

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
1	Canada	General Comment	We are in agreement that the results chain captures the main strategic thrust of the FCPF. We also agree that the M&E framework is not meant to replace country specific monitoring and evaluation efforts that have to be developed and implemented in each country to monitor and evaluate the performance in the implementation of their readiness grants and, ultimately, the performance of the pilots under the CF.	This comment does not ask for any specific answer	Done
2	Canada	General Comment	In terms of reporting, we are pleased to see and strongly encourage that there will be semi-annual reporting on the M&E Framework, and that it will be on tools already available for capturing reporting (i.e., FCPF Dashboard, Grant Reporting and Monitoring Reports, FCPF Annual Report).	FMT will report to the PC on an annual basis (comprehensive report for the fiscal year to be prepared in October/November), with a semi-annual update (only on selected aspects, in June).	Done  Ref 4.3, and column 3 of the PMF outlining the frequency of data collection
3	Germany	General Comment	<p><b>Concept:</b> The draft M&amp;E provides a very good conceptual basis for the FCPF to track the achievement of its objectives and will be a helpful support for strategic decision-making. We fully agree with the scope for both monitoring and evaluation, the tools proposed as well as the roles and responsibilities for managing the framework and very much appreciate the recommendations for capacity required to implement the M&amp;E Framework.</p> <p><b>Structure:</b> The Logical Framework is well-structured, contains many very helpful indicators and mostly strikes a good balance between desirable level of detail and feasibility.</p> <p><b>Formulations:</b> However, there are a number of indicators where we would like to see a greater level of detail. Please note that our suggestions were drafted with a limited amount of time available and not by M&amp;E Experts. Some may refer to the formulation of indicators, while others are better accommodated under Methods/Sources in the PMF. We have not been able to go through all the PMF details at this stage.</p>	<p>This comment does not ask for any specific answer</p> <p>This comment does not ask for any specific answer</p> <p>This is addressed through the response to the specific comments that follow</p>	Done
4	Canada	Impact monitoring	In term of boundary of the M&E Framework, we agree that there is a distinction between intermediate impact of the FCPF that can still be attributed to the FCPF and longer-term global impact of which FCPF indirectly contributes via successful interventions. However, <b>we would still like to see</b>	The Framework has been - adjusted at the impact level to add a few more indicators, as per other specific comments below. The impacts which can still be attributed to - at least a contribution - of the FCPF (called intermediate impacts in the	Done Ref chap 5

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			<b>impact results captured, as they go beyond the monitoring of outputs, and outcomes, and helps see the global progress achieved, to which the four programme intermediate impact can be linked.</b>	result chain) are captured on the impact level of the LF and the PMF. Those impacts which are beyond this level are only displayed on the impact level of the result chain without formulation of indicators. However they will be captured by the evaluations. -	
5	Canada	Impact monitoring	Once operationalized, it will place the FCPF in a strong position to provide impact reporting and capture lessons learned for the Facility, which is essential to reach the objective of disseminate knowledge broadly. <b>We encourage the FMT to provide a mixture of numbers, but also capture story of success of the Facility that aren't always captured through the numbers.</b>	A few additional qualitative indicators and use of anecdotal information have been added to the mix in the PMF and LF in response to this comment and others that follow below.	Done Ref LF and PMF
6	Bank Information Center	Impact monitoring	The ER Programmes under the CF are probably the best chance of the FCPF having some measurable impact on biodiversity and livelihoods (if robust reporting of non-carbon benefits is included in the methodological framework for the CF)	Use of anecdotal information from ER programmes has been added. This is should be aligned once the methodological framework is finalized.	Done Ref LF and PMF
7	Germany	Impact monitoring	The draft suggests (on p. 7) limiting the impact monitoring to ER-Programmes since only those can be directly attributed to the FCPF. However, given the conceptual importance of the Readiness Fund in the overall Facility design and the urgency of achieving emission reductions before 2020 for REDD+ to make any real climate change mitigation impact, <b>we would support a more ambitious approach for the final evaluation, even if a direct attribution to the FCPF is not possible.</b> Indicator I.1.A could be complemented by proxy indicators for emission reductions in all FCPF member countries, not only ER-Programmes. Such proxies could be the same sources of information that were used for IPCC estimates, i.e. existing data collection like the FRA, countries' GHG inventories etc. The result I.1 should then read “Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation from FCPF, especially CF portfolio, countries”	The assessment of impacts has been strengthened under the Evaluation section of the Framework to also cover impacts of the Readiness Fund. Evaluations have been added in the frequency column of the PMF as well for all relevant impact level indicators  The PMF and LF have also been expanded to include the proxy proposed in the comment	Done Ref LF; PMF (responsibility column of all impact indicators, outcome indicators 2.B and 4.B), chp.5)  Ref LF; PMF (impact I.2 and respective indicator I.2.B)
8	Germany	Impact monitoring	Impact I.3 (generated momentum to address governance etc.) is a very important one. <b>We suggest also looking into the GRMs for Indicator I.3.B.</b> We assume that the evaluations in 2015 and 2020 would also look into this and	GRMs has been added as a source, available once a year.  In addition country reporting will provide information if and	Done LF, PMF and chap 5

