



**PC Working Group:  
Discussion of Recommendations of the First FCPF  
Program Evaluation**

**Report to PC9 on the Outcomes of the Working Group Discussions**

**Submitted by  
Le Groupe-conseil baastel ltée**

## **Introduction**

At PC8 in Dalat, Vietnam, the independent evaluators presented their Interim Evaluation Report for the first program evaluation instituted by the Participants Committee. On the basis of the feedback received on this Interim Evaluation Report during the sessions, it was decided by PC that a Working Group would be established to undertake ground work to help structure the discussions on the recommendations from the independent evaluation of the FCPF, in preparation for the session at PC9 in Oslo on this topic.

This report presents the outcomes of the discussions held by the Working Group on the FCPF Program Evaluation.

## **Approach and Focus of Discussion**

This Working Group was formed in accordance with the decision at PC8 and met over a series of three teleconferences held on May 13<sup>th</sup>, May 25<sup>th</sup> and June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011. Facilitation and key documents were made available in English, French and Spanish.

The Working Group was comprised of the following members:

1. 3 REDD plus member country representatives (Kenya, Vietnam and Mexico),
2. 3 donor partner representatives (Australia, Germany and Norway),
3. 1 representative from the Indigenous Peoples organization (Juan Carlos Jintiach)
4. 1 representative from civil society (Bank Information Center) and,

The group was facilitated by Alain Lafontaine (Baastel) and FMT representative/s provided inputs and support as relevant.

The Working Group had as a basis for discussion the recommendations as formulated in the Draft Evaluation report (submitted in May) as well as the presentation of interim evaluation results and preliminary FMT response at PC8 meeting.

The discussion provided an opportunity to classify the recommendations by timescale, and main categories and identify the key target groups concerned with each of the 23 initial recommendations. The outcome of the process is a summary report in the form of a matrix presenting the entities with a potential role in implementing each of the recommendations if the PC agrees to them, early thoughts and views on issues to be considered in their operationalization as well as proposals on the process to move forward on each recommendation. This matrix is attached and constitutes the main outcome of the Working Group discussions to feed into the PC9 discussions on the outcomes of the evaluation.

The Working Group concluded that all recommendations – if the PC agrees to them – would be targeted for the short term (i.e. actions must be initiated within the next 12 months), except for recommendation 3 which is targeted at the medium term (i.e. action must be initiated within the next 13 to 24 months).

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
1. Streamline R-PP review process to ensure that TAP review comments are timely and that adequate time is left to country teams to address TAP comments and own the final product.	FMT	<p>The streamlining of the process must ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countries are given at least two weeks to integrate TAP comments prior to submission of their R-PP for discussion at the PC;</li> <li>• That PC members are given adequate time (at least two weeks) prior to the PC meeting to review the latest version of the R-PP and TAP review of a given country to provide for an adequate PC review process;</li> <li>• There has been a proposal made by FMT at PC8 that informal reviews by the TAP could be reduced to one prior to formal submissions by countries instead of the multiple informal reviews now taking place, as a way to allow adequate time for the reviews and integration of comments.</li> <li>• The PC should review only one version, ideally after the TAP has completed its review.</li> </ul>	In light of these timeline concerns FMT would make a proposal to streamline the process
2. Ensure translation in key meetings and that materials developed by FCPF are available in all main languages to facilitate participation of all PC members, lessons learning and in-take of global experience in national processes	PC FMT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type of documents to be prioritized for translation needs to be decided given both the time constraints for translation and the costs</li> <li>• There have been requests put forth from REDD countries for the TAP reviews to be translated</li> </ul>	The FMT will present the documents that could be translated, the time and budget estimates required for PC consideration.
3. Look at the option for further decentralizing staff to other regions	WB staff (also possibly delivery partners)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This recommendation does not necessarily target the decentralization of FMT staff but must also take into account the options from support from delivery partners. It</li> </ul>	Presentation from FMT in the form of a Note for PC10 on the way forward. This will entail an assessment of the status quo, discussions with the

