>The original indicator 2.4.a was formulated prior to submission of the first ERPD: however the ERPD format now provides a far stronger basis for SMARTer indicators of timely CF implementation. The proposed indicators will measure two critical aspects of CF program delivery: the extent to which each CF pilot budget is actually funded (where "secured finance" = committed or pledged funds), and the performance of each CF pilot against the originally envisaged ERs.</p> <p>The original indicator 2.4.b measures one of Outcome 2's 'big' results, and so is more appropriate as an outcome indicator, so has been re-positioned as outcome indicator 2.B.</p>
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	ERPDs will provide baseline data for each indicator, with countries then reporting against each indicator through the standard CF monitoring processes defined within the Methodological Framework.
<b>Responsibility:</b>	Participant Countries
<b>Implications:</b>	CF progress reports will need to be amended to allow for reporting against the two new indicators.
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	N/A. These are internally focussed indicators.

## 2.15 Outcome 3 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>CURRENT OUTCOME 3:</b> Engagement of all stakeholders (Governments, CSO, IPs, private sector and delivery partners) sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and to conserve biodiversity within the approach to REDD+
Proposed Revision:	<b>NEW OUTCOME 3:</b> REDD+ interventions within Participant countries sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and conserve biodiversity

Current Indicators:	<p><del>3.A: Design of national REDD strategies, monitoring systems and ER Programs addresses indicators for enhancement of livelihoods of local communities and for biodiversity conservation</del></p> <p>3.B: Actual examples on the inherent social and biodiversity benefits of REDD+ and how they are used to inform REDD+ Agenda and to scale-up results</p>
---------------------	---

Proposed Indicators:	<p>3.A: Number of people reached with benefits (assets and/or services) by CF pilots (% women)</p> <p>3.B: Areas brought under enhanced biodiversity protection by CF pilots (ha)</p>
----------------------	---

--> Covered by new output indicators 3.1.d, 3.2.a and 3.2.b

Rationale:	<p>Firstly, <b>a revised Outcome 3 is proposed</b> so as to better align the Outcome with the associated FCPF Charter Objective, namely:</p> <p><i>"Within the approach to REDD, to test ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and to conserve biodiversity"</i></p> <p>The current Outcome 3 places emphasis on <b>stakeholder engagement</b>, rather than testing approaches to livelihoods and biodiversity. Stakeholder engagement is of course critical, but it is <b>only one element</b> of potential approaches for sustaining livelihoods and/or conserve biodiversity. Consequently, the proposed revision <b>locates Outcome 3 at a higher level</b>.</p> <p>Outcome 3's proposed indicators will measure the <b>actual</b> livelihood and biodiversity benefits realised by <b>CF pilots</b>. While this goes beyond merely measuring the 'testing' of approaches as envisaged through the FCPF charter objective, the actual benefits attained will nevertheless be a critical dataset for understanding the FCPF's overall effectiveness in this outcome area.</p>
Potential measurement approaches:	Indicator 3.A is fully aligned with a BioCarbon Fund ISFL indicator, so could benefit from the ISFL's existing definitions and measurement approaches. Both indicators are derived from World Bank Core Sector Indicators, so existing World Bank measurement methodologies should also closely inform the FCPF's approach.
Responsibility:	Participant Countries
Implications:	While some countries will already be planning to measure against these (or similar) indicators, they do go beyond the <b>requirements</b> of the Methodological Framework. Consequently, some countries may require more resources and support to monitor these indicators.
Alignment with other initiatives:	<p>Indicator 3.A is fully aligned with a BioCarbon Fund ISFL indicator, so could benefit from the ISFL's existing definitions and measurement approaches. Variations of 3.B are applied by most other REDD+ initiatives.</p> <p>Both 3.A and 3.B will feed directly into <b>World Bank Indicators</b>, including the <b>mandatory</b> indicator of <i>"Direct project beneficiaries (number), of which female (percentage)"</i>: this is <b>not</b> covered by the current FCPF M&amp;E Framework.</p>

## 2.16 Output 3.1 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTPUT 3.1:</b> Enhanced capacity of IPs and CSOs to engage in REDD+ processes at the country level
----------------	--

