



Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

2. FMT Comments and Proposals on Multiple Delivery Partner Arrangement

Ninth Meeting of the Participants Committee (PC9)

Oslo, Norway, June 20-22, 2011

Outline

- General remarks on Common Approach
- Next steps: Transfer Agreements
- FMT proposal for targeted outreach
- Timing of lessons-to-be-learned
- FY12 budget for Multiple Delivery Partners arrangement
- Costs of using accountability mechanisms
- R-PP Template

General Remarks on Common Approach

- Innovative framework for cooperation
 - MDBs + UN agencies
 - Strong safeguard standards based on ‘Substantial Equivalence’ with ‘Material Elements’ of the World Bank policies and procedures
 - Safeguards + access to information + accountability

Next Steps: Transfer Agreements

- If PC adopts Common Approach, one of the next steps will be for the Trustee to negotiate Transfer Agreements with the Delivery Partners (DPs)
 - Starting with UNDP and IDB
 - Trustee is drafting Transfer Agreements
 - DPs may need further internal authorizations
 - Cost provisions:
 - DPs want their “incremental costs” fully covered
 - WB seeks equivalence to its current internal arrangements (budget coefficient per country per year)
 - Incremental cost for use of accountability mechanism?

FMT Proposal for Targeted Outreach

- Neither the FMT nor DPs will organize or conduct dedicated events for targeted outreach
- FMT will strive to participate in relevant events held by other parties, at which presentations can be given on the Common Approach
- FMT will prepare presentation slides and work with Task Force members to identify a targeted list of events where such presentations can be made

Timing of Lessons-to-be-learned

Types of Lesson Learned	By When
Responsibilities, in particular re accountability mechanisms	PC9 / PC10
Development of the Common Approach	PC10
Willingness of potential DPs / pilot countries to engage in Common Approach development	PC9 for questions about other DPs / PC10 for question about other pilot countries
Costs associated with implementing Common Approach	PC10 preliminary assessment/ PC11 and beyond
Negotiating Transfer Agreements	PC 10
Implementing Common Approach (Post-PC9 and Pre-PC10)	PC10
Grievance and accountability mechanisms (Post-PC9 and Pre-PC10)	PC10
Implementing Common Approach, grievance and accountability mechanisms (Post-PC10)	PC11, 12, etc.
Comparison with similar efforts (e.g., GEF)	PC10 / PC11

FY12 Budget for Multiple Delivery Partners Arrangement

Items	Budget (US\$)
Independent analyst	18,000
Travels for outreach	88,550
Lessons learned process	141,785
Staff time	141,222
Total	389,557

Costs of Using Accountability Mechanisms

- Three different types of costs related to accountability mechanisms:
 1. The accountability mechanism's own costs (usually covered by the mechanism's budget)
 2. Management's costs in preparing response to eligibility phase and, possibly, investigation of any claim registered by the mechanism
 3. Costs to Management in preparing and implementing any necessary action plan

Options for Coverage of DPs' Incremental Costs

- Who bears these incremental costs:
 - See, e.g., Readiness Fund Charter Section 19.2 (a) (iv):
“...the costs in connection to application of the Bank’s Operational Policies and Procedures”
- The DPs could provide cost estimates to the PC / Contact Group
- Arrangements are necessary to determine means of cost coverage and to be reflected in Transfer Agreements
- Specific case of UNDP (see Common Approach)

Use of R-PP Template

- Several topics in the R-PP template draft version 5 are under discussion based on comments received
- Once the PC reaches a decision on the Common Approach, the FMT will produce version 6 of the R-PP template (July 2011?) and address:
 - How safeguards are handled under the Common Approach (SESA/ESMF)
 - Free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)
 - Proposed revised language would provide that countries that have endorsed UNDRIP and enacted legislation on FPIC domestically apply FPIC
 - UN-REDD countries would use FPIC. World Bank is currently reviewing its safeguard policies and procedures, including the Bank's use of "free, prior and informed consultation leading to broad community support"

Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanisms

- Process for evaluating and addressing information requests and grievances from affected communities
- Country would propose mechanism in R-PP, as part of country's REDD+ management framework (component 1a), and to support Monitoring and Evaluation (component 6)
- Draft text under consideration for R-PP template Version 6 calls for:
 - Conduct rapid assessment of existing local dispute resolution processes, and build on them where feasible
 - Develop a framework for your proposed mechanism
 - Describe how information sharing and consultation on the proposed mechanism will occur
- Resource implications need to be considered

Schedule for Submission of R-PP

<i>R-PP Draft Received by FMT</i>	<i>Revised R-PP, Final TAP and PC Reviews on Website</i>	<i>PC Meeting: Tentative Dates</i>
April 11, 2011 (New submission) April 25, 2011 (Resubmission)	June 6	June 20-22, 2011 PC 9, Oslo, Norway
<i>Revision of R-PP template into Version 6: on FCPF web by end July 2011</i>		
August 1, 2011 (New submission) August 22, 2011 (Resubmission) <i>(Use December 22, 2010 R-PP template)</i>	October 3	October 17-19, 2011 PC 10, Berlin, Germany
January 6, 2012 (New submission) January 16, 2012 (Resubmission) <i>(Use Version 6 R-PP template, if agreed)</i>	Mid-March, 2012 ?	Late March, 2012 ? PC 11, to be determined