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			potentially complement methods/sources by literature review or interviews.	how governance issues have been addressed.  In addition, this issue will be looked at in the context of the planned evaluations.	
9	Germany	Impact monitoring	An additional indicator should be established <b>to track unintended negative impacts</b> , i.e. grievances reported at country or global level and their follow-up (see also independent evaluation of Common Approach)	Unintended impacts will also be looked at as part of all evaluations, in addition to intended impacts. The evaluation section has been amended to address this comment.	Done
10	Canada	General comment on PMF	Can we merge the logical framework with the PMF, not certain what is the added value of the logical framework, as the Results chain provides the Logic Model for the Facility and the PMF capture the indicator used (including baseline, targets, methods, sources, and responsibility) to monitor progress.	This comment has been thoroughly considered, but it is concluded that both are needed for the sake of clarity and to avoid having one complex and overloaded matrix instead. The LF in the end is the matrix communicated to outsiders while the PMF is an internal management tool for the M&E function.	Done
11	Canada	General comment on PMF	There is a significant number of quantitative indicators that are used across the PMF, we would also encourage using a few additional qualitative indicators that may help capture the story behind the numbers.	Qualitative indicators have been added under as per other specific comments received.	Done e.g: Indicator I3A
12	Canada	General comment on PMF	Most importantly, in regards to Gender, the documents states that indicators will be disaggregated by sex (male / female) whenever possible, we strongly support this, we also note the importance of given women a voice in designing, implementing and monitoring national REDD+ programmes, which would help ensure that interventions match their needs and, in so doing, would secure greater buy-in and more equitable distribution of benefits	Gender disaggregated indicators have been added when possible. The gender differentiation is also taken up in the proposed country reporting format	Done Ref LF, PMF, annex D
13	Japan	PMF – Traffic Lights Monitoring System	<b>We do believe this system (“the Traffic Lights Monitoring System” will make huge contribution to the process management of the Readiness Fund.</b> It would be highly appreciated if you could advise how to incorporate this system into FCPF.	The traffic light system has been taken on board and adjusted to match the definitions (Red, Orange, Yellow and Green) also proposed by the R-Package Assessment framework, to avoid any confusion between different rating systems. The traffic light system has been added as a visual aid under a number of more operational progress indicators, where it is more meaningful and feasible. Proposals as to which indicator should have a traffic light system in reporting are highlighted in the PMF.	Done Ref PMF and annex D (3.2)
14	Bank Information Center	Monitoring/ Evaluating the Common Approach	<b>Omission of monitoring/evaluating the implementation of the Common Approach.</b> As the FMT will no doubt recall, the PC resolution approving the Common Approach states that “The full operationalization of the multiple Delivery Partner arrangement will be contingent upon a more rigorous effort to gather and apply lessons learned after PC10 and the completion of mid-term review for at least two Pilot Countries per Delivery Partner. The process for evaluating lessons learned shall include: a) reports provided by the FMT every	In indicator on the common approach “Common approach successfully implemented” has been added as indicator I.3.B on intermediate impact level.  The Evaluation of the Common Approach has been added in the Evaluation section of the report. It is now proposed to do this in conjunction with the 2015 planned evaluation, as a review with FMT of the realistic timing for the Common	Done See PMF In. I.3.B

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			<p>six months; b) any other information that is deemed necessary by the PC; and c) an evaluation of the piloting arrangements for the Common Approach by an independent third party under the direction of the PC and in cooperation with the Delivery Partners.” (Resolution PC/9/2011/1). As the implementation of the Common Approach has been delayed for the past year, the FMT has provided updates on the process of resolving the dispute resolution issues, negotiating the transfer agreements, and provided space for the IDB and the UNDP to report on any ongoing issues, however the plan for documenting lessons learned was never followed up on after PC10. Given the amount of time invested in creating the Common Approach, negotiating the Transfer Agreements and related provisions, and the possibly important precedent it sets for upward harmonization of safeguards for climate finance, we suggest it will be important to monitor and evaluate implementation, including arranging for an independent evaluation as mandated by the PC. Working on the assumption that CA implementation would start early in 2013, we should expect midterm reports from at least two of those countries during 2014, thus making the next external evaluation in 2015 a bit late to effectively incorporate lessons or give the PC the relevant information needed to decide on full operationalization of the multiple delivery partner arrangement, including the possibility of including other delivery partners, unless the full operationalization of this modality is no longer urgent and can be delayed a year.</p> <p><b>We would recommend, in any case, incorporating a robust plan for monitoring the implementation of the Common Approach into the M &amp; E framework</b>, with clear responsibilities for the FMT and delivery partners to gather data, (especially around safeguards application, DP supervision of safeguard compliance including the existence of functioning national and DP accountability mechanisms, and consistency of ESMF with WB policy) and the incorporation of a clear mandate to look in depth at these issues in the terms of reference for the 2015 external evaluation. In the interests of ensuring efficient data collection and transparency, it might be worth considering forming an informal group among delivery partners, and some REDD focal points, CSO and IP observers in MDP countries to meet periodically (over 2013 and 2014) to feed into FMT bi-annual reports to the PC on implementation progress and help trouble-shoot any issues arising. This group could be responsible for carrying out the specific M&amp;E requirements of the framework related to the Common Approach.</p>	<p>approach evaluation, given the various steps involved, suggests this is likely to be feasible.</p> <p>.</p> <p>We share your concern about the need for robust monitoring of the implementation of the Common Approach. Options for documenting and tracking lessons learnt including your suggestion of setting up an informal group for monitoring the implementation of the Common Approach will be considered and decided on in collaboration with the Delivery Partners, REDD participant countries, IPs, CSOs and others as appropriate. The FMT and DPs are aware of this need and have initiated discussions with a view to finalizing the content, structure and process for such monitoring.</p>	
15	Bank Information Center	Safeguards Compliance	<b>Lack of visibility/insufficient attention to safeguards compliance.</b> While pieces of safeguard implementation are mentioned throughout the framework, there seems to be no overarching plan to neither deepen the documentation	The SESA. Common approach will be covered as part of the 2015 evaluation. The text in evaluation section has been amended to reflect this.	Done