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	<b>3.1.a.i:</b> Number and types of examples of in-country REDD+ actions where IPs CSOs, and local communities participate actively	-->	<b>Proposed Indicators:</b>	<b>3.1.a:</b> Number / % of Participant countries whose REDD+ decision making process formally requires representation or input from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSOs</li> <li>- IPs</li> <li>- Local communities</li> <li>- Womens groups</li> </ul>
	<del><b>3.1.a.ii:</b> Examples of resources made available to enable active participation of IPs, CSOs, and local communities in national REDD+ readiness</del>			<b>3.1.b:</b> Number (disaggregated) of participants in CBP-funded activities
	<b>3.1.b:</b> Number of IP and REDD country - CSO representatives (men/women and/or/youth) that have participated and benefitted from FCPF organized workshops/ trainings on SESA, governance, MRV aspects/related aspects of REDD	-->		<b>3.1.c:</b> % of participants in CBP-funded activities indicating that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- they have more confidence to engage with REDD+ processes</li> <li>- they will definitely increase their engagement with REDD+ processes</li> </ul>
<b>3.1.c:</b> Examples of IPs and REDD country-CSO representation in institutional arrangements for REDD+ at the national level	-->		<b>3.1.d:</b> Extent to which the involvement of various stakeholder groups influences national REDD+ processes	

<b>Rationale:</b>	Revised indicators <b>3.1.b</b> and <b>3.1.c</b> make explicit the original intention of focusing Output 3.1 on the FCPF's <b>Capacity Building Program</b> (CBP). Additionally, all revised indicators now provide a basis for <b>qualitative</b> (rather than just quantitative) measurement, which is particularly critical when assessing the effectiveness of capacity development activities.
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	<p>Revised indicator <b>3.1.a</b> would be measured through periodic country reporting, supported by clear guidance on which 'decision making processes' and structures to include.</p> <p>Revised indicators <b>3.1.b-c</b> would be measured through a standard post-event questionnaire issued to all participants, potentially followed up by online surveys undertaken 6-12 months after event delivery.</p> <p><b>3.1.d</b> could be measured through periodic qualitative evaluations / case studies that assess progress against all the proposed 'learning and evidence' and influence indicators (I.1.A, I.1.B, I.4.B, 2.3.a, 3.1.d, 3.2.a, 3.2.b, 4.A). Potential evaluation questions for 3.1.d could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How does the engagement of certain stakeholder groups (CSOs, IPs, womens groups) influence national decision-making processes? Is this influence substantive (if so, why)?</li> <li>- Are there notable differences between countries with broad representation and countries with limited representation?</li> </ul> <p>The FMT could support this process by continuing to gather examples of FCPF influence on an ongoing, ad-hoc basis.</p>
<b>Responsibility:</b>	<p><b>3.1.a:</b> Participant Countries</p> <p><b>3.1.b-c:</b> FMT and/or other institutions delivering CBP events and activities</p> <p><b>3.1.d:</b> External evaluation / review, supported by ongoing ad-hoc monitoring by FMT</p>
<b>Implications:</b>	For 3.1.d, resources will be required to conduct periodic qualitative evaluations / progress reviews against this and the other proposed 'learning and evidence' / influence indicators.
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	Other initiatives <i>aspire</i> to measure the level and result of stakeholder engagement, but no clear, consistent indicators or methodologies have yet been implemented.

## 2.17 Output 3.2 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>CURRENT OUTPUT 3.2:</b> Pilots have been successfully implemented on ways to sustain and enhance livelihoods and conserve biodiversity
Proposed Revision:	<b>NEW OUTPUT 3.2:</b> FCPF Participant countries test ways to sustain and enhance livelihoods and conserve biodiversity

Current Indicators:	<p><b>3.2.a:</b> Number of countries where stakeholder engagement platforms proposed in R-PPs have taken up work and meet regularly</p> <p><b>3.2.b.i:</b> Number of countries with R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to FCPF that demonstrate: i) Ways to maintain or enhance livelihoods including at local levels are integrated into design of national REDD+ strategies, monitoring systems, and ER-Program design</p> <p><b>3.2.b.ii:</b> ii) Ways to conserve and/or restore biodiversity (fauna and flora) are integrated into design of national REDD+ strategies, monitoring systems, and ER-Program design, and take into account traditional knowledge</p> <p><b>3.2.b.iii:</b> iii) Relevant sustainability standards, as provided for in the Common Approach for Readiness preparation including those for grievance redress, and in the World Bank safeguards for ER-Programs, are applied</p>
---------------------	--

