



# Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

## Technical Assessment: Final ER-PD for Côte d'Ivoire

Nineteenth Meeting of the Carbon Fund (CF19)  
Washington DC, February 5 – February 7, 2019

# Presentation of TAP

- The technical assessment was conducted from September 30, 2018 to January 18, 2019 by the following team:
- Simon Rietbergen                                      Netherlands (Team lead and Safeguards)
- Agustin Inthamoussu                                      Uruguay (Carbon accounting)
- Moritz von Unger                                      Germany (Legal)
- Marc Daubrey                                      Côte d'Ivoire (Local)

# Overall assessment of final ER-PD

		1 <sup>st</sup> Assessment	2 <sup>nd</sup> assessment	Indicators not met
II. Level of Ambition	YES	3	3	
	NO	0	0	
	N.A.	0	0	
III. Carbon Accounting	YES	23	30	8.1; 8.2; 14.3
	NO	10	3	
	N.A.	10	10	
IV. Safeguards	YES	2	6	
	NO	4	0	
	N.A.	1	1	
V. Sustainable Program Design and Implementation	YES	1	8	27.2; 28.3
	NO	9	2	
	N.A.	4	4	
VI. ER Program Transactions	YES	3	6	36.2
	NO	4	1	
	N.A.	4	4	

# Introduction

- Overall, the proposed ER Program is ambitious and uses innovative measures to reduce deforestation, including partnerships with the private sector and with smallholder farmers and local communities.
- The proposed program accounts for emissions reductions from deforestation, forest degradation and for emissions removals due to enhancement of carbon stocks. It aims to generate 39 million tonnes of emission reductions over the 2019-2027 period. During the 2019-2024 ERPA period, the ER Program would generate an estimated 22.5 million tons of CO2 emissions reductions and removals, or about 44% of the 2019-2024 Reference Level. The ERPA would be for 16.5 million tons.
- The ERPD improved significantly from the initial draft (42 No), through the advanced draft (27 No), to the final version (6 No).
- Of the six remaining non-conformities, three are major and three minor  
III. Carbon accounting has 3 (1 major and 2 minor);  
V. Sustainable Program Design has 2 (1 major and 1 minor); and  
VI. ER Program Transactions has 1 (major).

# III. Carbon Accounting (1)

**Ind. 8.1** Systematic errors are minimized through the implementation of a consistent and comprehensive set of standard operating procedures,...

**Ind. 8.2** Random errors and other uncertainties are minimized to the extent practical based on the assessment of their relative contribution to the overall...

**NO**

- The following sources of systematic or random errors have not been considered, nor minimized:
  - Côte d'Ivoire has addressed an important systematic error by shifting from a gross to a net approach, but has maintained the assumption that all deforested areas are converted to cocoa plantations, which is not accurate, but it doesn't lead to overestimation of emissions.
  - The visual interpretation of canopy cover in the activity data analysis lacks robust QA/QC procedures and/or SOP to calibrate the interpretation of the operators and avoid misinterpretations.
  - Uncertainty of activity data could be improved by increasing the sampling intensity and improving the stratification.

# III. Carbon Accounting (2)

**Ind. 8.1** Systematic errors are minimized through the implementation of a consistent and comprehensive set of standard operating procedures,...

**Ind. 8.2** Random errors and other uncertainties are minimized to the extent practical based on the assessment of their relative contribution to the overall...

**NO**

- The following sources of systematic or random errors have not been considered, nor minimized:
  - For estimating the degradation activity, the ERPD assumes that sampling units that have had forest degradation are those that have partially lost any canopy cover, not those that have transited from dense to degraded forest (transition from  $\geq 70\%$  to 30-70% canopy cover), which overestimates emissions from forest degradation.
- In conclusion, the methods applied in the ERPD could result in overestimation of forest degradation emissions. Currently, Côte d'Ivoire is working on a new method to estimate these emissions.
- Ind. 8.1 is a **major non-conformity** and Ind. 8.2 is **minor**.

# III. Carbon Accounting (3)

<b>Ind 14.3</b> Emission factors or the methods to determine them are the same for Reference Level setting and for Monitoring, or are demonstrably equivalent. IPCC Tier 2 or higher methods are used to establish emission factors,...	<b>NO</b>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

- Côte d'Ivoire hasn't provide enough evidence on how the emission factor for degradation activity is elaborated and applied to the results from Collect Earth. As per TAP understanding, the determination of degradation emission factor is the conversion from dense to open forest ( $\geq 70\%$  to 70-30% canopy cover). However, the activity data for degradation represents a partial loss of canopy (e.g. 60% to 30% canopy cover ). This would represent an overestimation of GHG emissions.
- Since Côte d'Ivoire is currently developing a definition of forest degradation and a methodology for mapping and estimating it with higher accuracy and precision, it will have to demonstrate that the same emission factor will be used for Reference Level setting and for Monitoring, when new degradation emission factors are generated.
- This is considered a **minor** non-conformity

# IV. Safeguards

**Ind 24.2:** Safeguards Plans address social and environmental issues and include related risk mitigation measures identified during the national readiness process,...