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			gathered nor assess the lessons learned. If left unmodified, this would be a serious missed opportunity. In particular, given that the application of the SESA approach to national level policy and programme planning is a relatively new and innovative phenomena, one on which the FCPF has placed much importance, and is a methodology still poorly understood at the country level, there should be considerably more effort devoted to documenting, understanding and disseminating lessons learned on a fast track. This would warrant specific efforts over 2013 and 2014 and the 2015 evaluation in particular should have a dedicated work stream to gather documentation and evaluate experiences	<p>In addition, the SESA process is now referred at the indicator level in the LF and PMF as indicator 3.1.b (focusing on training) and 3.2.d. for implementation, and will be monitored regularly.</p> <p>As for lessons learnt on SESA, this is a good suggestion and could be proposed as a dedicated work activity for 2014 by the FMT just like the social inclusion training workshops (which include a module on SESA/ESMF) being carried out now, the findings of which could be used for reporting on the M&amp;E framework.</p>	
16	Bank Informati on Center	Outcome 1	Under Outcome 1, <b>there should be a more balanced approach to monitoring and evaluating progress</b> —i.e. it is not the mere fact that countries submit an R-Package that indicates countries have built capacity for REDD, but that those R-Packages reflect strong outcomes at the country level on the different pieces of readiness—institutional arrangements, MRV/RL, national REDD strategy, and SESA/ESMF/grievance mechanisms, such that those are seen by national stakeholders and the PC to be of high (or improving) quality. Of particular relevance will be assessing whether countries are taking steps not just to have capacity to undertake MRV of carbon, but the far more politically sensitive steps to improve governance which will demonstrate a commitment to REDD and real capacity to successfully undertake REDD in a sustainable way.	See response to comment 17 below, which also addresses this concern.	Done
17	Germany	Outcome 1	<b>We think that more qualitative information could be captured either under Outcome I.A or under Output 1.3.</b> The M&E framework should help the FCPF to keep track of which Readiness building blocks are especially difficult for countries and need further or more targeted support. Thus, disaggregated information on progress for the different R-Package components could be helpful, eg. by using the traffic-light system of green-yellow-orange-red of the draft R-Package Assessment Framework as qualitative indicators for 1.3.b and further definition of “satisfactory performance”.	An indicator has been added referring to progress towards the R-PP milestones under each of the R-PP sub-components, to provide for a better assessment of the quality of the readiness process by the countries. A similar traffic light system to the R-package has been introduced.	Done Ref: LF, PMF (indicator under outcome 1, output 1.3), annex D
18	Germany	Outcome 1	<b>Text on Outcome 1 (p. 7) should be consistent with Outcome definition: “to benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives for REDD+”.</b> Keeping the plural is important since negotiations have not settled on one system but options are still open. The FCPF therefore has a mandate to build country capacities to benefit from any system, not only from one system,	Text has been amended to conserve the plural, as suggested, and in line with the text elsewhere in the document	Done Ref 2.2 (statement of outcome 1)

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			eg. a carbon market-mechanism. These capacities are further defined in the Readiness-Package Assessment Framework, which is certainly a good reference at this point. However, the M&E Framework should take into account that the R-Package is produced 1) voluntarily and 2) not necessarily at the end of the readiness process, but as a snapshot in the continuous process of readiness. Also, the Readiness Package assesses progress made with the contributions from all developing partners, not only the FCPF.		
19	Germany	Outcome 1	<b>Definition of Outcome 1 (Table at p.11) slightly reduces the level of ambition in the FCPF Charter objective from “assisting countries in their efforts to achieve emission reductions” to “building capacity to reduce emissions”.</b> Genuine ownership and country-led efforts clearly need to be part of the outcome or of the underlying assumptions for it.	The text has been modified to be more in line with the spirit of the charter.	Done Ref LF, PMF and chap. 2.2 description of outcome 1
20	Bank Information Center	Outcome 1	Under Activities for Output 1.2 (p. 11), bullet three, <b>SESA is a country executed safeguard exercise, not a WB due diligence activity, so does not contribute to the indicator of signed grant agreements.</b>	Reference to SESA as part of due diligence has been removed from the LF on page 11 as an activity under this particular output.	Done Ref LF
21	Germany	Outcome 1	Early ideas and ER-PINs submitted to the CF are also an important indicator for the effectiveness of capacity building in the Readiness phase. <b>Thus, another output could read “Countries apply capacities built with the support of the Readiness Fund to the design of high-quality and large-scale ER-Programmes presented to the CF (and/or other results-based finance schemes)”</b> , or as Indicator: “Number of early ideas or ER-Programmes presented by countries to the CF and/or others.” (Alternatively under Outcome 2)	The proposed indicator has been added	Done Ref :LF, PMF (under Outcome 2, output 2.2)
22	Germany	Outcome 1	Output Indicator 1.2: <b>What is meant by “approved”?</b> Not sure if it means RPPs assessed by PC or Readiness Grants signed? We think both are useful indicators.	Wording changed to track both aspects with two separate indicators: “Number of RPPs assessed and endorsed by PC as eligible for receiving Readiness Preparation Grants” and “Number of Readiness Grant signed”	Done Ref :LF, PMF (output indicators under outcome 1)
23	Germany	Outcome 1	<b>Targets for 1.3.a (10+ MTRs by 2015) needs to be more ambitious</b> in order to achieve the target for overall Outcome 1 (11 Readiness Packages by 2015). Could be 3 MTR by 2013 and 10 MTR by 2014.	Revised to 15 MTRs by 2015 and 10 Readiness Packages by 2015	Done Ref. target outcome 1 and of output 1.3
24	Germany	Outcome 2	<b>Output 2.1 should read “discussed and endorsed by CF Participants and/or PC”,</b> Targets should refer also to the Carbon Fund meetings not only	Wording has been changed accordingly for both output statement and targets	Done