Proposed Indicators:	<p><b>3.2.a:</b> Extent to which FCPF processes support Participant country efforts to sustain and enhance livelihoods within REDD+ intervention areas</p> <p><b>3.2.b:</b> Extent to which FCPF processes support Participant country efforts to conserve biodiversity within REDD+ intervention areas</p>
----------------------	---

Rationale:	<p>Firstly, <b>a revised Output 3.2 is proposed</b> so as to broaden measurement beyond <b>CF pilots</b>, in turn allowing for the evaluation of livelihood and biodiversity approaches in <b>RF countries</b>.</p> <p>A comprehensive revision of indicators is proposed, as the original indicators were solely focused on CF pilots, and were formulated to only monitor intentions (i.e. plans) rather than actual results. Output 3.2 is focussed on identifying successful approaches to sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity conservation, consequently the revised indicators are wholly qualitative in nature (quantitative indicators would not be appropriate in this context).</p>
Potential measurement approaches:	<p>Both indicators would be measured through periodic qualitative evaluations / case studies that assess progress against all the proposed 'learning and evidence' and influence indicators (I.1.A, I.1.B, I.4.B, 2.3.a, 3.1.d, 3.2.a, 3.2.b, 4.A). However, in comparison to these other 'learning and evidence' indicators, Output 3.2 is more 'outward looking' with potentially highly valuable learning for other REDD+ initiatives. Consequently, <b>dedicated studies may be warranted for Output 3.2 alone</b>.</p> <p>The FMT could support this process by continuing to gather examples of successful FCPF-supported or influenced approaches on an ongoing, ad-hoc basis.</p>
Responsibility:	External evaluation / review, supported by ongoing ad-hoc monitoring by FMT
Implications:	Resources will be required to conduct periodic qualitative evaluations / progress reviews against this and the other proposed 'learning and evidence' / influence indicators.
Alignment with other initiatives:	Other initiatives <i>aspire</i> to measure the effectiveness of approaches to livelihoods and biodiversity, but no clear, consistent indicators or methodologies have yet been implemented.

## 2.18 Outcome 4 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>OUTCOME 4:</b> Knowledge gained in the development of the FCPF and implementation of Readiness Preparation Proposals (under the RF) and Emission Reductions Programs (under the CF) broadly shared, disseminated and used by international REDD practitioners
---------	--

Current Indicators:	<p>4.A: Number of new countries / stakeholders requesting to become FCPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- observers</li> <li>- members</li> </ul>		<p><b>Proposed Indicators:</b></p> <p>4.A: Extent to which learning, evidence and knowledge products generated through the FCPF influences other REDD+ programs and practice</p>
	4.B: Examples of utilization of/or reference to FCPF knowledge products	-->	

Rationale:	<p>Outcome 4 is squarely focused on the <b>influence</b> of FCPF experience, so lends itself more to qualitative rather than quantitative measurement. The proposed indicator aims to explore whether, how and why FCPF knowledge is or is not influential.</p> <p>The indicator also complements all the FCPF <b>Communications and KM Strategy</b> objectives, particularly objectives 2 (stronger outreach processes) and 3 (better feedback loops).</p>
Potential measurement approaches:	<p>The indicator would be measured through periodic qualitative evaluations / case studies that assess progress against all the proposed 'learning and evidence' and influence indicators (I.1.A, I.1.B, I.4.B, 2.3.a, 3.1.d, 3.2.a, 3.2.b, 4.A). Potential evaluation questions for 4.A could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Who</b> has used FCPF knowledge products (have the 'right' people been reached)?</li> <li>- <b>How</b> have FCPF knowledge products been used (are there any tangible examples of influence on e.g. specific national processes or policies)?</li> </ul> <p>The FMT could support this process by continuing to gather examples of FCPF (and particularly knowledge product) influence on an ongoing, ad-hoc basis.</p>
Responsibility:	External evaluation / review, supported by ongoing ad-hoc monitoring by FMT
Implications:	Resources will be required to conduct periodic qualitative evaluations / progress reviews against this and the other proposed 'learning and evidence' / influence indicators.
Alignment with other initiatives:	N/A. This is an internally focussed indicator.

