**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)**

**Technical Assessment of Advanced Draft / Final ER-PD**

**Country**

Instructions for completing the assessment report:

* All items in the boxes of this template must be completed using Calibri 11pt, black, regular (non-italic) font. All boxes must appear in the final document.
* Where an Indicator is not applicable, the cell must be marked N.A and shaded in grey. Indicators marked in the table with \* may be N.A in some cases (i.e. lack of benefit sharing plan, national registry not implemented, adjustment non-applicable, quantification of uncertainty in the case of use or not of integrated methods to estimate emissions) and subject to the TAP’s opinion.
* The assessment of each indicator must not cover more than 1 page.
* All instructions, including this introductory text, should be deleted from the final document

Guidance for completing assessment: The TAP shall complete the description of the assessment of each indicator considering the following guidance:

* Description of the assessment: The reader must understand how a certain conclusion was reached (the process followed and the evidence on which it is based). Findings must contain adequate detail to understand the rationale of the score. A simple statement that an indicator is met/not met without any background is not good practice.
* Risked-based approach: The assessment should concentrate on the likely sources of material misstatements. The materiality threshold is defined as a misstatement that could potentially account for at least 1 percent of total greenhouse gas emissions.
* Professional judgement: It is expected that the TAP will use professional judgement in the case there is no evidence or not enough information in the ER-PD so as to conclude whether an error or misstatement is material (i.e., assessing if it is a MAJOR or MINOR non-conformity). E.g., the ER-PD might not have information on whether a carbon pool is significant or not, but the TAP may use its professional judgement to confirm whether it is significant or not.
* Non-Conformities: It is expected that non-conformities are raised following a standard approach
  + Requirement: indicate the interpretation of the requirement (as appropriate)
  + Evidence: refer to the objective evidence used, and how this objective evidence was used to conclude on the existence of a non-conformity against the requirement (E.g., the TAP checked the excel spreadsheet)
  + Explanation: explain the non-conformity, and provide an indication of the expectation to allow possible course of actions in order to address the finding
  + Potential impact: the assessment must include an explicit statement on whether the non-conformity is MAJOR or MINOR, so as to provide an indication of whether it is a material issue (i.e., a non-conformity with no major impact). This has to be done in a plain, non-aggressive and polite language without insisting in the existence of a failure. Note, in general:
    - **A major non-conformity (MAJOR)** is issued where (i) the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient; (ii) mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations which could have a material influence on the results; (iii) non-compliance with relevant criteria.
    - **A minor non-conformity (MINOR)** is issued where (i) the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient but does not lead to breakdown in the systems delivery; (ii) mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations which could have an influence on the future results; (iii) if a certain aspect has to be verified in the next verification event (e.g., there are foreseen modifications, etc.)
* **Observations (OBS)** are issued as team’s recommendation in relation to future improvements of the analysis process or the monitoring. These may be included in the Assessment Report, but the TAP must not make recommendations with respect to complying with criteria and indicators. If areas of improvement are suggested, clarify when this applies (i.e., to a future ERPD revision, or more generally to system improvements overtime).
* Description of changes from Draft ER-PD to Advanced Draft ER-PD: It is important to describe, where applicable in the Summary table, the changes that were made by the country from the Draft ER-PD to the Advanced Draft ER-PD as a result of preliminary findings from the TAP. This is important to inform the reader of previous findings that were already addressed at the time of the Advanced Draft ER-PD.

Update of Assessment report from Advanced Draft ER-PD to Final ER-PD: The assessment report needs to be updated overtime. In order to update the report:

* The first summary table includes columns for an initial review (desk review), first and second assessments of the Advanced Draft ER-PD and Final ER-PD respectively. The second assessment will provide the final scoring from the review of the Final ER-PD (which addresses both TAP findings and CFPs/Observers comments).
* It is expected that the TAP will update those indicators which have been changed. The TAP will have to explain why the scoring has been kept or has changed using objective evidence to support this and explain the process followed to reach the conclusion.

Roles: TAP members will have the following roles and division of labor. This is just indicative and it depends on the specific expertise available and the division of labor decided by the Leader.

* Leader: Overall supervision, confirm that the assessment report follows the above guidance and Indicators 27.1-27.2, 37.1-38.4
* Carbon accounting expert: 3.1 – 23
* Social and environmental safeguards expert: 24-26.3, 31.1-32.1, 34.1-35.2
* Legal expert: 23, 28.1-28.3, 33.1 and 36.1-36.3

**I General Approach of the Review**

Provide a description of the technical assessment including:

- Describe the method used for undertaking the assessment, including any sampling or audit plan, used for undertaking the technical assessment.

- Desk review: Describe how the desk review of the project description and any supporting documents were reviewed, cross-checked and compared with identified and stated requirements.

-Country visit: Provide the dates and describe the interview process and identify personnel, including their roles, who were interviewed and/or provided information additional to that provided in the project description and any supporting documents.