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			PC meetings and may need to be updated after further delays at CF 5 and PC 13. Assumption seems out of place, implies a high quality product presented by the FMT that is subsequently diluted because of opposing views of Participants. This assumption would have to be valid for any product approved by FCPF governance bodies, including the R-Package Assessment Framework.	Assumption has been deleted.	
25	Germany	Outcome 2	<b>Also on Output 2.1: The Methodological Framework might deserve a separate treatment</b> , given its importance and potential to serve as a knowledge product similar to the Readiness-Package Assessment Framework. Output could be designed similar to Output 1.1 (see comments above).	Output 2.1 has been broken down in two, to create a specific output 2.2 around the methodological framework as suggested.	Done
26	Bank Information Center	Outcome 2	Under Activities for Output 2.2 (p. 13), <b>the link between activities to test equitable benefit sharing and Grievance Redress Mechanisms is unclear.</b>	It is understood that grievances will, in a number of cases, be related to benefit sharing issues. Not all activities or sub-activities related to addressing grievance can be listed in this LF and M&E framework	Done
27	Germany	Outcome 2	<b>The emphasis of the FCPF Charter Objective on “equitable benefit-sharing” should be reflected more clearly</b> , eg. as an Outcome Indicator 2.B. (eg. Number of beneficiaries and percentage of monetary benefits shared with them per ER Program)	Two new indicators are proposed under Outcome 2: indicator 2.B.: Number of pilots in which the benefit sharing scheme is being implemented according to plans 2.C.: Average % of monetary benefits shared with beneficiaries in approved pilots	Done Ref LF, PMF, outcome 2 indicators
28	Germany	Outcome 2	<b>On Assumption for Output 2.2: Which administrative burdens does this refer to – those of the FCPF/DP or at country level?</b>	This refers to the burdens due to FCPF/DP. This has been specified in the LF	Done Ref assumption for output 2.2
29	Germany	Outcome 2	<b>Output indicator 2.4 should track the implementation of ER Programs</b> , i.e. performance after ERPA signature (eg. advance payments upon Interim Progress Reports, Transfer of ERs upon independent verification). Targets should be ambitious and in line with the long-term financial plan for the CF (16 Mio USD in FY 14, 39 Mio USD in FY 15 etc.). It is not clear to what extent the mobilization of non-FCPF investments for the implementation of ER-Programmes (eg. FIP, bilateral donors, private sector) is a task for the FCPF Carbon Fund or rather an underlying assumption of achieving its objectives? Could be measured by a reworded Impact Indicator I.2.B.i (amount of non-FCPF investments)?	2.4. Added indicator 2.4.b Amount of ER purchases following ERPA signature. Targets identified in line with CF targets: 10 Mio USD in FY 15, 50 Mio USD in FY 16, 70 Mio per annum in FY1719 and 85 Mio USD in FY 20  Indicator I.2.B.i has been reworded to cover mobilization of non-FCPF investments for the implementation of ER-Programmes (e.g. FIP, bilateral donors, private sector) as impact 1.4.	Done Ref LF, LFM outcome 2, indicator 2.4.c
30	Bank Information Center	Outcome 3	<b>Weak outcomes/monitoring plan for Outcome #3 on Biodiversity and Livelihoods.</b> This is undoubtedly the weakest part of the framework, lacking clarity on both what is to be achieved and how it will be monitored. While this may stem from the current focus of the FMT (and within REDD readiness generally) on carbon outcomes, it needs to be enhanced to be credible. The	Impacts on BD and livelihoods are related to the impact level (as pointed out in the result chain diagram) not the outcome level. One could only assess impact for some pilots. Measurement might be difficult; changes not related to the time period of the intervention and are strongly influenced by	Done  Ref result chain diagram