## 2.19 Output 4.1 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

<b>Result:</b>	<b>OUTPUT 4.1:</b> The FCPF has generated momentum to address governance and transparency issues and policy reforms related to sustainable forest resource management and REDD+
----------------	---

<b>Current Indicators:</b>	<b>4.1.a:</b> Approved framework communication strategy for knowledge management and communication at the global level and up-to-date annual work plan for its implementation presented to the PC every year	
	<b>4.1.b:</b> Number of knowledge products distributed via workshops, publications, websites or other media	--> <b>Proposed Indicator:</b> 4.1.a: Number of knowledge products produced
	<b>4.1.c:</b> Number of people reached, by type of knowledge product and type of audience (including website site counts)	--> Covered by new output indicator 4.3.b
	<b>4.1.d:</b> Examples of activities undertaken including at national level to generate and institutionalize awareness on REDD+ such as through inclusion of REDD+ in curricula in schools and universities	--> <b>Proposed Indicators:</b> 4.1.b: Participant countries' assessment of usefulness of FCPF's knowledge products 4.1.c: Extent to which FCPF learning, evidence and knowledge products are used by Participant countries 4.1.d: Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences ongoing FCPF implementation

<b>Rationale:</b>	While the number of knowledge products produced is an important indicator of FCPF activity, more important is how those knowledge products are subsequently used. The revised indicators will gather qualitative assessments from Participant Countries and from the FMT itself on the utility of FCPF knowledge products. Indicator 4.1.d strongly complements the FCPF's Communications & KM Strategy, objective 3 (better feedback loops).
<b>Potential measurement approaches:</b>	Indicators 4.1.b and 4.1.c could be measured through standard FCPF country reporting templates, with new questions asking countries to 'score' the usefulness of specific products, and to identify real life examples (if any) of product usage.  4.1.d would require the FMT to periodically self-assess the effectiveness of their internal mechanisms for ensuring FCPF lessons and experience are actually applied and fed back in to FCPF programming processes. These self-assessments could be validated by external evaluation.
<b>Responsibility:</b>	<b>4.1.a, 4.1.d:</b> FMT (potentially validated by external evaluation) <b>4.1.b, 4.1.c:</b> Participant Countries
<b>Implications:</b>	Country reporting templates will require revision for indicators 4.1.b and 4.1.c. The FMT would need to develop a formal process for self-assessing their progress against 4.1.d.
<b>Alignment with other initiatives:</b>	N/A. These are internally focussed indicators.

## 2.20 Output 4.2 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>OUTPUT 4.2:</b> Participants actively engage in South-south-learning activities
---------	--

Current Indicators:	4.2.a: Number of S-S learning activities and/or events connecting FCPF countries	-->	Proposed Indicators:	4.2.a: Number of S-S learning activities and/or events connecting FCPF countries
	4.2.b: Total number of participants to South-south knowledge exchange activities by category: REDD member countries (men/women); non-REDD member countries (men/women); IP/CSO representatives from region (men/women)	-->		4.2.b: Number of participants in S-S learning activities and/or events connecting FCPF countries (% women)
				4.2.c: % of participants in S-S learning activities indicating that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- they acquired new knowledge or skills</li> <li>- they will definitely apply the new knowledge or skills in their work</li> <li>- they have established new connections / networks that they will maintain</li> </ul>

Rationale:	As with Outcome 4 and Output 4.1, the quantitative measurement of Output 4.2 needs to be supported by a degree of qualitative measurement. The introduction of indicator 4.2.c allows for a deeper analysis of the effectiveness of the FCPF's learning events, with metrics based on the broadly applied 'Kirkpatrick model' for measuring the effectiveness of training and learning.
Potential measurement approaches:	All indicators would be measured through standardised post-event questionnaires issued to all participants, potentially followed up by online surveys undertaken 6-12 months after event delivery.
Responsibility:	FMT and/or other institutions delivering learning events and activities.
Implications:	A standardised post-event questionnaire will need to be developed and administered.
Alignment with other initiatives:	N/A. These are internally focussed indicators.