**PART 1 OF TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT: Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date of Current Assessment:**[Day Month Year]**.**[Version of the ER-PD, e.g. Advanced Draft ER-PD or Final ER-PD; date of the ER-PD]  **Name of Assessment team members:**  [List the names of the team members in alphabetical order and their respective roles] | | | | | |
| **Summary Assessment of the Quality and Completeness of the ER-PD:**  [Short summary of assessment, focusing on the key strengths and major/material non-conformities]  [In the case of the updated Assessment Report, indicate briefly the indicators that were changed in score since the previous assessment report] | | **Indicators** | **Initial review** | **1st Assessment** | **2nd assessment (final)** |
| **II. Level of Ambition 🡪 Criteria 1 – 2, including issues relating to legal aspects**    [Short assessment] | | **1.1**  **1.2**  **1.3** | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | |
| **III. Carbon Accounting**  **III (a) Scope and methods🡪 Criteria 3 - 6**  **III (b) Uncertainties🡪 Criteria 7 - 9**  **III (c) Reference Level🡪 Criteria 10 - 13**  **III (d) Reference Level, Monitoring & Reporting on Emission Reductions🡪 Criteria 14-16**  **III (e) Accounting for Displacement (leakage) 🡪 Criterion 17**  **III (f) Accounting for Reversals🡪 Criteria 18 – 21**  **III (g) Accounting for ERs 🡪 Criteria 22 - 23**  [Short assessment] | | **3.1**  **3.2**  **3.3**  **4.1**  **4.2**  **5.1**  **6.1**  **6.2**  **7.1**  **7.2**  **8.1**  **8.2**  **9.1**  **9.2**  **9.3**  **10.1**  **10.2**  **10.3**  **11.1**  **11.2**  **12.1**  **13.1**  **13.2**  **13.3**  **13.4**  **14.1**  **14.2**  **14.3**  **15.1**  **16.1**  **17.1**  **17.2**  **17.3**  **17.4**  **18.1**  **18.2**  **19.1**  **20.1**  **20.2**  **21.1**  **21.2**  **22**  **23** | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NA** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NA** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **YES** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NA** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | |
| **IV. Safeguards**  **Actions undertaken to meet WB and Cancun Safeguards­­🡪 Criteria 24-26**    [Short assessment] | | **24.1**  **24.2**  **25.1**  **25.2**  **26.1**  **26.2**  **26.3** | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | |
| **V. Sustainable Program Design and Implementation**  **V. (a) Drivers and Land Resource Tenure Assessment ­­🡪 Criteria 27-28**  **V. (b) Benefit sharing 🡪 Criteria 29 – 33**  **V. (c) Non-Carbon Benefits 🡪 Criteria 34 – 35**  [Short assessment] | | **27.1**  **27.2**  **28.1**  **28.2**  **28.3**  **29**  **30.1**  **31.1**  **32.1**  **33.1**  **34.1**  **34.2**  **35.1**  **35.2** | |  | | --- | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | |  | | --- | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | |  | | --- | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | |
| **VI. ER Program Transactions**  **VI (a) ERPA Signing Authority and Transfer of Title To ERs ­­🡪 Criterion 36**  **VI (b) Data Management and ER Transaction Registries 🡪 Criteria 37 - 38**  [Short assessment] | | **36.1**  **36.2**  **36.3**  **37.1**  **37.2**  **37.3**  **37.4**  **38.1**  **38.2**  **38.3**  **38.4** | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **\*** |   **\*** | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **\***  **\*** | | |  | | --- | | **YES** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NA** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **NO** | | **\*** | | **\*** | | **\***  **\*** | |
| **SUMMARY SCORE and overall comment:**  [Short assessment] | | |  |  |  |