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
<p>beyond Africa to help foster further coordination on the ground and smoother implementation.</p>		<p>also must involve discussion with the countries and their specific needs as they embark on the readiness process and must be looked at on a case-by-case basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In this sense it comprises a transfer of capacity to delivery partners in order to provide more in-country support to REDD countries where needed.</li> <li>• This in-country support will need to maintain close communication with FMT to ensure that the messages are clear and non-conflicting for REDD countries.</li> <li>• Another important consideration is to ensure that any budget considerations for this transfer of capacity or decentralization of staff would not adversely impact the amount of resources at the disposal of the countries to effectively move ahead with their readiness work.</li> <li>• This transfer of capacity could potentially be possible with limited additional costs in countries where the delivery partners are already active.</li> </ul>	<p>countries and with delivery partners, while being mindful of resource allocation concerns.</p>
<p>4. Pursue with energy the process of development and operationalization of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework for the readiness process (and in future for the Carbon Fund), as a way to ensure adequate feedback loops in decision-making and improvement of the Facility effectiveness, beyond the formulation phase. This should go beyond the guidance</p>	<p>FMT; PC; delivery partners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This recommendation is also linked to R19 (communication strategy) and to R21 (state of readiness).</li> <li>• This framework would target primarily the program level and does not necessarily entail much more effort to bring in that dimension, building on what already exists.</li> <li>• Feedback loops are already existent i.e. the Dashboard, but could be enhanced via country updates so as to provide a little more information on the countries as a ‘stock-taking’ for those countries that have yet to present an R-PP but also for what is happening in the countries after final R-PP approval.</li> </ul>	<p>FMT to present a Note on different ideas on how to enhance M&amp;E at PC10.</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
provided in the draft monitoring and evaluation framework <sup>1</sup> (updated in 2010 <sup>2</sup> ) which tends to focus more on external reviews rather than routine monitoring.			
5. Consider provision of dedicated funds available to national civil society actors (where other sources of funding do not exist) to support a more deliberate process of civil society and IP engagement. Funding support should be made available through global mechanism rather than through country grants channeled to government, to avoid risks of conflict of interest. This funding could be for two purposes – namely to increase their capacity to engage in national and global policy processes, but also covering the	PC	<p>This has been identified as a recommendation to be considered in the strategic discussion regarding the mandate of FCPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback has already been positive regarding the capacity-building of IPs and could potentially be expanded to other civil society organizations.</li> <li>• When discussing this recommendation, one has to be mindful of potential duplications and limitations of financing in the Readiness Fund.</li> <li>• One option brought forth includes possibly accessing other sources of funding, such as GEF funding for instance in some countries, to complement FCPF support and avoid duplications.</li> </ul>	This must be the subject of a strategic level discussion at PC9 on the focus of the FCPF as a mechanism.

<sup>1</sup> Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). 2009. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework DRAFT-For Comments Only December 4, 2009

<sup>2</sup> Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). 2010. Proposed Evaluation Framework. Revised DRAFT. March 7, 2010

