



# Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

## Readiness Assessment Framework: Preliminary Proposed Approach

Pre-PC Workshop to the Thirteenth Meeting of the FCPF  
Participants Committee

October 20, 2012

Brazzaville, Republic of Congo

# Overview

- PC12 Resolution
- Development of R-Package Assessment Framework
- Proposed Assessment Framework
- Proposed Assessment Process
- Next Steps and PC Actions
- Discussion Questions for Break-out Sessions

## PC12 Resolution on R-Package: *Purpose*

- (i) **Assess progress** on REDD+ Readiness, identify gaps and needs (country self-assessment);
- (ii) **Demonstrate commitment** to REDD+ Readiness and transparency; and
- (iii) **Generate feedback** and guidance to REDD Country Participants through comprehensive assessment processes.

# PC12 Resolution on R-Package: *Scope*

## 1. Readiness Organization and Consultation

- 1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements
- 1b. Consultation, Participation, and Outreach

## 2. REDD+ Strategy Preparation

- 2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance
- 2b. REDD+ Strategy Options
- 2c. Implementation Framework
- 3d. Social and Environmental Impacts

## 3. Reference Emissions Levels/Reference Levels

## 4. Monitoring Systems for Forests and Safeguards

- 4a. National Forest Monitoring System
- 4b. Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards

# PC Resolution on R-Package: *Assessment Process*

- Two stage assessment:
  - (i) A national multi-stakeholder self-assessment performed by a REDD Country Participant; and
  - (ii) An assessment by the PC (with TAP input)
- PC endorsement
  - Upon completion of assessment process

# Development of the Assessment Framework

- **FMT Note 2011-14 (Dec 2011)**
  - Early FMT proposal
  - Based on R-PP review approach (standards-based)
  - Feedback and views discussed at PC11 in Asuncion
- **FMT Note 2012-10**
  - Builds on FMT Note 2011-14
  - Proposes draft readiness assessment approach and country self-assessment process
  - Considers previous comments from FCPF Participants and Observers
  - Incorporates lessons learned and approaches of existing and relevant practices of self-assessment

# Key Messages from Feedback

- R-Package assessment has to be
  - Meaningful, comprehensive and rigorous
  - Practical, resource and cost-effective
    - Build on existing outputs, processes and commitments
  - Flexible
    - Accommodate country capacity and circumstances
  - Actionable
    - Focus on strengths, weaknesses and future actions
  - Consistent with the UNFCCC process

# Characteristics of Effective Assessment Frameworks (1)

- The assessment framework should:
  - Be **generic enough for wide application** while also allowing for tailoring at the country level
  - Use **indicators** that capture decision-making mechanisms
  - Indicators should be **actionable**, and identify **strengths, weakness, and actions**
  - Use the **smallest possible indicator set** (focus on key issues and overall performance)
  - Be **piloted**, which offers an opportunity for refinement.

# Characteristics of effective assessment frameworks\* (2)

- The self-assessment
  - Promotes national **ownership** and prioritizes country-specific issues
  - Uses a **multi-stakeholder workshop** to reach agreement on assessment (workshop facilitation enhances effectiveness)
  - Is **lead by an organizing team** (government, or jointly with stakeholders) with **local expertise, credibility with stakeholders.**

\* **Based on review of existing and relevant practices of self-assessment:**

- *UN-REDD Participatory Governance Assessments*
- *PROFOR Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance*
- *CCBA/CARE International REDD+ Social & Environmental Standards*
- *WRI Governance of Forest Initiative Framework of Indicators*
- *World Bank Land Governance Assessment Framework*

# Proposed Assessment Framework (FMT Note 2012-10)

- For each R-Package subcomponent:
  - **Rationale**
    - Describes the role and function of subcomponent activities in the readiness process
  - **Assessment criteria**
    - Capture core aspects related to each subcomponent
  - **Progress indicators**
    - Capture desired outcome of readiness preparations activities
    - Formulated as diagnostic questions
  - **Guidance notes**
    - Provide guidance, good practice examples, and references

# Proposed Presentation of Assessment Results

- Consensus-based process to assess readiness progress
- For each subcomponent:
  - **Progress scores** that convey a synthesis of the overall achievement in an intuitive fashion

Green	'significant progress'
Yellow	'progressing well, further development required'
Orange	'further development required'
Red	'not yet demonstrating progress'

- Description of **significant achievements** and **areas requiring further development**
- **Actions** that address identified areas for further work

## Rationale

- The national body responsible for leading the REDD+ process conducts consultations with key stakeholders and facilitates their participation in both stages of Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) preparation and implementation, including activities related to national REDD+ strategy, reference levels, and monitoring systems.
- Consultation and participation of key stakeholders builds on early dialogues during the formulation of the R-PP, and the plan for consultation, participation, and outreach that was developed for the R-PP. This process results in a sustainable institutional structure that ensures meaningful participation in decision-making concerning REDD+ strategies and activities beyond the readiness phase.
- This part of the assessment focuses on how consultation, participation, and outreach are conducted during the preparation phase and the platform for consultation with and participation of key stakeholders for future REDD+ programs.
- The R-Package assessment reviews consultations with key stakeholders are performed to ensure participation of different social groups, transparency, and accountability of decision-making.

**Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators)**

- Engagement of key stakeholders
  - How is the full and effective participation of key stakeholders demonstrated?
- Consultation processes
  - What evidence demonstrates that consultation processes at the national and local levels are clear, inclusive, transparent, and facilitate timely access to information in a culturally appropriate form?
- Information sharing
  - How have national REDD+ institutions and management arrangements demonstrated transparent, consistent and comprehensive sharing and disclosure of information (related to all readiness activities, including the development of REDD+ strategy, reference levels, and monitoring systems)?
- Implementation of consultation outcome
  - How are the outcomes of consultations taken into account in management arrangements, strategy development and technical activities related to reference level and monitoring systems development?

**Guidance Notes**

- Countries should draw upon the outcomes of dialogues with key stakeholders and the documentation produced during the formulation and implementation of the R-PP, including the Consultation and Participation Plan, Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA), and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF).
- Information should be consistent with applicable World Bank and/or other Delivery Partner safeguard policies as provided for under the Common Approach, FCPF/UN-REDD Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness, and FCPF Guidelines on the Disclosure of Information.
- Countries should explicitly address identified stakeholders' concerns about potential social economic and environment risks and impacts, and expectations of potential delivery of benefits of proposed REDD+ activities.

### Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators)\*

- Clear, step-wise methodology
  - Is the preliminary sub-national or national forest REL or RL presented using a clearly documented methodology based on a step-wise approach?
  - Are plans for additional steps and data needs provided, and is the relationship between the sub-national and the evolving national reference level demonstrated?
- Historical data and adjustment for national circumstances
  - How does the establishment of the REL/RL take into account historical data, or if adjusted for national circumstance, what is the rationale and supportive data that demonstrate that proposed adjustments are credible and defensible?
  - Is sufficient data and documentation provided to allow for the reconstruction of the REL/RL?
- Consistency with UNFCCC & IPCC guidance/guidelines
  - Is transparent, complete and accurate information consistent with UNFCCC guidance and the most recent IPCC guidance and guidelines provided, allowing for technical assessment of the data sets, approaches, methods, models, if applicable, and assumptions used in the construction of a reference level?

\* Rationale and Guidance Notes [see example in FMT 2012-10]

# Assessment Process

## Stage 1: National Multi-Stakeholder Self-Assessment

### – Basic steps

1. **Identification** of organizer, sponsor and/or funder of assessment process
2. **Preparation**, including compilation of inputs, review of assessment framework, development of a process schedule
3. **Facilitation**, e.g., multi-stakeholder workshop, focus groups, stakeholder interviews, field visits, desk review, independent review, or a combination
4. **Synthesis** of feedback and outcomes, including progress score, significant achievements and areas for further development, and forward looking actions
5. **Dissemination and validation**, including inputs, outputs and outcomes

### – R-Package consists of

- Summary of the readiness preparation process
- Key outcomes for nine readiness subcomponents
- Supporting documentation (technical reports, strategy documents etc.)
- Report of the self-assessment process

# Assessment Process

## Stage 2: PC Assessment

- Follow practice established through the R-PP review process
  - Independent TAP review using the same nine subcomponents, assessment criteria and progress indicators
  - TAP documents assessment, provides feedback and proposes guidance actions
- Possible modifications
  - TAP may choose to include additional criteria and indicators (based on previously identified issues e.g., in the PC resolution for R-PP)
  - TAP process may include in-country assessment by TAP members
- PC receives
  - Country self-assessment and TAP assessment as independent inputs
  - Reports from Delivery Partner and others to inform the assessment
- PC considers the R-Package with a view to adopting a resolution endorsing the R-Package

# Next Steps and Actions for the PC

- At PC13
  - Update PC and solicit feedback and guidance on proposed assessment approach in FMT Note 2012-10
  - PC to identify means and timeline for soliciting further feedback
  - PC to consider ways to test the framework (in-country)
- Next steps
  - Incorporate PC13 feedback and solicit further input
  - Pilots (early 2013) and further revisions
- Draft assessment framework submitted to PC14

# Discussion Questions

- **Assessment criteria and indicators**
  - Do the proposed assessment criteria adequately capture the essential core elements of readiness progress?
  - Do the proposed diagnostic questions reflect an appropriate degree of readiness progress?
  - What form of guidance is most useful, including the desired level of detail?
  - Are relative progress scores (presented in tandem with strengths and weaknesses and actions going forward) a clear and understandable means of summarizing assessment and communicating progress?
- **Assessment process**
  - Does the note contain an adequate level of detail on the assessment process?
  - In practice, how can countries draw on existing platforms/protocols/procedures to perform the self-assessment?

# Break-Out Session (until 12:00)

## FMT Facilitation

	ENGLISH	FRENCH	SPANISH
Room	Equateur	Djiri	Maya
Facilitation	Kate Cecys Ken Andrasko	André Aquino Benoît Bosquet	Leonel Iglesias Peter Saile
Synthesis	Simon Whitehouse	Erin Conner	Nina Doetinchem
Specific Questions	Alex Lotsch (Readiness Assessment Framework) Stephanie Tam (Mid-term Progress Reporting)		