## 2.21 Output 4.3 indicators

Indicator to be removed	Indicator to be retained	Revised indicator	New indicator
-------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------

Result:	<b>OUTPUT 4.3:</b> Strong visibility of REDD+ and FCPF
---------	--

Current Indicators:	4.3.a: Number of neutral/positive mentions of FCPF and REDD+ issues in different key media worldwide per period	-->	Proposed Indicators:	4.3.a: Number of <del>neutral/positive</del> mentions of FCPF and REDD+ <del>issues</del> in different key media worldwide <del>per X</del> period
	4.3.b: Number of negative mentions of FCPF and REDD+ issues in different key media worldwide per year	-->		4.3.b: Number of unique and returning visitors to FCPF website
				4.3.c: Number of people reached on social media

Rationale:	The public visibility of the FCPF is certainly of interest, and it will be informative to track the changing levels of interest as the Facility develops. However, strong visibility does not appear to be a priority for the Facility, or for the FCPF Communications & KM Strategy. Consequently, the revised indicators propose only light-touch measurement against this output. The indicators will provide a useful, high-level view of the changing levels of interest in the FCPF, but the limited resources available for monitoring should be applied elsewhere. Moreover, it is not clear that milestones or targets for these metrics can or <b>should</b> be pursued.
Potential measurement approaches:	Standard media tracking and web analytics should be applied. When reporting figures within the FCPF Annual Report, year-on-year % changes should be presented alongside absolute figures.
Responsibility:	FMT
Implications:	There should be limited additional reporting burden associated with these indicators.
Alignment with other initiatives:	N/A. These are internally focussed indicators.

### 3 Summary comparison of current indicators with proposed indicators

Indicator to be removed

Indicator to be retained

Revised indicator

New indicator

#### 3.1 Impact Level

Result	Current indicator		Proposed indicator
I.1: The FCPF has contributed to the design of a global regime under or outside UNFCCC that provides incentives for REDD+	<del>I.1.A: Actual design of the global regime that includes REDD+</del>		I.1.A: Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences the design and implementation of other ER schemes
	I.1.B: Examples of how FCPF learning and experience has fed into UNFCCC REDD+ decisions	-->	I.1.B: Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences UNFCCC REDD+ decisions
I.2: Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation from FCPF, especially CF portfolio countries	I.2.A: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced in CF supported interventions	-->	I.2.A: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced <b>and avoided</b> in CF supported interventions
	I.2.B: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced in all FCPF supported countries	-->	I.2.B: Number of tons of CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation reduced <b>and avoided</b> in all FCPF supported countries
			I.2.C: Total forest area re/afforested or restored through CF supported interventions (ha)
I.3: FCPF has catalyzed the creation of recognized global standards for REDD+	I.3.A: Examples of non-participant countries that have adopted FCPF standards in their own REDD+ process	-->	I.3.A: Number of non-participant countries that have adopted FCPF <del>standards</del> <b>approaches</b> in their own REDD+ process
	<del>I.3.B: Common approach successfully implemented</del>		I.3.B: Participant countries' assessment of FCPF's role within and contribution to REDD+
I.4: FCPF has catalyzed investment in REDD+ (CF, and grants)	I.4.A: Amount of non-FCPF investments under R-PP process in Participant countries and for implementation of ER Programs (e.g. FIP, bilateral donors, private sector)	-->	I.4.A: Amount of finance mobilized (private, public) to support delivery of RF and CF objectives: Grants; Loans; Equity; ERPs
	I.4.B: Examples of other mechanisms that have adopted and/or scaled up the approach piloted under FCPF	-->	I.4.B: Extent to which FCPF leverages other (non-FCPF) REDD+ benefits
I.5: The FCPF has generated momentum to address governance and transparency issues and policy reforms related to sustainable forest resource management and REDD+	I.5.A: Degree to which decision making processes related to emission reductions and forest resource management in participant countries allow for active multi-stakeholder participation including CSOs, IPs and local communities	-->	I.5.A: Extent to which FCPF builds momentum for sustainable forest resource management in Participant countries
	I.5.B: Number of policy reforms initiated, completed or underway complying to REDD+ standards in Participants' country, potentially include issues of land tenure	-->	I.5.B: Number of policy reforms initiated, completed or underway complying to REDD+ standards in Participant countries <del>potentially include issues of land tenure</del>

### 3.2 Outcome Area 1 (Readiness Fund)

Result	Current indicator
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Efforts successfully undertaken by countries with FCPF support to achieve emission reductions from deforestation and/or forest degradation, and to benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives for REDD+ (Readiness Fund)	<b>1.A:</b> Number of Readiness Packages endorsed by PC. (R-Packages are in line with assessment framework)