**PART 2 OF TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT: DETAILED ASSESSMENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C. 1 The proposed ER Program is ambitious, demonstrating the potential of the full implementation of the variety of interventions of the national REDD+ strategy, and is implemented at a jurisdictional scale or programmatic scale*.*** | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 1.1** The ER Program Measures aim to address a significant portion of forest-related emissions and removals  **[**Ambition and strategic rationale for the ER Program – 2.2] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 1.2** The ER Program is ambitious, uses new or enhanced ER Program Measures to reduce Emissions or enhance removals**,** is undertaken at a jurisdictional scale and/or takes a programmatic approach (i.e., involves multiple land areas, landowners or managers within one or several jurisdictions), and reflects a variety of interventions from the national REDD+ strategy in a coordinated manner.  [Ambition and strategic rationale for the ER Program – 2.2, 2.3] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **C. 2 The Accounting Area matches a government- designated area that is of significant scale** | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 2.1** The Accounting Area is of significant scale and aligns with one or more jurisdictions;  or a national-government-designated area (e.g., ecoregion) or areas.  **[**Accounting Area of the ER Program – 3.1] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **C. 3 The ER Program can choose which sources and sinks associated with any of the REDD+ Activities will be accounted for, measured, and reported, and included in the ER Program Reference Level. At a minimum, ER Programs must account for emissions from deforestation. Emissions from forest degradation also should be accounted for where such emissions are significant.** | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 3.1** The ER Program identifies which anthropogenic sources and sinks associated with any of the REDD+ Activities will be accounted for in the ER Program  **[**Description of Sources and Sinks selected – 8.1] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 3.2** The ER Program accounts for emissions from deforestation.  **[**Description of Sources and Sinks selected – 8.1] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 3.3** Emissions from forest degradation are accounted for where such emissions are more than 10% of total forest-related emissions in the Accounting Area, during the Reference Period and during the Term of the ER-PA. These emissions are estimated using the best available data (including proxy activities or data).  **[**Description of Sources and Sinks selected – 8.1] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **C. 4 The ER Program should account for, measure and report, and include in the ER Program Reference Level, significant carbon pools and greenhouse gases, except where their exclusion would underestimate total emission reductions.** | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 4.1** The ER Program accounts for all Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases that are significant within the Accounting Area, both for Reference Level setting and Measurement, Monitoring and reporting (MMR).  **[**Description of Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases selected – 8.2] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 4.2** Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases may be excluded if:   1. Emissions associated with excluded Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases are collectively estimated to amount to less than 10% of total forest-related emissions in the Accounting Area during the Reference Period; or 2. The ER Program can demonstrate that excluding such Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases would underestimate total emission reductions.   [Description of Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases selected – 8.2] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **C. 5 The ER Program uses the most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) guidance and guidelines, as adopted or encouraged by the Conference of the Parties as a basis for estimating forest-related greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks.** | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 5.1** The ER Program identifies the IPCC methods used to estimate emissions and removals for Reference Level setting and Measurement, Monitoring and reporting (MMR).  **[**Description of method used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the  Reference Period – 8.3]  [Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the  ER Program within the Accounting Area– 9.1] | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | |
| **C. 6 Key data and methods that are sufficiently detailed to enable the reconstruction of the Reference Level, and the reported emissions and removals (e.g., data, methods and assumptions), are documented and made publicly available online. In cases where the country’s or ER Program’s policies exempt sources of information from being publicly disclosed or shared, the information should be made available to independent reviewers and a rationale is provided for not making these data publicly available. In these cases, reasonable efforts should be made to make summary data publicly available to enable reconstruction.** | | | | | | | |
| **Ind. 6.1** The following methodological steps are made publicly available:   1. Forest definition; 2. Definition of classes of forests, (e.g., degraded forest; natural forest; plantation), if applicable; 3. Choice of activity data, and pre-processing and processing methods; 4. Choice of emission factors and description of their development; 5. Estimation of emissions and removals, including accounting approach; 6. Disaggregation of emissions by sources and removal by sinks; 7. Estimation of accuracy, precision, and/or confidence level, as applicable; 8. Discussion of key uncertainties; 9. Rationale for adjusting emissions, if applicable; 10. Methods and assumptions associated with adjusting emissions, if applicable.  [Forest definition used in the construction of the Reference Level 9.2][Description of method used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 8.3][Activity data & emission factors used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Ref. Period 8.3][Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 9.1] | | | | | | **YES/NO** | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 6.2** For the following spatial information, maps and/or synthesized data are displayed publicly, and reasonable efforts are made to explain how these were derived from the underlying spatial and other data, and to make key data sets or analyses publicly available:   1. Accounting Area 2. Activity data (e.g., forest-cover change or transitions between forest categories) 3. Emission factors 4. Average annual emissions over the Reference Period 5. Adjusted emissions   Any spatial data used to adjust emissions, if applicable. [Forest definition used in the construction of the Reference Level 9.2][Description of method used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 8.3][Activity data &emission factors used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Ref. Period 8.3][Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 9.1] | | | | | | | **YES/NO** | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | |
| **C.7 Sources of uncertainty are systematically identified and assessed in Reference Level setting and Measurement, Monitoring and reporting** | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 7.1** All assumptions and sources of uncertainty associated with activity data, emission factors and calculation methods that contribute to the uncertainty of the estimates of emissions and removals are identified. [Activity data and emission factors used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 8.3][Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 9.1][Identification and assessment of sources of uncertainty 13.1] | | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [Countries should **create a comprehensive list of all possible sources of systematic and random errors, not limited to statistical sampling errors**. The guidance provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines may be used to understand potential causes of uncertainty.  Moreover, while most countries have identified and described random errors, **they have not discussed potential systematic errors** such as (i) the application of [ADxEF integration methods](https://www.reddcompass.org/search-mgd#_48_INSTANCE_4exBNbTOerXc_%253Dhttps%25253A%25252F%25252Fwww.reddcompass.org%25252Fmgd-content-v2%25252Fdita-webhelp%25252Fen%25252Findex.html%25253F%3D%26_48_INSTANCE_4exBNbTOerXc_%3Dhttps%253A%252F%252Fwww.reddcompass.org%252Fmgd-content-v2%252Fdita-web) that may result in bias by simplifying complex land use dynamics and (ii) the use of land cover as a proxy for land use that may result in bias. Experience has also shown that **assumptions that contribute to the uncertainty of emissions and removals** (e.g. assumptions made in the establishment of adjustments) **have not been discussed**, even though these can be a source of systematic and random errors. Hence, Countries and TAP should respectively present in the ERPD and Technical Assessment report the **identification of uncertainties associated with assumptions.** Theseassumptions, such as those related to adjustments, should be addressed as part of the political discourse between Countries and CFPs. The FMT will provide non-binding best practice good practice guidance in the coming weeks] | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 7.2** The sources of uncertainty identified in Indicator 7.1: are assessed for their relative contribution to the overall uncertainty of the emissions and removals. [Identification and assessment of sources of uncertainty 13.3] | | | | | **YES/NO** | | | |