**Ind 26.1:** An assessment of existing FGRM, including any applicable customary FGRMs, is conducted and is made public.

YES

- The safeguards instruments were prepared as part of the readiness process at national level and were the subject of a sustained consultation effort, including a final consultation meeting where stakeholders from all five ERP regions were represented. They include a Resettlement Policy Framework as a matter of precaution only: neither the ER-P nor the national REDD+ Strategy options foresee any involuntary resettlement.
- Key elements of the ERPD – such as the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism have benefited from consistent consultation of Program Area stakeholders, and build on existing customary rules and institutional mechanisms



# V. Sustainable Program Design and Implementation (1)

<b>Ind 27.2</b> The ER Program identifies currently planned ER Program Measures and how they address the key drivers identified in Indicator 27.1, and the entities that would undertake them	<b>NO</b>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

- In order to ascertain whether the proposed ERP interventions are likely to be effective in addressing the drivers of deforestation, the ER-PD should analyze the results of the recent report on the technical and economic/financial feasibility of the proposed agroforestry alternatives for the smallholder (cocoa) farmers. In quantifying the delays or reductions in land use revenues participating farmers will face, this will also help to “calibrate” the compensations to be paid under the planned Payment for Environmental Services (PES) scheme.
- This is a **minor** non-conformity.

# V. Sustainable Program Design and Implementation (2)

<b>Ind 28.3</b> The ER Program provides a description of the implications of the land and resource regime assessment for the ER Program Entity's ability to transfer Title to ERs to the Carbon Fund	<b>NO</b>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

- The ER-PD notes that the laws of Cote d'Ivoire are not conclusive and that legislative action is required to (a) establish that the State has title to ERs, and (b) to define "carbon rights" as a "personal right" to compensation available to non-state actors, including all tenure-holders, in exchange for participation in the ER Program. While the required legislative actions are well described, the necessary legislative instrument is not yet in place and concrete preparations (in the form of a consolidated draft with robust timeline for adoption) are not demonstrated, Indicator 28.3 is deemed not met.
- This is a **major** non-conformity.

# VI. ER Program Transactions (1)

<b>Ind 36.2</b> The ER Program Entity demonstrates its ability to transfer to the Carbon Fund Title to ERs, while respecting the land and resource tenure rights of the potential rights-holders, including Indigenous Peoples...	<b>NO</b>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

- The ER-PD foresees the adoption of a legal instrument that will define the concept of title to ERs, on the one hand, and the notion of “carbon rights”, on the other hand. The former – title to ERs – will be characterized as an emissions trading commodity reserved for the State, while “carbon rights” will be characterized as personal rights, linked to the provision of an environmental service as defined by the ER Program and the details of the benefit sharing plan. Contribution to the ER Program will generate “carbon rights” for the contributing individuals, communities, and entities, which in turn translate into a claim to be rewarded.
- The structure presented is sound, especially since it links the matter of title to ERs with the benefit sharing arrangements and the specific form of inscription into the ER Program: Participation of non-state actors – individuals, corporate actors (for-profit or not-for-profit), as well as communities – is voluntary; and participants will expressly agree to the terms of the BSP, the specific reward offered, and the exclusivity of the transfer of title to ERs.

## VI. ER Program Transactions (2)

<b>Ind 36.2</b> The ER Program Entity demonstrates its ability to transfer to the Carbon Fund Title to ERs, while respecting the land and resource tenure rights of the potential rights-holders, including Indigenous Peoples...	<b>NO</b>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

(Continued from previous slide)

- Nonetheless, the indicator is deemed not met since the legal instrument is not yet in place (see previous slide). In addition, the ER-PD does not yet fully demonstrate that individuals and communities in Protected Areas have access to the ER Program and can inscribe themselves into the BSP. Equal and inclusive access of stakeholders, in particular of ancestral communities, is a pre-condition for the effective functioning of the authorization mechanism presented.
- This is a **major** non-conformity

# Concluding remarks

- The TAP congratulates the Government of Côte d'Ivoire on developing a sound ER-PD that focuses on the area that contains most of the remaining intact tropical moist forest in the country.
- The proposal has mobilized an impressive number of partners, both in the public and private sectors.
- In addition to contributing to climate change mitigation, the ER Program's engagement with smallholder (cocoa) farmers will generate considerable adaptation benefits.
- Some of the major non-conformities highlighted above are not the result of any flaw in the design of the ER Program, but rather due to the absence of the relevant legislative instrument.

**Thank You!**