Proposed indicator
<b>1.A:</b> Number of Readiness Packages endorsed by PC. (R-Packages are in line with assessment framework)
<b>1.B:</b> Number of countries with endorsed R-Packages that have secured REDD+ ER payments through non-FCPF ER schemes

-->

<b>Output 1.1:</b> Readiness Assessment Framework is agreed upon and disseminated	<b>1.1:</b> Existence of published assessment framework on readiness package
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Countries demonstrate an adequate plan to achieve preparedness for REDD+ funding	<b>1.2.a:</b> Number of R-PPs endorsed by PC
	<b>1.2.b:</b> Number of Readiness Preparation Grant agreements signed
<b>Output 1.3:</b> Countries progress adequately on implementation of their R-PP and Grant Agreements	<b>1.3.a:</b> Number of mid-term progress (MTRs) reports presented by countries that follow agreed reporting standards and are presented in a timely manner
	<b>1.3.b:</b> Percentage of countries that are achieving planned milestones according to approved Readiness Preparation grant (>USD 3.4 m)
	<b>1.3.c:</b> Percentage of countries that are overall achieving planned milestones for sub-component as per country - annual reporting scale Sub-Component 1 to 9
	<b>1.3.d:</b> Percentage of countries with a disbursement rate that is in line with agreed Readiness Fund Preparation grant (>3.4 million USD) disbursement plans of grant agreement (up to 10% variance with plans)

<b>1.1:</b> Existence of published assessment framework on readiness package
<b>1.2.a:</b> Number of R-PPs endorsed by PC
<b>1.2.b:</b> Number of Readiness Preparation Grant agreements signed
<b>1.3.a:</b> Number of mid-term progress (MTRs) reports presented by countries that follow agreed reporting standards and are presented in a timely manner
<b>1.3.b:</b> Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 1: Organize and Consult
<b>1.3.c:</b> Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 2: Prepare the REDD+ Strategy
<b>1.3.d:</b> Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 3: Develop a National FREL
<b>1.3.e:</b> Number / % of countries that have completed R-PP Component 4: Design systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards
<b>1.3.f:</b> Readiness Fund disbursement rate (\$ disbursed; amount disbursed as % of RF), disaggregated by RF grants disbursed through WB, and RF grants to other DPs

-->

-->

-->

-->

-->

### 3.3 Outcome Area 2 (Carbon Fund)

Result	Current indicator	Proposed indicator
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Selected FCPF countries demonstrate key elements (carbon accounting, programmatic elements and pricing) of performance-based payment systems for emission reductions generated from REDD+ activities with a view to ensuring equitable benefit sharing and promoting future large-scale positive incentives for REDD+ (Carbon Fund)	<b>2.A:</b> Number of pilots where carbon accounting, programmatic elements and pricing are operating as planned	<b>2.A:</b> Number of <u>CF</u> pilots where carbon accounting and programmatic elements are operating as planned within <u>ERPD</u>
	<del><b>2.B:</b> Number of pilots in which the benefit-sharing scheme is being implemented according to plans</del>	<b>2.B:</b> Volume of ERs purchased from CF pilots following ERPA signature
	<b>2.C:</b> Average % of monetary benefits shared with beneficiaries in approved pilots	<b>2.C:</b> Volume of REDD+ ER payments secured by CF pilot countries through other (non-FCPF) transactions
		<b>2.D:</b> <del>Average</del> % of monetary benefits shared with beneficiaries ( <u>disaggregated</u> ) in <u>approved CF</u> pilots, <u>aligned to benefit sharing plan</u>
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Standards and preparations in place for high-quality ER Programs discussed and endorsed by CF Participants and/or PC	<b>2.1.a:</b> Number and types of standards and management tools discussed and endorsed by CF participants and/or PC for ER programs including: a) Methodological framework and Pricing Approach	<b>2.1.a:</b> Number and types of standards and management tools discussed and endorsed by CF participants and/or PC for ER programs including: a) Methodological framework and Pricing Approach
	<b>2.1.b:</b> b) Business processes (ER-PD, ER-PIN, ERPA)	<b>2.1.b:</b> b) Business processes (ER-PD, ER-PIN, ERPA)
	<b>2.1.c:</b> c) Legal documents (General Conditions, ERPA term sheet)	<b>2.1.c:</b> c) Legal documents (General Conditions, ERPA term sheet)
<b>Output 2.2:</b> Countries have entered into the portfolio of the Carbon Fund	<b>2.2.a:</b> Number of early ideas or ER-Programs presented by countries to the CF	<b>2.2.a:</b> Number of early ideas <del>or ER-Programs</del> presented by countries to the CF
		<b>2.2.b:</b> Number of ER-PINs presented by countries to the CF
		<b>2.2.c:</b> Number of countries invited into CF pipeline
		<b>2.2.d:</b> Number of countries signing a CF letter of intent
		<b>2.2.e:</b> Number of ERPDs presented by countries to the CF
		<b>2.2.f:</b> Number of countries accepted into CF portfolio
	<b>2.2.g:</b> Number of REDD countries that have signed ERPA	<b>2.2.g:</b> Number of <del>REDD</del> countries that have signed <u>an ERPA with the CF</u>
<b>Output 2.3:</b> Increased levels of private sector investment for incentivizing, testing, and supporting up-scale of ER activities	<del><b>2.3:</b> Number of private sector participants in CF</del>	<b>2.3.a:</b> Extent to which CF pilots influence private sector engagement with deforestation and REDD+ processes
<b>Output 2.4:</b> ER Programs are being implemented in a timely manner	<b>2.4.a:</b> Amount and date of disbursements for ER Programs according to plans	<b>2.4.a:</b> % of CF pilot program budgets (as per ERPD) covered by secured finance
	<b>2.4.b:</b> Amount of ER purchases following ERPA signature	<b>2.4.b:</b> Actual ERs as % of originally estimated ERs (as per ERPA)
		Covered by new outcome indicator 2.B