| [The MF stipulates that the sources of uncertainty identified in Indicator 7.1 be assessed for their relative contribution to the overall uncertainty of the emissions and removals. However, **it is not clear whether this assessment is done using quantitative methods** (i.e. using error propagation of all sources as described in Chapter 3, Volume 1 of the [2006 IPCC Guidelines](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.html)) **or through qualitative methods** (i.e. explanation of the potential contribution using available literature, professional judgement, etc.). This distinction is important as systematic errors cannot be included in a quantitative assessment using error propagation methods, i.e. the [2006 IPCC Guidelines](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.html) only provide guidance for the treatment of random errors and require that systematic errors be removed. This means that not all sources identified in Indicator 7.1 may be assessed for their relative contribution. Some good practice guidance and suggestions to address these issues:   * Countries should conduct a **qualitative assessment of the potential bias that identified systematic errors could cause,** and where possible, correct for this bias (as recommended by the [2006 IPCC Guidelines](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/1_Volume1/V1_3_Ch3_Uncertainties.pdf)). If bias cannot be removed through the application of SOPs and QA/QC procedures, countries should apply conservative approaches and explain transparently how they has addressed the bias. Countries may refer to Table 3.1 of Volume 1, 2006 IPCC Guidelines for more guidance on how to treat causes of uncertainty. * Countries should u**se quantitative methods**, such as Approach 1 described in [2006 IPCC Guidelines](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/1_Volume1/V1_3_Ch3_Uncertainties.pdf), **to identify all random errors outlined in Indicator 7.1 and assess their relative contribution to overall uncertainty**. Countries may obtain the uncertainty estimates from the following sources by order of priority: i) estimates from data collected; ii) publications; iii) IPCC; and iv) expert judgement. Countries may not include sources of uncertainty that are negligible and for which estimates are of low quality.   Countries **should not address the uncertainties associated with assumptions, namely the plausibility of adjustments.** Theseassumptions are political in nature and present an uncertainty that cannot be easily assessed. These should be addressed as part of the political discourse between Countries and CFPs.] | | | | | | | | |
| **C 8 The ER Program, to the extent feasible, follows a process of managing and reducing uncertainty of activity data and emission factors used in Reference Level setting and Measurement, Monitoring and reporting.** | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 8.1** Systematic errors are minimized through the implementation of a consistent and comprehensive set of standard operating procedures, including a set of quality assessment and quality control processes that work within the local circumstances of the ER Program. [Activity data and emission factors used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period, 13.2] [Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area] | | | | | | | **YES/NO** | |
| [Countries should **implement the analysis of uncertainty described in Criteria 7-9 as an iterative process** with Criteria 7 and 8 applied at the beginning of the design stage based on available data and Criteria 9 subsequently completed once new data is collected (e.g. RL). Criteria 7 and 8 can then be repeated to identify improvements needed for MMR. This last analysis should be provided in Chapter 12 of the ERPD, while the QA/QC procedures and SOPs should be described or referenced in Chapter 8.3. Countries should follow existing IPCC guidance for the preparation of QA/QC plans.] | | | | | | | | |
| **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 uncertainty of the emissions and removals. [Activity data and emission factors used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 10, 13][Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER   Program within the Accounting Area 9.1] [Identification and assessment of sources of uncertainty 13.1] | | | | | | | **YES/NO** | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | |
| **C 9 Uncertainty of activity data and emission factors used in Reference Level setting and Measurement, Monitoring and reporting is quantified in a consistent way, so that the estimation of emissions, removals and Emission Reductions is comparable among ER Programs** | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 9.1** Uncertainty associated with activity data and emission factors is quantified using accepted international standards, for example by providing accuracy, confidence interval, distribution of error, and propagation of error. Where errors in data and methods are considered large as defined in IPCC Guidelines, Monte Carlo methods (numerical simulations) should be used to estimate uncertainty [Activity data and emission factors used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 13.1] [Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 9.1] | | | | | | | **YES/NO** | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 9.2** Uncertainty of the estimate of Emission Reductions is quantified using Monte Carlo methods. Underlying sources of error in data and methods for integrated measurements of deforestation, forest degradation and enhancements (e.g., as in a national forest inventory) are combined into a single combined uncertainty estimate and are reported at the two-tailed 90% confidence level [Quantification of uncertainty in Reference Level setting 13.2] | | | | | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | |
| [Short assessment. It may be non-applicable if integrated measurements are not applied] | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 9.3** Uncertainty of Emissions Reductions associated with deforestation, forest degradation and enhancements are reported separately if measured through separate (i.e., non-integrated) approaches and when degradation is estimated using proxy data. [Quantification of uncertainty in Reference Level setting 13.2] | | | | | | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | |
| [Short assessment. It may be non-applicable if deforestation, degradation and enhancements are measured through separate approaches] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 10 The development of the Reference Level is informed by the development of a Forest Reference Emission Level or Forest Reference Level for the UNFCCC** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 10.1** The Reference Level is expressed in tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year [Estimated Reference Level 9.7] | | | | | | | | **YES/NO** | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 10.2** The ER Program explains how the development of the Reference Level can inform or is informed by the development of a national Forest Reference Emission Level or Forest Reference Level, and explains the relationship between the Reference Level and any intended submission of a Forest Reference Emission Level or Forest Reference Level to the UNFCCC [Relation between the Reference Level, the development of a FREL/FRL for the UNFCCC and the country’s existing or emerging greenhouse gas inventory 9.8] | | | | | | | | **YES/NO** | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| Ind 10.3 The ER Program explains what steps are intended in order for the Reference Level to achieve consistency with the country’s existing or emerging greenhouse gas inventory[Relation between the Reference Level, the development of a FREL/FRL for the UNFCCC and the country’s existing or emerging greenhouse gas inventory 9.6] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 11 A Reference Period is defined** | | | | | | | | | |