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			FCPF objective in this area is clear, and the proposed long term impacts (biodiversity conserved and sustainable or enhanced livelihoods of forest dependent communities) are also fine. Starting with the results chain, however, the framework needs to be strengthened. The output of increased CSO/IP capacity is not directly (or causally) related to livelihoods and/or biodiversity (discussed more below), and the proposed outcome (engagement for sustainable livelihoods of forest communities) is not clear—engagement of who, for what specifically?	other factors. A global compilation/comparison would not be possible.  The outputs have been modified to help simplify the result chain. One output does directly address livelihoods “models for sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity”	
31	Bank Information Center	Outcome 3	<b>The output of “models for sustainable livelihoods and biodiversity” also lacks clarity</b> , but is workable—if one assumes that what this means is that there are (or will be) good examples of national REDD strategies that effectively incorporate social and environmental considerations. This leads to a greater focus on effective implementation of WB safeguards for REDD readiness, an area almost completely ignored by the framework (except as an assumption)—are SESA processes and “stand-alone” ESMF’s successful in bringing social and environmental issues into the National REDD Strategy in meaningful and coherent ways? Did SESA processes identify, and figure out workable solutions for, the main S/E issues? Is there uptake of SESA recommendations by policy makers? Does the REDD strategy reflect these? Are they specific to prioritized drivers? Does the ESMF capture the main issues and propose credible mitigation measures? Is it being used? Is it being incorporated in policy and regulation? Is it actually changing the way investment decisions are made? Ultimately, community livelihoods and biodiversity will be impacted by both (potentially) the national REDD strategy, and (definitely) the continued impact of investment decisions outside the forest sector that reduce local use/access/control of forests and forest cover itself (mining, roads, agricultural expansion, etc.), so the “models” are likely to be specific to sectors, or even projects/regions. Figuring out how to monitor the process steps (presumably being done anyway by regional staff at the WB or other DP’s charged with supervising safeguard applications) along the way, and evaluating these questions in 2017/2020 will contribute to an understanding of the biodiversity/livelihoods impacts of the FCPF.	Comment reflected in the new formulation of indicators for Outcome 3: 3.A. Design of ER Programmes addresses indicators for enhancement of livelihoods of local communities and for biodiversity conservation. 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	Done Ref LF, PMF. Indicators for outcome 3
32	Bank Information Center	Outcome 3	<b>Outcome 3 (p.8) should refer to REDD strategies</b> , not REDD projects	The descriptive of outcome 3 has been amended as proposed.	Done Ref 2.2
33	Germany	Outcome 3	<b>Text on Outcome 3 (on page 8) should read “cross-cutting issue for any national REDD+ strategy and ER-Program”</b>	See response to comment 32	Done
34	Germany	Outcome 3	<b>Outcome 3, Output 3.1 and related activities need to be reworded to avoid impression that responsibility for achieving livelihood and</b>	Agreed. We would include Governments and DPs under stakeholders, but have made it more explicit on outcome	Done

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			<b>biodiversity impacts rests mainly with stakeholders</b> (CSOs and IPs), while it actually should be everybody’s task, including governments and Delivery Partners. Eg. output 3.1 should read “enhanced capacity of governments, stakeholders and Delivery Partners...” and indicators adjusted accordingly. Related activities include capacity-building for social inclusion (SESA, ESMF, grievance mechanisms, governance) and the targeted outreach on the Common Approach. There also is a link to the planned independent evaluation of the implementation of the Common Approach (See PC resolution and Task Force Conveyance Memo ).	level. However, Output 3.1. is directly related to CSO/IP capacity development. Capacities of Governments and Delivery Partners are assessed through indicators on Outcome level.	
35	Germany	Outcome 3	<b>On indicator 3.A:</b> Due to the inherent character of non-carbon benefits of REDD+, it might be difficult to neatly separate funds within ER-Programs that specifically address biodiversity and livelihoods and are even “earmarked”. Ideally all REDD+ payments will benefit biodiversity and livelihoods, simply by protecting forests. Indicator 3.B seems to be a much better way to tell the story with concrete examples from ER-Programs and national Readiness. However, the focus of this indicator should not be on how the results were disseminated/used (□ Outcome 4) but on the results themselves: the story of the inherent social and biodiversity benefits of REDD+ on the ground. A relevant source of information (PMF) are also the DP’s safeguards specialists involved in the due-diligence and supervision of Readiness Grants and ERPAs.	Indicator 3.A replaced by one on the Design of ER Programs to address indicators related to enhancement of livelihoods of local communities and to biodiversity conservation. Indicator 3.B has been more oriented on examples for social and biodiversity benefits of REDD+, and their use for up-scaling	Done Ref LF, PMF (Indicator 3A and 3B)
36	Germany	Outcome 3	In addition (and in relation to the ongoing discussion on the ERPA Term Sheet) <b>we see an important role here for the planned CF evaluations in 2017 and 2020 which should aim for sample data collection in the field</b> (case studies) in order to independently review and complement the information provided by countries and Delivery Partners on the achievement of non-carbon benefits.	Integrated into Evaluation chapter	Done Ref chap. 4.3
37	Bank Information Center	Outcome 3	<b>Indicator 3.1.b</b> This indicator “number of IP and REDD country CSO representatives...trained by FCPF training programmes in lobbying for and promoting forest communities livelihoods and biodiversity” <b>is inappropriate</b> , no such training programmes exist nor are planned	Scope and intent of CSO/IP training indicator has been clarified	Done Re LF, PFM Indicator 3.1.b
38	Germany	Outcome 3	<b>Output 3.2 is confusing</b> , because it can either refer to the specific examples already measured under the Outcome Indicator 3B or refer to the actual output level which would be the design of R-Packages and ER-Programmes (rather “ways to sustain and enhance livelihoods and conserve biodiversity are integrated into national REDD+ strategies and the design of ER-Programs”?). For the second option, indicators could be more specific and build on the draft R-Package assessment criteria for stakeholder participation and	Text refined to make it more precise.	Done LF output 3.2 and resp. indicators