### 3.4 Outcome Area 3 (Testing approaches to livelihoods and biodiversity)

Result	Current indicator
<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Engagement of all stakeholders (Governments, CSO, IPs, private sector and delivery partners) sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and to conserve biodiversity within the approach to REDD+</p> <p><b>PROPOSED OUTCOME 3 REVISION:</b> REDD+ interventions within Participant countries sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and conserve biodiversity</p>	<p><b>3.A:</b> Design of national REDD strategies, monitoring systems and ER Programs addresses indicators for enhancement of livelihoods of local communities and for biodiversity conservation</p>
	<p><b>3.B:</b> Actual examples on the inherent social and biodiversity benefits of REDD+ and how they are used to inform REDD+ Agenda and to scale-up results</p>

Proposed indicator
<p><b>3.A:</b> Number of people reached with benefits (assets and/or services) by CF pilots (% women)</p>
<p><b>3.B:</b> Areas brought under enhanced biodiversity protection by CF pilots (ha)</p>

--> Covered by new output indicators 3.1.d, 3.2.a and 3.2.b

<p><b>Output 3.1:</b> Enhanced capacity of IPs and CSOs to engage in REDD+ processes at the country level</p>	<p><b>3.1.a.i:</b> Number and types of examples of in-country REDD+ actions where IPs CSOs, and local communities participate actively</p>	-->
	<p><b>3.1.a.ii:</b> Examples of resources made available to enable active participation of IPs, CSOs, and local communities in national REDD+ readiness</p>	-->
	<p><b>3.1.b:</b> Number of IP and REDD country -CSO representatives (men/women and/or/youth) that have participated and benefitted from FCPF organized workshops/ trainings on SESA, governance, MRV aspects/related aspects of REDD</p>	-->
	<p><b>3.1.c:</b> Examples of IPs and REDD country-CSO representation in institutional arrangements for REDD+ at the national level</p>	-->

<p><b>3.1.a:</b> Number / % of Participant countries whose REDD+ decision making process formally requires representation or input from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSOs</li> <li>- IPs</li> <li>- Local communities</li> <li>- Womens groups</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.1.b:</b> Number (disaggregated) of participants in CBP-funded activities</p>
<p><b>3.1.c:</b> % of participants in CBP-funded activities indicating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- they have more confidence to engage with REDD+ processes</li> <li>- they will definitely increase their engagement with REDD+ processes</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.1.d:</b> Extent to which the involvement of various stakeholder groups influences national REDD+ processes</p>