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
costs of organizing a coherent civil society voice and ensuring it reaches decision-making forums.			
6. Strengthen participation of key sectoral ministries in national R-PP planning processes and in particular their involvement in identifying, negotiating and resolving conflicting land uses (where they are shown to contribute to deforestation or forest degradation)	Participant countries FMT Delivery partners	<p>This has been identified as a recommendation to be considered in the strategic discussion regarding the mandate of FCPF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This recommendation can be merged with Recommendation 7 and bundled possibly with recommendations 6-9 with a close link to recommendation 11. These target primarily priorities to be addressed <i>within</i> the R-PPs rather than at the program level.</li> <li>• Must also keep in mind the challenge that some REDD countries face and what the FCPF as a whole can do to assist in engaging some ministries in the readiness process who do not necessarily demonstrate an interest in the REDD agenda but have an important role to play when it comes to deforestation drivers</li> <li>• Such recommendations can act as a tool to support the efforts of implementing agencies in bringing these other actors on-board.</li> <li>• It would be useful to explore how the FCPF can support this process further. E.g.: Change in R-PP template, ensure the involvement of such actors in regional workshops, policy dialogue, etc...</li> </ul>	This must be the subject of a strategic level discussion at PC9.
7. Strengthen participation of “non-sectoral” ministries such as Ministries of Finance, Rural Development and Local Government.	Participant countries FMT Delivery partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments for Recommendation 6</li> </ul>	Follow-up with Strategic Discussion at PC9.
8. Strengthen efforts to learn from previous	FMT Delivery	This has been identified as a recommendation to be considered in the strategic discussion regarding the mandate of FCPF.	Follow-up with Strategic Discussion at PC9.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
<p>experiences, lessons, successes and failures in participating countries with regard to sustainable forest management initiatives and programs as well as efforts to link more directly to complimentary, on-going multi-lateral and bilateral initiatives with the potential to address deforestation drivers.</p>	<p>partners</p>		
<p>9. In view of capacity and institutional challenges found in many Participant Country and the need to advance the REDD agenda, focus capacity building efforts around the early building blocks of the readiness process, around piloting in selected areas to later allow learning and scaling up.</p>	<p>Participant countries Delivery partners other REDD programs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This recommendation is closely linked to Recommendation 21 and should be discussed in the FCPF in conjunction with Recommendation 21,</li> <li>• This implies building capacities at various levels as relevant in the national context with the aim of building a fully functional national architecture for REDD implementation.</li> <li>• One must also discuss how IPs would be involved in this process</li> </ul>	<p>To be discussed as part of the operationalization of recommendation 21 (see below)</p>
<p>10. Actively support learning and reflection around the SESA process – by ensuring effective and efficient transfer of early experiences from countries piloting SESA but also by linking</p>	<p>Participant countries FMT Delivery partners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This recommendation is seen as key for countries now embarking on the SESA process</li> <li>• Some action has already been initiated by the FMT on this with the currently hiring process for a SESA expert</li> <li>• Allocation of additional resources for capacity building in this area from the overall FCPF readiness allocation could be envisaged while also considering the need to link this closely at the country level through the existing national</li> </ul>	<p>FMT will present at PC9 its 5 year business plan in which a budget estimate is assigned for this and could be discussed and adjusted based on proposals</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
<p>externally to other initiatives exploring social and environmental impacts of REDD at national levels. This might include the CCBA/CARE/ODI Learning Initiative on the Social Assessment of REDD.</p>		<p>consultation process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be kept in mind that delivery partners, such as the bank can also assist countries with their expertise and resources in this process</li> <li>• Efforts should be made to ensure the uptake of lessons from SESA implementation in the first few countries, to share with other countries and use in subsequent implementation, FMT could facilitate that process of documenting and disseminating lessons learned</li> <li>• Country specific safeguard initiatives should be taken into account, as relevant</li> </ul>	
<p>11. Scale up technical and financial support to regional measures designed to foster South-South exchange and learning. This could include additional regional workshops covering particular issues of mutual concern (such as methodologies, consultation, governance, legal reforms), or measures designed to harmonize and link country plans at a regional level. Where possible create synergies between countries working in similar conditions (e.g. Amazon Basin, Congo Basin, Borneo-Mekong Basin)</p>	<p>PC FMT REDD+ partnership other regional forums</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional workshops are seen as a good approach. It was suggested that they perhaps be made more hands-on in order to enhance the exchange of country and regional experiences (on topics such as R-PP development, challenges in implementation, reference scenario, MRV, governance, community forest management, etc)</li> <li>• Additionally, when possible, such workshops should take into account new regional initiatives (for instance on cross-border forestry issues in Africa) and support their work in the process on transboundary REDD efforts</li> <li>• While fostering South-South learning remains a priority, this should be done with a view to build synergy and not overlap with regard to other fora, such as the REDD+ partnership, where a number of these South-South exchanges would be best supported</li> <li>• A budget allocation from the global FCPF allocation could also be considered on this item, if the REDD countries identify this as a priority.</li> <li>• This recommendation should be linked with the actions under recommendations 7,8, 9, 10 and 22.</li> </ul>	<p>General discussion and identification of joint areas of interest at PC9.</p> <p>FMT currently developing a proposal on MRV.</p>



Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
or major language groups (French, Spanish, and English).			
12. Move away from “flat rate” disbursements of Preparation and Readiness Grants, to a system that provides differentially sized grants based on agreed, transparent and universal criteria.	PC FMT	This has been highlighted as a strategic level recommendation.	Follow-up with Strategic Discussion at PC9.
13. Develop clearer plans regarding the expansion of the program to new countries seeking support and criteria for their inclusion. This may involve tightening and revision of criteria found in the FCPF Charter <sup>3</sup> .	PC FMT	This has been highlighted as a strategic level recommendation.	Follow-up with Strategic Discussion at PC9.
14. While pursuing efforts to streamline the process of approval and disbursement of funds, continue to foster greater coordination with bilateral and multilateral	Delivery partners REDD countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is evident that efforts in this regard are already occurring on the ground; For instance, Mexico has already had a workshop with different donors in an attempt to align their efforts</li> <li>This still represents a challenge for countries</li> <li>This recommendation could be brought together with recommendation 18</li> </ul>	Update from FMT on fund disbursement, No need for action by PC; efforts already ongoing at the country level.  See R 18 as well.

<sup>3</sup> International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. 2010. Charter Establishing The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (Revised August 2010). Page 50.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
<p>partners at the country level, as a means to raise efficiency and reduce the risks associated with funding gaps due to delayed disbursement of funding support by the FCPF.</p>			
<p>15. Continue efforts through the Task Force on Multiple Delivery Partners to identify delivery channels outside the World Bank, recognizing the fact that diversifying delivery and implementation partners will most likely help to improve disbursement rates. This will also be important in the near future once the Readiness Grants begin being signed in larger numbers and disbursed.</p>	PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This recommendation expresses support for the efforts already being conducted on this issue through the Task Force, and to be finalized by PC 9. PC to take decision on operationalization no later than PC 10.</li> <li>• These efforts must be cautious of expanding beyond the six potential delivery partners already identified.</li> </ul>	No further action is required from PC beyond those already on-going on this agenda item.
<p>16. Provide limited flexibility with respect to specific budget allocations under the Readiness grant given the rapidly evolving REDD plus financing landscape in countries where the R-PP has now long been</p>	Delivery partners, FMT, PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mexico has highlighted that in its case, this process of reallocation has recently been smoothly carried out and that such a recommendation may not require further operationalization but is useful as a reminder (view supported by Kenya)</li> </ul>	No formal steps required from PC.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
<p>approved. As has been seen in Mexico, the development of the R-PP led to a much broader process that has catalyzed funding from other donors on items initially to be funded by the FCPF. The opportunity should be provided in such context to reassign funding from the FCPF to other activities proposed in the R-PP that are not yet funded.</p>			
<p>17. Continue to strengthen coordination with UN-REDD, to take advantage of mutual strengths and limitation in delivery mechanisms. Jointly resolve any remaining differences with UN-REDD including with regard to advice given to participating countries on implementation of social safeguards.</p>	<p>PC FMT Participant Countries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination with UN-REDD ongoing, make use of common RPP-Template in both initiatives</li> <li>• There is a need to enable UN-REDD agencies to provide targeted support in FCPF-countries via the Common Approach.</li> <li>• A revised version of stakeholder engagement guidance helps clarify how FPIC could be implemented in those countries that have adopted UNDRIP</li> </ul>	<p>FMT to continue coordination with UN-REDD.</p> <p>The common approach is to be agreed at PC9 which should help move ahead on safeguards.. The FMT should take stock of the first efforts at this level of implementation</p> <p>If other critical issues are identified in terms of differences in approach, PC should express its concerns as well during the discussion on this item</p>
<p>18. Strengthen move towards greater alignment and harmonization of FCPF funds with other multi-</p>	<p>All involved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This process should be country-led</li> <li>• This is important and should be brought as an operational measure under recommendation 14.</li> <li>• Include activities that are supported by other delivery partners (including bilateral) in the R-PP and R-Package.</li> </ul>	<p>Exchange of experience between REDD country participants, discussion at PC9</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