| Ind 11.1 The end-date for the Reference Period is the most recent date prior to two years before the TAP starts the independent assessment of the draft ER Program Document and for which forest-cover data is available to enable IPCC Approach 3. An alternative end-date could be allowed only with convincing justification, e.g., to maintain consistency of dates with a Forest Reference Emission Level or Forest Reference Level, other relevant REDD+ programs, national communications, national ER program or climate change strategy [Reference Period 9.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 11.2** The start-date for the Reference Period is about 10 years before the end-date. An alternative start-date could be allowed only with convincing justification as in Indicator 11.1, and is not more than 15 years before the end-date.  [Reference Period 9.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 12 The forest definition used for the ER Program follows available guidance from UNFCCC decision 12/CP.17** | | | | | | | | | |
| Ind 12.1 The definition of forest used in the construction of the Reference Level is specified. If there is a difference between the definition of forest used in the national greenhouse gas inventory or in reporting to other international organizations (including an Forest Reference Emission Level or Forest Reference Level to the UNFCCC) and the definition used in the construction of the Reference Level, then the ER Program explains how and why the forest definition used in the Reference Level was chosen.[Forest definition used in the construction of the Reference Level 9.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 13 The Reference Level does not exceed the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period. For a limited set of ER Programs, the Reference Level may be adjusted upward by a limited amount above average annual historical emissions. For any ER Program, the Reference Level may be adjusted downward.** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 13.1** The Reference Level does not exceed the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period, unless the ER Program meets the eligibility requirements in Indicator 13.2. If the available data from the National Forest Monitoring System used in the construction of the Reference Level shows a clear downward trend, this should be taken into account in the construction of the Reference Level  [Average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 9.6, 13.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 13.2** The Reference Level may be adjusted upward above average annual historical emissions if the ER Program can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Carbon Fund that the following eligibility requirements are met:  (i)Long-term historical deforestation has been minimal across the entirety of the country, and the country has high forest cover (country or jurisdictional area);  (ii)National circumstances have changed such that rates of deforestation and forest degradation during the historical Reference Period likely underestimate future rates of deforestation and forest degradation during the Term of the ERPA.  [Explanation and justification of proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period, Quantification of the proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 9.6]. | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment. It may be non applicable if the ER-program does not meet the eligibility criteria] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 13.3** For countries meeting the eligibility requirements in Indicator 13.2, a Reference Level could be adjusted above the average historical emission rate over the Reference Period. Such an adjustment is credibly justified on the basis of expected emissions that would result from documented changes in ER Program circumstances, evident before the end-date of the Reference Period, but the effects of which were not fully reflected in the average annual historical emissions during the Reference Period. Proposed adjustments may be rejected for reasons including, but not limited to:  i. The basis for adjustments is not documented; or  ii. Adjustments are not quantifiable. [Explanation and justification of proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period, Quantification of the proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 9.6] | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment. It may be non applicable if the ER-program does not meet the eligibility criteria] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 13.4** An adjustment of the Reference Level above the average annual historical emissions during the Reference Period may not exceed 0.1%/year of Carbon Stocks [Explanation and justification of proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period, Quantification of the proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period 9.6] | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment. It may be non applicable if the ER-program does not meet the eligibility criteria] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 14 Robust Forest Monitoring Systems provide data and information that are transparent, consistent over time, and are suitable for measuring, reporting and verifying emissions by sources and removals by sinks, as determined by following Criterion 3 within the proposed Accounting Area** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 14.1** The ER Program monitors emissions by sources and removals by sinks included in the ER Program’s scope (Indicator 3.1) using the same methods or demonstrably equivalent methods to those used to set the Reference Level.  [Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 10.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 14.2** Activity data are determined periodically, at least twice during the Term of the ERPA, and allow for ERs to be estimated from the beginning of the Term of the ERPA. Deforestation is determined using IPCC Approach 3. Other sinks and sources such as degradation may be determined using indirect methods such as survey data, proxies derived from landscape ecology, or statistical data on timber harvesting and regrowth if no direct methods are available  [Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 9.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 14.3** 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, and the uncertainty for each emission factor is documented. IPCC Tier 1 methods may be considered in exceptional cases [Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 10.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 15 ER Programs apply technical specifications of the National Forest Monitoring System where possible** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 15.1** ER Programs articulate how the Forest Monitoring System fits into the existing or emerging National Forest Monitoring System, and provides a rationale for alternative technical design where applicable.  [Relation and consistency with the National Forest Monitoring System 10.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 16 Community participation in Monitoring and reporting is encouraged and used where appropriate** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 16.1** The ER Program demonstrates that it has explored opportunities for community participation in monitoring and reporting, e.g., of ER Program Measures, activity data, emission factors, safeguards and Non-Carbon Benefits, and encourages such community participation where appropriate [Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area 10.1, 10.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 17 The ER Program is designed and implemented to prevent and minimize potential displacement** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 17.1** Deforestation and degradation drivers that may be impacted by the proposed ER Program measures are identified, and their associated risk for displacement is assessed, as well as possible risk mitigation strategies. This assessment categorizes Displacement risks as high, medium or low. [Identification of risk of Displacement 11.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 17.2** The ER Program has in place an effective strategy to mitigate and/or minimize, to the extent possible, potential Displacement, prioritizing key sources of Displacement risk. [ER Program design features to prevent and minimize potential Displacement 11.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 17.3** By the time of verification, the ER Program has implemented its strategy to mitigate and/or minimize potential Displacement | | | **N.A** | | | | | | |
| Only applicable at the time of verification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 17.4** ER Programs are also invited to report on changes in major drivers in the ER Accounting Area, any Displacement risks associated with those drivers, and any lessons from the ER Programs’ efforts to mitigate potential Displacement | | | **N.A** | | | | | | |