<p><b>Output 3.2:</b> Pilots have been successfully implemented on ways to sustain and enhance livelihoods and conserve biodiversity</p> <p><b>PROPOSED OUTPUT 3.2 REVISION:</b> FCPF Participant countries test ways to sustain and enhance livelihoods and conserve biodiversity</p>	<p><b>3.2.a:</b> Number of countries where stakeholder engagement platforms proposed in R-PPs have taken up work and meet regularly</p>
	<p><b>3.2.b.i:</b> Number of countries with R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to FCPF that demonstrate: i) Ways to maintain or enhance livelihoods including at local levels are integrated into design of national REDD+ strategies, monitoring systems, and ER Program design</p>
	<p><b>3.2.b.ii:</b> i) Ways to conserve and/or restore biodiversity (fauna and flora) are integrated into design of national REDD+ strategies, monitoring systems, and ER Program design, and take into account traditional knowledge</p> <p><b>3.2.b.iii:</b> ii) Relevant sustainability standards, as provided for in the Common Approach for Readiness preparation including those for grievance redress, and in the World Bank safeguards for ER Programs, are applied</p>

<p><b>3.2.a:</b> Extent to which FCPF processes support Participant country efforts to sustain and enhance livelihoods within REDD+ intervention areas</p>
<p><b>3.2.b:</b> Extent to which FCPF processes support Participant country efforts to conserve biodiversity within REDD+ intervention areas</p>

### 3.5 Outcome Area 4 (Communications and knowledge)

Result	Current indicator		Proposed indicator
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Knowledge gained in the development of the FCPF and implementation of Readiness Preparation Proposals (under the RF) and Emission Reductions Programs (under the CF) broadly shared, disseminated and used by international REDD practitioners	<b>4.A:</b> Number of new countries/ stakeholders requesting to become FCPF: –observers –members		<b>4.A:</b> Extent to which learning, evidence and knowledge products generated through the FCPF influences other REDD+ programs and practice
	<b>4.B:</b> Examples of utilization of/or reference to FCPF knowledge products	-->	
<b>Output 4.1:</b> Knowledge products and lessons from piloting of REDD+ in general and FCPF activities in particular are developed and disseminated, in accordance with global knowledge management and communication framework strategy and annual work plans	<b>4.1.a:</b> Approved framework communication strategy for knowledge management and communication at the global level and up-to-date annual work plan for its implementation presented to the PC every year	-->	<b>4.1.a:</b> Number of knowledge products produced
	<b>4.1.b:</b> Number of knowledge products distributed via workshops, publications, websites or other media	-->	Covered by new output indicator 4.3.b
	<b>4.1.c:</b> Number of people reached, by type of knowledge product and type of audience (including website site counts)	-->	<b>4.1.b:</b> Participant countries' assessment of usefulness of FCPF's knowledge products
	<b>4.1.d:</b> Examples of activities undertaken including at national level to generate and institutionalize awareness on REDD+ such as through inclusion of REDD+ in curricula in schools and universities	-->	<b>4.1.c:</b> Extent to which FCPF learning, evidence and knowledge products are used by Participant countries
<b>Output 4.2:</b> Participants actively engage in South-south-learning activities	<b>4.2.a:</b> Number of S-S learning activities and/or events connecting FCPF countries	-->	<b>4.1.d:</b> Extent to which FCPF learning and evidence influences ongoing FCPF implementation
	<b>4.2.b:</b> Total number of participants to South-south knowledge exchange activities by category: REDD member countries (men/women); non-REDD member countries (men/women); IP/CSO representatives from region (men/women)	-->	<b>4.2.a:</b> Number of S-S learning activities and/or events connecting FCPF countries
		-->	<b>4.2.b:</b> Number of participants in S-S learning activities and/or events connecting FCPF countries (% women)
<b>Output 4.3:</b> Strong visibility of REDD+ and FCPF		-->	<b>4.2.c:</b> % of participants in S-S learning activities indicating that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- they acquired new knowledge or skills</li> <li>- they will definitely apply the new knowledge or skills in their work</li> <li>- they have established new connections / networks that they will maintain</li> </ul>
	<b>4.3.a:</b> Number of neutral/positive mentions of FCPF and REDD+ issues in different key media worldwide per period	-->	<b>4.3.a:</b> Number of neutral/positive mentions of FCPF and REDD+ issues in different key media worldwide per period
	<b>4.3.b:</b> Number of negative mentions of FCPF and REDD+ issues in different key media worldwide per year	-->	<b>4.3.b:</b> Number unique & returning visitors to website
			<b>4.3.c:</b> Number of people reached on social media