<p>lateral and bilateral funding sources. Joint annual review missions (of the type seen in DRC) provide a strong example. While they do place greater transaction costs for external partners in terms of scheduling, they create important benefits at the country level and increase opportunities for efficiency savings.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint missions can indeed help enhance coordination and fill funding gaps</li> <li>• The formal approval of the R-PP can also then act as a basis for donor consultation in the country</li> </ul>	
<p>19. Develop and implement a communication and outreach strategy to disseminate and package FCPF outcomes more widely for use at country-level, within the WB and to external audiences.</p>	<p>PC FMT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has been identified as a high priority</li> <li>• While developing a communication strategy FMT should at the same time develop appropriate communication actions for quick implementation</li> <li>• The communication strategy could have a two pronged approach: a) Outreach to the global community involved in REDD regarding the overall objectives and status of the FCPF; b) Sharing of country experiences and what is happening at the country-level, and providing an opportunity for feedback from other stakeholders</li> <li>• There is a need to systematize the communication and outreach and make it more proactive (i.e. newsletter, social media options, website, etc), possibly hire full-time staff</li> <li>• See also Targeted Outreach of the Common Approach</li> </ul>	<p>FMT is now working on a communication strategy and will present some of its basic elements at PC9, while soliciting views from Participants in time for PC10</p>
<p>20. Consider, in close coordination with other REDD-related funding mechanisms, measures to strengthen participation of responsible private sector players in REDD-</p>	<p>PC FMT Carbon Fund</p>	<p>Different views were expressed on this agenda item</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some members were of the view that this recommendation clearly exceeds the FCPF’s mandate particularly in the REDD readiness phase while others were of the view that it is important to engage the private sector at the country level and in coordination with other funds that are more targeted</li> </ul>	<p>No formal steps required at this stage</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
plus processes (such as timber operators interested in identifying alternative revenue streams and project developers). This could include reducing barriers to market entry, supporting feasibility studies and offering bank guarantees for investment capital.		<p>towards engaging the private sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active outreach to mobilize private sector participants in the Carbon Fund</li> <li>Targeting the private sector should be considered via the communication strategy at this stage, with a view to increasing its involvement when the Carbon Fund becomes operational</li> </ul>	
21. Beyond R-PP development, with a view to operationalizing the Carbon Fund, engage as early as possible a reflection at the PA-level on minimum readiness conditions (“triggers”) required to access the Carbon Fund.	PA/PC FMT Carbon Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is considered a key recommendation</li> <li>The FMT has will propose early thoughts for the PC to initiate discussion on this issue.</li> </ul>	<p>Panel discussion will be organized at PC9 and FMT concept note to quick start the process.</p> <p>In terms of timing, it would be helpful to have a readiness package defined by PC11.</p>
22. As part of this reflection, also engage with countries on options for governance and institutional set up to ensure transparency and agreed approaches to benefit sharing in this operationalization.	Participant countries Delivery partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This recommendation serves as a reminder and is linked to R 21. Countries already asked to provide their thinking on this issue in the R-PP.</li> <li>Efforts in this regard should also be linked to other efforts in capacity building and lessons sharing outlined above under R 11</li> <li>Efforts in this area remain up to the countries themselves and are guided by the SESA guidelines, for instance</li> </ul>	<p>A panel discussion at PC9 on benefit-sharing is already planned.</p> <p>See R 11</p>
23. Ensure during the operationalization phase of the Carbon Fund, that	PC/PA FMT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This recommendation is not meant to suggest a short cut on due diligence</li> <li>SESA undertaken during the Readiness phase and the</li> </ul>	<p>No action required at this stage beyond the on-going dialogue in place with delivery partners</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Recommendation	Entities with a role in implementing the recommendation	Early thoughts and views	Proposed Process
<p>it is building on the lessons of the FCPF preparation phase, in particular in terms of ensuring that due diligence requirements do not impede ER transaction, beyond the legitimate requirements of the FCPF.</p>		<p>ESMF should form the basis for safeguards application for the Carbon Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As such, the potential for transaction delays should be reduced</li> </ul>	