| Only applicable at the time of verification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 18 The ER Program is designed and implemented to prevent and minimize the risk of reversals and address the long-term sustainability of ERs** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 18.1** The ER Program has undertaken an assessment of the anthropogenic and natural risk of reversals that might affect ERs during the Term of the ERPA and has assessed, as feasible, the potential risk of reversals after the end of the Term of the ERPA [Identification of risk of Reversals 12.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 18.2** The ER Program demonstrates how effective ER Program design and implementation will mitigate significant risks of Reversals identified in the assessment to the extent possible, and will address the sustainability of ERs, both during the Term of the ERPA, and beyond the Term of the ERPA  [ER Program design features to prevent and mitigate Reversals 12.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 19 The ER Program accounts for Reversals from ERs that have been transferred to the Carbon Fund during the Term of the ERPA** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 19.1** During the Term of the ERPA, the ER Program accounts for Reversals from ERs using one of the following options:   * Option 1: The ER Program has in place a Reversal management mechanism (e.g., buffer reserve or insurance) that is substantially equivalent to the Reversal risk mitigation assurance provided by the ‘ER Program CF Buffer’ approach referred to in option 2 below, appropriate for the ER Program’s assessed level of risk, which in the event of a Reversal during the Term of the ERPA will be used to fully cover such Reversals. * Option 2: ERs from the ER Program are deposited in an ER Program-specific buffer, managed by the Carbon Fund (ER Program CF Buffer), and based on a Reversal risk assessment. ERs deposited in the ER Program CF Buffer (Buffer ERs) will not be transferred to the Carbon Fund. In the event that a Reversal event occurs during the Term of the ERPA, an amount of Buffer ERs will be cancelled from the ER Pro   [Reversal management mechanism, Selection of Reversal management mechanism 12.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 20 The ER Program, building on its arrangements put in place during the readiness phase and during the Term of the ERPA, will have in place a robust Reversal management mechanism to address the risk of Reversals after the Term of the ERPA** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 20.1** At the latest 1 year before the end of the Term of the ERPA, the ER Program will have in place a robust Reversal management mechanism or another specified approach that addresses the risk of Reversals beyond the Term of the ERPA | | | | **N.A** | | | | | |
| Only applicable before the end of the ERPA term. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 20.2** If the ER Program has selected option 2 under Indicator 19.1, all or a portion of the Buffer ERs of the ER Program, subject to a Carbon Fund review of the Methodological Framework and a decision of the parties to the ERPA in 2019, will be transferred to the mechanism identified in Indicator 20.1 at the end of the Term of the ERPA. If the ER Program fails to meet the requirements of Indicator 20.1, all remaining Buffer ERs in the ER Program CF Buffer will be cancelled | | | | **N.A** | | | | | |
| Only applicable before the end of the ERPA term. | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 21 The ER Program monitors and reports major emissions that could lead to reversals of ERs transferred to the Carbon Fund during the Term of the ERPA** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 21.1** The ER Program Monitoring Plan and Monitoring system are technically capable of identifying Reversals [Monitoring and reporting of major emissions that could lead to Reversals of ERs 12.4] | | | **YES** | | | | | | |
| [Although at the time of the assessment it is not possible to confirm if it can identify reversals, the TAP may confirm if based on the design these reversals can be identified] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 21.2**. The ER Program reports to the Carbon Fund within 90 calendar days after becoming aware of any emissions in the Accounting Area or changes in ER Program circumstances that, in the reasonable opinion of the ER Program, could lead to Reversals of previously transferred ERs by the next Monitoring event. The ER Program explains how the potential Reversals would be addressed by additional ER Program Measures or by the Reversal management mechanism described in Indicator 19.1. | | | **N.A** | | | | | | |
| Only applicable at the time a reversal occurs and at the time of verification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 22 Net ERs are calculated by the following steps:**  **1. Subtract the reported and verified emissions and removals from the Reference Level**  **2. Set aside a number of ERs from the result of step 1, above, in a buffer reserve. This amount reflects the level of uncertainty associated with the estimation of ERs during the Term of the ERPA. The amount set aside in the buffer reserve is determined using the conservativeness factors for deforestation listed in the MF. For estimated emissions reductions associated with degradation, the same conservativeness factors may be applied if spatially explicit activity data (IPCC Approach 3) and high-quality emission factors (IPCC Tier 2) are used. Otherwise, for proxy-based approaches, apply a general conservativeness factor of 15% for forest degradation Emission Reductions.**  **3. Set aside a number of ERs in the ER Program CF Buffer or other reversal management mechanism created or used by an ER Program to address Reversals** | | | | | | | | | |
| [Ex-ante estimation of the Emission Reductions 14.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 23 To prevent double-counting, ERs generated under the ER Program shall not be counted or compensated for more than once. Any reported and verified ERs generated under the ER Program and sold and/or transferred to the Carbon Fund shall not be sold, offered or otherwise used or reported a second time by the ER Program Entity. Any reported and verified ERs generated under the ER Program that have been sold and/or transferred, offered or otherwise used or reported once by the ER Program Entity shall not be sold and transferred to the Carbon Fund** | | | | | | | | | |
| (i) [Participation under other GHG initiatives 14.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 19.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 24 The ER Program meets the World Bank social and environmental safeguards and promotes and supports the safeguards included in UNFCCC guidance related to REDD+** | | | | | | | | | |
| Ind 24.1 The ER Program demonstrates through its design and implementation how it meets relevant World Bank social and environmental safeguards, and promotes and supports the safeguards included in UNFCCC guidance related to REDD+, by paying particular attention to Decision 1/CP.16 and its Appendix I as adopted by the UNFCCC [ Description of how the ER Program meets the World Bank social and environmental safeguards and promotes and supports the safeguards included in UNFCCC guidance related to REDD+ 15.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| Ind 24.2 Safeguards Plans address social and environmental issues and include related risk mitigation measures identified during the national readiness process, e.g., in the SESA process and the ESMF, that are relevant for the specific ER Program context (e.g., land tenure issues), taking into account relevant existing institutional and regulatory frameworks. The Safeguards Plans are prepared concurrently with the ER Program Document, and are publicly disclosed in a manner and language appropriate for the affected stakeholders [Description of how the ER Program meets the World Bank social and environmental safeguards and promotes and supports the safeguards included in UNFCCC guidance related to REDD+ 15.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 25 Information is provided on how the ER Program meets the World Bank social and environmental safeguards and addresses and respects the safeguards included in UNFCCC guidance related to REDD+, during ER Program implementation** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 25.1** Appropriate monitoring arrangements for safeguards referred to in Criterion 24 are included in the Safeguards Plans [Description of arrangements to provide information on safeguards during ER Program implementation 15.2 and 6.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 25.2** During ER Program implementation, information on the implementation of Safeguards Plans is included in an annex to each ER monitoring report and interim progress report. This information is publicly disclosed, and the ER Program is encouraged to make this information available to relevant stakeholders. This information is also made available as an input to the national systems for providing information on how safeguards are addressed and respected (SIS) required by the UNFCCC guidance related to REDD+, as appropriate. | | | **N.A** | | | | | | |