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			<p>safeguards/non-carbon benefits. Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.2.a eg. stakeholder engagement platforms proposed in RPPs have taken up work and meet regularly → Target: 8 countries by 2012 (Readiness grants signed) etc...</li> <li>• 3.2d SESA plan is approved and carried out, Grievance Mechanisms are operational, ESMF is completed and captures SESA results, ESMF is being used for REDD+ investments and results-based payments → Target: 8 countries a implementing SESA by 2013 (Readiness grants signed) etc.</li> <li>• 3.2.b Ways to conserve biodiversity are integrated into national REDD+ strategies, monitoring systems, and ER-Programme design. → targets should clearly be 100 % of R-Packages and ER-Programs, but qualitative information would be much more useful, i.e. examples</li> <li>• 3.2.c Ways to maintain or enhance livelihoods are integrated into national REDD+ strategies, monitoring systems, and ER-Programme design. → targets same as 3.2.b</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, target related to signed readiness grants</p> <p>Indicator taken on board (Targets have not changed)</p> <p>Indicator taken on board</p> <p>Indicator taken on board</p>	
39	Bank Information Center	Outcome 3	<b>Indicator 3.2.d- is also inappropriate</b> —R-Packages (presumably) will not be considered if a SESA has not been successfully carried out and an ESMF prepared	Reformulated:	Done LF/PMF I3.2.d
40	Germany	Outcome 4	<b>Relevant Sources for Indicator 4.B (PMF) could also include UNFCCC, international organizations, academia, non-FCPF REDD countries, CSOs</b> etc. (compare also to Impact Indicators I.2.A and C).	Yes, these potential sources have been added to the list. It should be noted that this can only be done to a more limited extent as part of monitoring. Evaluations cast a wider net.	Done Ref LF, PMF (indicator 4.B of outcome 4)
41	Germany	Outcome 4	<b>Activities for Output 4.1 could also include the networking activities of FMT staff</b> (eg. coordination with UN-REDD, FIP etc. presentations held at non-FCPF conferences, participation in REDD+ workshops or related initiatives)	Yes, this has been added to the list of activities in LF	Done Ref LF, PMF (output 4.1 of outcome 4)
42	Germany	Outcome 4	<b>It would be helpful to have a differentiation between positive/neutral and negative media mentions in the indicator for Output 4.3</b> , although both are valid indicators for the broad dissemination of lessons learnt. The assumption should maybe be reworded to “International momentum for REDD+ remains high enough to generate Media interest”.	Media mentions have been differentiated under 2 separate indicators (a and b) for output 4.3 The assumption under output 4.3 in the LF has been reworded as proposed	Done Ref LF, PMF (indicator 4.3 a and b of output 4.3 of

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
					outcome 4)
43	Germany	Outcome 4	<b>Assumption for Output 4.2 seems out of place</b> since this can clearly be influenced by the FCPF (maybe should be stated under Activities).	The assumption has been made more specific, to focus on events managed by the countries, over which the Facility does not have direct control.	Done Ref. LF assumption concerning output 4.2
44	Bank Information Center	National M&E	<b>The identification of additional benefits in the R-PPs can be systematized into a simple matrix</b> , with links to the proposed M&E of those (even if this is only robust in a few countries) and targeted support offered to those countries to enhance their M&E efforts and produce usable data. The strengthening of these aspects of national REDD frameworks in a few countries in itself is an important outcome, and hopefully there might be some usable quantitative data that can also be captured to roll into global reporting.	The reporting in progress towards R-PP implementation has been beefed up under output 1.3 to also reflect such aspects and proposes more robust regular country reporting on R-PP implementation	Done Ref LF, PMF (output 1.3 of outcome 1)
45	Bank Information Center	CSO & IP	<b>Role of CSOs and IPs in the framework</b> There is a reference to the IP and CSO Capacity Building Programmes under Outcome 3 (p.7) that seems out of place, but establishes a pattern of associating IP/CSO activities financed by the FCPF CB Programmes with these objectives, which, as far as we can tell, as no basis in actual practice/experience up until now, nor is based on any credible plans that we know of. While it is undoubtedly true the CS and the IP movements are concerned with livelihoods and biodiversity impacts of REDD, there is no reason to believe that funding under the FCPF would be exclusively for these ends, or that if it were, given the small size of funding, that it would have significant impacts, and in either case would be difficult to monitor and evaluate given that interventions are likely to be small scale, widely dispersed geographically, and not include support for any systemic M&E by grantees, and not subject to rigorous supervision by Bank staff. The significance of this role (described in more detail on p.29) seems overblown.	The indicator related to IP and CSO capacity building has been broadened to be more in line with the IP/CSO CB programme objectives. The IP/CSOs are one source of such influence, amongst others.  That being said, it would be expected that Grantees report on the results achieved with the funds allocated, even if they are small scale.	Done Ref LF, PMF (indicator 3.1b of outcome 3)
46	Bank Information Center	CSO & IP	<b>The draft M&amp;E framework also conveys the notion</b> (indicator 3.1.b mentioned above) <b>that the FCPF will train CSOs and IPs in advocacy to influence their national governments around inclusion of positive outcomes for livelihoods and biodiversity in national REDD strategies. This is neither appropriate nor feasible</b> , nor, as far as we are aware, has it been proposed by anyone. This indicator should be removed (or an advocacy training programme developed).  <b>This raises the broader question of the role of CSOs and IPs in the implementation of the M&amp;E framework</b> —where they are conceived of as actors making significant contributions. We welcome this concept—and the	Indicator 3.1.b has been revised to be more in line with the IP/CSO CB program objectives.  CSOs and IPs have a role to play in monitoring at various levels as part of this M&E framework. At the country level, CSO and IPs have representation on the - National REDD+	Done Ref Ref: LF,PMF (indicator 3.1b of outcome 3)