| Only applicable at the time of verification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 26 An appropriate Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) developed during the Readiness phase or otherwise exist(s), building on existing institutions, regulatory frameworks, mechanisms and capacity** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 26.1** An assessment of existing FGRM, including any applicable customary FGRMs, is conducted and is made public. The FGRM applicable to the ER Program demonstrates the following:  i) Legitimacy, accessibility, predictability, fairness, rights compatibility, transparency, and capability to address a range of grievances, including those related to benefit-sharing arrangements for the ER Program;  ii) Access to adequate expertise and resources for the operation of the FGRM  [Description of the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) in place and possible actions to improve it 15.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 26.2** The description of FGRM procedures, included in the Benefit-Sharing Plan and/or relevant Safeguards Plans, specifies the process to be followed to receive, screen, address, monitor, and report feedback on, grievances or concerns submitted by affected stakeholders. As relevant, the Benefit-Sharing Plan and/or relevant Safeguards Plans and/or ER Program Document describe the relationship among FGRM(s) at the local, ER Program, and national levels [Description of the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) in place and possible actions to improve it 15.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 26.3** If found necessary in the assessment mentioned in Indicator 26.1, a plan is developed to improve the FGRM  [Description of the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) in place and possible actions to improve it 15.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 27 The ER Program describes how the ER Program addresses key drivers of deforestation and degradation** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 27.1** The ER Program identifies the key drivers of deforestation and degradation, and potentially opportunities for forest enhancement [Analysis of drivers and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, and existing activities that can lead to conservation or enhancement of forest carbon stocks 4.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 27.2** 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 [Description and justification of the planned actions and interventions under the ER Program that will lead to emission reductions and/or removals 4.3] [Institutional and implementation arrangements 6.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 28 The ER Program has undertaken and made publicly available an assessment of the land and resource tenure regimes present in the Accounting Area** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 28.1** The ER Program reviews the assessment of land and resource tenure regimes carried out during the readiness phase at the national level (i.e., SESA) and, if necessary, supplements this assessment by undertaking an additional assessment of any issues related to land and resource tenure regimes in the Accounting Area that are critical to the successful implementation of the ER Program, including:   * 1. The range of land and resource tenure rights (including legal and customary rights of use, access, management, ownership, exclusion, etc.) and categories of rights-holders present in the Accounting Area (including Indigenous Peoples and other relevant communities);   2. The legal status of such rights, and any significant ambiguities or gaps in the applicable legal framework, including as pertains to the rights under customary law;   3. Areas within the Accounting Area that are subject to significant conflicts or disputes related to contested or competing claims or rights, and if critical to the successful implementation of the ER Program, how such conflicts or disputes have been or are proposed to be addressed; and   4. Any potential impacts of the ER Program on existing land and resource tenure in the Accounting Area.   The ER Program demonstrates that the additional assessment has been conducted in a consultative, transparent and participatory manner, reflecting inputs from relevant stakeholders [Description of land tenure systems, analysis of laws and regulatory framework 4.4 and 4.5, stakeholder consultation process 5.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 28.2** The ER Program explains how the relevant issues identified in the above assessment have been or will be taken into consideration in the design and implementation of the ER Program, and in the relevant Safeguards Plan(s). If the ER Program involves activities that are contingent on establishing legally recognized rights to lands and territories that Indigenous Peoples have traditionally owned or customarily used or occupied, the relevant Safeguards Plan sets forth an action plan for the legal recognition of such ownership, occupation, or usage. Beyond what is required for the successful implementation of the ER Program, the ER Program is encouraged to show how it can contribute to progress towards clarifying land and resource tenure in the Accounting Area, where relevant. [Assessment of land and resource tenure in the Accounting Area 4.4] [Description and justification of the planned actions and interventions under the ER Program that will lead to emission reductions and/or removals 4.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 28.3** 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 [Transfer of Title to ERs 18.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 29 The ER Program provides a description of the benefit-sharing arrangements for the ER Program, including information specified in Indicator 30.1, to the extent known at the time.** | | | | | | | | | |
| Description of benefit-sharing arrangements [16.1 in ER-PD of 15 Jan. 2016] | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 30 The Benefit Sharing Plan will elaborate on the benefit-sharing arrangements for Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits, building on the description in the ER Program Document, and taking into account the importance of managing expectations among potential beneficiaries.** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 30.1** The Benefit-Sharing Plan is made publicly available prior to ERPA signature, at least as an advanced draft, and is disclosed in a form, manner and language understandable to the affected stakeholders for the ER Program. The Benefit-Sharing Plan contains the following information:   1. The categories of potential Beneficiaries, describing their eligibility to receive potential Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits under the ER Program and the types and scale of such potential Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits that may be received. Such Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits should be culturally appropriate and gender and inter-generationally inclusive. The identification of such potential Beneficiaries takes into account emission reduction strategies to effectively address drivers of net emissions, anticipated implementers and geographical distribution of those strategies, land and resource tenure rights (including legal and customary rights of use, access, management, ownership, etc. identified in the assessments carried out under Criterion 28), and Title to ERs, among other considerations. 2. Criteria, processes, and timelines for the distribution of Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits. 3. Monitoring provisions for the implementation of the Benefit-Sharing Plan, including, as appropriate, an opportunity for participation in the monitoring and/or validation process by the Beneficiaries themselves   [Description of benefit-sharing arrangements 16.1] | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | | | | | | |
| [While the Benefit-Sharing Plan is not required before ERPA signature and might not be available at the time of the TAP assessment, countries should have defined the benefit-sharing arrangements (as required by Criteria 29). As such, the TAP should evaluate the proposed arrangements and aspects identified in Criteria 30 and Indicator 30.1, to the extent possible.] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 31 The benefit-sharing arrangements are designed in a consultative, transparent, and participatory manner appropriate to the country context. This process is informed by and builds upon the national readiness process, including the SESA, and taking into account existing benefit-sharing arrangements, where appropriate** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 31.1** The Benefit-Sharing Plan is prepared as part of the consultative, transparent and participatory process for the ER Program, and reflects inputs by relevant stakeholders, including broad community support by affected Indigenous Peoples. The Benefit-Sharing Plan is designed to facilitate the delivery and sharing of Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits that promote successful ER Program implementation. The Benefit-Sharing Plan is disclosed in a form, manner and language understandable to the affected stakeholders of the ER Program [Description of stakeholder consultation process 5.1][Summary of the process of designing the benefit-sharing arrangements 16.2] | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | | | | | | |