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			<p>acknowledgement it seems to be based on that we provide valuable information about the REDD process at the national level, but suggest it needs to be thought through more, and if deemed realistic and practical, discussed and negotiated with specific organizations such that specific contributions are agreed on with specific timelines, perhaps with financial support from outside the FCPF. Alternatively, an idea that arose repeatedly in the Dialogues with IP's organized by the FCPF-- that there be independent monitoring of REDD implementation by IPs at the country level—could be intentionally fostered through targeted support by the IP Capacity Building Program. An example would be issuing a call for proposals in countries approaching midterm and R-Package reporting milestones to support independent assessments of progress from the point of view of IPs and forest communities. This is both feasible and desirable—and could contribute to both the overall M&amp;E framework and the credibility of midterm and R-package reporting.</p>	<p>Working Group/ equivalent bodies. It is also proposed that the semi-annual country progress reports that are proposed under this M&amp;E Framework be prepared in consultation with the National REDD+ Working Groups/equivalent to ensure that stakeholders provide inputs during the process. The IPs and CSOs therefore have a means through set national processes to participate in the monitoring of national progress. In addition, as already mentioned, to the extent that IPs and CSO get direct funding from FCPF (through the CB program), they would be expected to report on their own progress.</p> <p>In addition, CSO and IP representative will, have an opportunity to provide independent assessments at the time of mid-term and R-Package reporting milestones--through those representing them as Observers to the FCPF.</p> <p>To conclude, at the global level, IPs and CSOs have the opportunity to have their voices heard on both FCPF progress as a whole, and specific country progress issues.</p> <p>At the country level there could be opportunities for instituting studies by CSOs and IPs as part of independent evaluations for mid-term reports and/or R-Packages.</p> <p>This combination of entry points in M&amp;E seems to provide sufficient assurances of an effective role for IPs/CSOs effective in M&amp;E.</p> <p>On the specific suggestion of targeted support for independent assessments through the IP Capacity Building Program, the annual work program for the Capacity Building programs is yet to be decided by the IPs and we cannot preempt which programs will be funded.</p>	<p>Ref: chap. 6 (bullet point 5)</p>
47	Bank Information Center	Assumptions	<p><b>Third paragraph section 2.2 (p. 7) references the assumption of “normal progress”—this needs to be discarded because we have already seen that REDD readiness is more complex, time consuming and costly than originally anticipated during design of FCPF (and confirmed by IEG review</b></p>	<p>The assumption has been revised to account for progress under diverse country circumstances and different country contexts.</p>	<p>Done Ref: chap.2.2</p>

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			findings). The assumption should then perhaps be “slow progress” or “uneven progress across countries” and the implications of this thought through		
48	Bank Information Center	Evaluations	<p>We note that the proposed future evaluations are to: 1) take place under the guidance of a “transparent and balanced Steering Committee structure”, and 2) focus on relevance given the shifts in global carbon markets, as per the recent recommendations by the WB IEG, and support these changes (p.26)</p> <p>We agree that the 2017 evaluation should focus on the CF, <b>although not to the exclusion of the RF, and suggest that approval of the ToR for the 2017 evaluation be left with the PC as the overall governance body of the FCPF, and not shifted to the CF Financial Contributors.</b> We note (p.27) that it is hoped that the 2017 evaluation is planned to “influence further procedures and arrangements under the CF”, and suggest that this is unlikely as the major design activities will have been completed, and all of the ERPA’s signed.</p> <p><b>The final evaluation in 2020 should also assess impacts and sustainability of REDD readiness activities funded under the RF.</b></p>	<p>No response needed</p> <p>Agreed, the text under the evaluation section has been amended to reflect that the 2017 evaluation would not exclude the RF</p> <p>Agreed, the text has also been amended to reflect the PC approval of the ToRs and the refinement of the scope of the 2017 evaluation</p> <p>Agreed, this has been amended as well in the text.</p>	Done Ref: Chap 5
49	Germany	Evaluations	The draft states (p. 7 and 26) that evaluation constitutes an integral part of the M&E Framework and that not all results/indicators can be monitored but must be left for evaluation. However, <b>it is not always clear from the tables which indicators would be monitored or left for evaluation.</b> The PMF table defines only some impact indicators to be left for evaluation (see Frequency column). [The reference to section 4 on p. 7 needs to be changed to section 5]	<p>It is expected that all evaluations will build on monitoring data to the extent possible and as relevant. The aim is not to duplicate the collection of data through the evaluation, but to complement it when relevant to the purpose of a given evaluation. For the indicators where additional data collection beyond the monitoring data is planned, the PMF has been adjusted to clearly mention evaluations in the Frequency column. It should also be clear that the PMF is focused on performance indicators, while evaluations will look at other criteria as well (such as relevance and sustainability). In such cases, the data collection methods and sources of information will be defined for these additional criteria as part of the inception stages of each evaluations, as is the standard practice for evaluations.</p> <p>Reference to section 5 has been made in the revised version.</p>	Done Ref: chap 5 PMF (responsibility column e.g. for all impact indicators, indicator 2.B, 4.B)
50	Germany	Evaluations	<b>Sentence should be added on p. 27 stating that the final evaluation in 2020 would be under the guidance of a Steering Committee</b> and approved by the PC as well.	Agreed. This comment has been taken up under the evaluation section	Done Ref: chap. 5
51	Germany	Evaluations	Giving approval for the proposed Carbon Fund evaluation in 2017 to CF participants exclusively is a substantial change to decision-making as defined in	Agreed, the text has been amended to reflect the fact that the PC would approve the ToRs for the 2017 evaluation. The	Done Ref: chap.

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			the Charter. Normally, it would be the PC's task to evaluate the Facility and the PC has equal representation of REDD Country Participants and Donor Participants. This is not the case with CF Participants (no representation of REDD Countries). Hence, the TOR should at least be consulted with the PC. A Steering Committee should ensure balanced representation of REDD countries (avoiding conflicts of interest with CF pilot countries who are being evaluated) and ensure communication of the evaluation results to the PC.	need for a balanced representation on the Steering Committee has also been highlighted in the revised text.	5
52	Norway	Outcome 2	Want to see a much more aggressive timeline. We should move backwards from the goals of 2020, we need to speed up for REDD to work. A key impact sought should be to have a REDD regime in place. And why are we using this language? Limiting for the moment the number of countries entering the CF portfolio to five countries by 2015? (p8)	All targets in the PMF have been critically reviewed by FMT and adjusted in light of this comment and other more specific ones below, within the limits of the accountabilities of the FCPF. A new Impact I.1 has been added in the LF and PMF in relation to the establishment of a REDD regime. In addition, information on country milestones will be made available on the FCPF website via the FCPF Dashboard and next generation Country Progress reports.  The 2015 targets for number of countries have been modified to reflect a minimum rather than a ceiling. This established minimum is an estimate based on the resources available at the moment in the CF	Done Ref: LF, PMF ( impact I.1)  Ref: LF, PMF ( indicators 2.A., 2.B. and 2.3b )
53	Norway	Impact 1.2 Result C	Move result C up (most important) and change to: <b>FCPF has catalyzed a regime under UNFCCC or outside that provides incentives for reducing deforestation in line with 2 degree target with REDD included as a part of an agreement. (need to look beyond 2020 and not be bound by that artificial date)</b>	Same as comment above, a new more ambitious impact has been put up first under I.1 instead of impact I.2.C. to capture FCPF's contribution to the design of the global regime for REDD+.	Done Ref: LF, PMF ( impact indicator I.1)
54	Norway	Outcome 1	All of the targets are under aggressive and should both increase in number and shorten in timeline. For example, instead of 10 new R-Ps by 2015, it should be 12 new RPs by 2014.	The targets have been revised based on an internal assessment of countries achieving milestones by the FMT and the Deliver Partners.	Done Ref: LF, PMF ( targets for outcome 1)
55	Norway	Outcome 1	Same as previous comment #54	See #54	Done
56	Norway	Output 1.2	Change target 1.3 a to 20+ MTRs by (2015)	Changed to align with internal assessment	Done Ref: LF, PMF ( target for indicator 1.3a)

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
57	Norway	Outcome 2	Indicator 2a – we necessarily need signed ERPAs to have pilots? Change the 2A target to 5+ by 2015	See response to comment 52. FMT to revise and respond	Done
58	Norway	Output 2.2	Be sure that targets are consistent with carbon fund targets. Target says 5+ but isn't the understanding of the CF participants that only 5 will be in the portfolio? Also, for the Activities, bullet 3, we need to develop enough to allow for meeting the target of having 5 'operational' ERPAs, is the assumption that only 5 will go to due diligence stage? We must allow for attrition, even at this later stage.	See response to comment 52. FMT to revise and respond regarding the target.  Under the activities, the wording has been changed to "a number of ER-PINs"	Done  Ref: LF, PMF (output 2.2)
59	Norway	Output 2.3	2.3a target \$2 billion (2015) 2.3b check with language from Carbon Fund, is it two new private sector participants?	2.3 a: Has been deleted following comments from FMT. Now 2.3.a: language changed to "two new private sector participants"	Done
60	Norway	Outcome 3	Indicator 3A is quite tough to assess. It seems logical to approach it from a stakeholder buy in perspective rather than a focus on funding volume.	Indicator 3.A. has been changed to: Design of ER Programmes addresses indicators for enhancement of livelihoods of local communities and for biodiversity conservation. A second indicator, 3.B. has been added as well: 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	Done Ref: LF, PMF (indicators 3A and B)
61	Norway	Output 3.1	For the target, include evidence of broad community support	This dimension has been added in the target	Done
62	Norway	Output 3.2	Where does the term "testing" come from? And how is it defined? A desired interpretation is that the programmes demonstrate ways to promote enhanced livelihoods and a conserve BD in line with the Methodological Framework.  Also, ideally all programmes should promote enhancement of livelihoods and conserve biodiversity not just 75 or 60% of them.	The word 'testing' comes from the objectives as stated in the Charter. The word "testing" has been replaced by a clearer operational definition in both PMF and LF: Ways to maintain or enhance livelihoods/biodiversity are integrated into national REDD+ strategies, monitoring systems, and ER-Programme design  Targets have been revised to 100%	Done
63	Norway	Output 4.1	Raises concerns around the potential for perverse incentives if only the quantity and not quality of KPs	The ultimate assessment of the quality of the products through a reporting on their usefulness is made at the outcome level.	Done
64	Norway	Evaluation Function – 2015	Language on P26,. "some initial, mainly preparatory activities under the CF. Originally it was planned to transition fully into CF operations in 2015" suggests further delays, we need to get on. A 2015 evaluation should see actual operations, not just preparatory actions.	Language on page 26 has been changed to cover operations	Done
65	Norway	Sustainability of FCPF	Just a reminder that FCPF was created to catalyze something larger and should not be sustained in the absence of that greater mechanism just for the sake of	Point noted. Language adjusted in the evaluation section of the report as well as in PMF and LF at Impact level	Done. See Evaluations

**FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework – Tracking matrix on comments received on the draft M&E Framework presented at the Participants Committee (PA5/PC13, October 20-23, 2012) meeting in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo**

#	Author	Focus	Comments	How the comments have been addressed?	Status (In progress? Done? – ref Chap)
			longevity.		section and LF and PMF, Impact 1.
66	Norway	Evaluation Function – 2017	The goal is to have some ERPAs that finish by 2017.	Language changed accordingly to point this out based on an assessment by the FMT	Done