| [While the Benefit-Sharing Plan is not required before ERPA signature and might not be available at the time of the TAP assessment, countries should have defined the benefit-sharing arrangements (as required by Criteria 29). As such, the TAP should evaluate the process undertaken or proposed in accordance with Criteria 31 and Indicator 31.1, to the extent possible.] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 32 The implementation of the Benefit-Sharing Plan is transparent** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 32.1** Information on the implementation of the Benefit-Sharing Plan is annexed to each ER Program monitoring report and interim progress report and is made publicly available [16.1] | | | **N.A** | | | | | | |
| Only applicable at the time of verification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 33 The benefit-sharing arrangement for the ER Program reflects the legal context** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 33.1** The design and implementation of the Benefit-Sharing Plan comply with relevant applicable laws, including national laws and any legally binding national obligations under relevant international laws [Description of the legal context of the benefit-sharing arrangements 16.3] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 34 Non-Carbon Benefits are integral to the ER Program** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 34.1** The ER Program outlines potential Non-Carbon Benefits, identifies priority Non-Carbon Benefits, and describes how the ER Program will generate and/or enhance such priority Non-Carbon Benefits. Such priority Non-Carbon Benefits should be culturally appropriate, and gender and inter-generationally inclusive, as relevant [Outline of potential Non-Carbon Benefits and identification of Priority Non-Carbon Benefits 17.1 in the reviewed ER-PD of 15 January 2016] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 34.2** Stakeholder engagement processes carried out for the ER Program design and for the readiness phase inform the identification of such priority Non-Carbon Benefits [Description of stakeholder consultation process 5.1] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 35 The ER Program indicates how information on the generation and/or enhancement of priority Non-Carbon Benefits will be provided during ER Program implementation, as feasible.** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 35.1** The ER Program proposes an approach utilizing methods available at the time to collect and provide information on priority Non-Carbon Benefits, including, e.g., possibly using proxy indicators. If relevant, this approach also may use information drawn from or contributed as an input to the SIS [Approach for providing information on Priority Non-Carbon Benefits 17.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 35.2** Information on generation and/or enhancement of priority Non-Carbon Benefits will be provided in a separate annex to each ER Program monitoring report and interim progress report, and will be made publicly available | | | **N.A** | | | | | | |
| Only applicable at the time of verification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 36 The ER Program Entity demonstrates its authority to enter into an ERPA and its ability to transfer Title to ERs to the Carbon Fund** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 36.1** The ER Program Entity demonstrates its authority to enter into an ERPA with the Carbon Fund prior to the start of ERPA negotiations, either through:  i. Reference to an existing legal and regulatory framework stipulating such authority; and/or  ii. In the form of a letter from the relevant overarching governmental authority (e.g., the presidency, chancellery, etc.) or from the relevant governmental body authorized to confirm such authority.  [Authorization of the ER Program 18.1] | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| Ind 36.2 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 (i.e., those holding legal and customary rights, as identified by the assessment conducted under Criterion 28), in the Accounting Area. The ability to transfer Title to ERs may be demonstrated through various means, including reference to existing legal and regulatory frameworks, sub-arrangements with potential land and resource tenure rights-holders (including those holding legal and customary rights, as identified by the assessments conducted under Criterion 28), and benefit-sharing arrangements under the Benefit-Sharing Plan [Transfer of Title to ERs 18.2 ] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 36.3** The ER Program Entity demonstrates its ability to transfer Title to ERs prior to ERPA signature, or at the latest, at the time of transfer of ERs to the Carbon Fund. If this ability to transfer Title to ERs is still unclear or contested at the time of transfer of ERs, an amount of ERs proportional to the Accounting Area where title is unclear or contested shall not be sold or transferred to the Carbon Fund  [Transfer of Title to ERs 17.2 ] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 37 Based on national needs and circumstances, the ER Program works with the host country to select an appropriate arrangement to avoid having multiple claims to an ER Title.** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 37.1** Based on national needs and circumstances, the ER Program host country has made a decision whether to maintain its own comprehensive national REDD+ Program and Projects Data Management System, or instead to use a centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System managed by a third party on its behalf. In either case of a country’s use of a third party centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System, or a country’s own national REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System, the indicators below apply [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 18.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 37.2** A national REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System or a third party centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System needs to provide the attributes of ER Programs, including:  i. The entity that has Title to ERs produced;  ii. Geographical boundaries of the ER Program or project;  iii. Scope of REDD+ activities and Carbon Pools; and  iv. The Reference Level used.  An ER Program for the Carbon Fund should report its activities and estimated ERs in a manner that conforms to the relevant FCPF Methodological Framework C&Is  [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 18.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 37.3** The information contained in a national or centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System is available to the public via the internet in the national official language of the host country (other means may be considered as required).  [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 19.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 37.4** Administrative procedures are defined for the operations of a national or centralized REDD+ Programs and Projects Data Management System; and an audit of the operations is carried out by an independent third party periodically, as agreed with the Carbon Fund  [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 18.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **C 38 Based on national needs and circumstances, ER Program host country selects an appropriate arrangement to ensure that any ERs from REDD+ activities under the ER Program are not generated more than once; and that any ERs from REDD+ activities under the ER Program sold and transferred to the Carbon Fund are not used again by any entity for sale, public relations, compliance or any other purpose** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 38.1** Based on national needs and circumstances, the ER Program host country has made a decision whether to maintain its own national ER transaction registry, or instead to use a centralized ER transaction registry managed by a third party on its behalf  [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 18.2] | | | **YES/NO** | | | | | | |
| [Short assessment] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 38.2** The national or centralized ER transaction registry reports ERs for the Carbon Fund using the accounting methods and definitions described above in the MF  [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 19.2] | | | **YES/NO/N.A.** | | | | | | |
| [This may be non-applicable depending on the specific ER program] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 38.3** An independent audit report certifying that the national or centralized ER transaction registry performs required functions is made public.  [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 19.2] | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | | | | | | |
| [This may be non-applicable depending on the specific ER program] | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind 38.4** Operational guidance exists, or is in advanced stage of preparation, that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of entities involved in the national or centralized ER transaction registry, as well as rules for operation of the registry.  [Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs 19.2] | | | **YES/NO/N.A** | | | | | | |
| [This may be non-applicable depending on the specific ER program] | | | | | | | | | |

**Annex 1 to the TAP technical assessment**