

## Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)

### Draft Logical Framework

March 16, 2012

*This note on draft logical framework comprises of three sections: (A) the comments received from Participant Committee members (Canada, Denmark, Germany and Norway) on the draft logical framework version dated January 29, 2012, and FMT responses to the comments; (B) a summary of comments and request for PC guidance on proposed next steps; and (C) a revised version of the draft logical framework addressing some of the comments received (in Annex 1). Changes from the January 29, 2012 version are highlighted in yellow in Annex 1.*

*Please note that comments that require major changes to the logical framework will be addressed based on PC guidance at PC11.*

*The FMT welcomes feedback from the PC on the following: (i) Should the FMT proceed with the development of an M&E framework only, which would include the relevant elements already captured in draft logical framework and incorporating suggestions? (ii) Should the logical framework be revised based on the comments received and finalized for monitoring progress in addition to the M&E framework? (iii) Is there a need for a second evaluation of the FCPF, and, if so, when?*

#### A. Comments from PC members on draft Logical Framework and FMT responses

Comment		Response
<b>General</b>		
1	Overall, we consider the log frame to be a very positive step, and a move towards addressing one of the FCPF program evaluation's recommendations to develop and operationalize a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework for the readiness process (and in future, the Carbon Fund) (Canada)	Thank you.
2	In terms of reporting, we would encourage the FMT to consider regular reporting on the log frame as a complement to the existing reporting in the	Noted. This proposal would be viewed together with reporting on the basis of an M&E framework.

	FCPF Annual Report, as appropriate. (Canada)	
3	It is emphasized that the log frame is seen more as a planning tool than a monitoring and evaluation framework, however, the background information presented does not give a clear insight as to what the exact purpose of the log frame is, and how and by whom it will be used and reported on. Clarification on this would be required. (Norway)	The log frame was prepared to guide and prioritize key activities that should be undertaken by FCPF partners in the coming 3-4 years to achieve the FCPF objectives (outcomes). It was designed as a tool to keep track of the overall progress at the Program level. The FMT would report the progress at the FCPF Program level using the indicators included in the log frame.
<b>Does the log frame capture the main strategic thrust of the FCPF for the next three-four years?</b>		
4	We are in agreement that the log frame captures the main strategic thrust of the FCPF for the next 3 to 4 years. (Canada)	Thank you for the confirmation.
5	By aligning outcomes directly to the FCPF objectives as stated in the Charter and by defining output indicators relevant to the activities of the next years, the log frame captures indeed the strategic thrust. (Germany)	Thank you for the confirmation
6	The context of the FCPF has changed substantially since its establishment in 2007. It was set up as a pilot program to prepare countries for a REDD+ mechanism to take effect in 2012. A 'global climate agreement of legal force' will only take effect after 2020, while it is unclear how demand for emission reductions from REDD+ will be financed in the 2012-20 period to deliver on our agreed goal in the UNFCCC to slow, halt and reverse forest cover and carbon loss. We think this fundamental change in FCPF's "business environment" merits a PC discussion on whether the strategic objectives from the charter are still relevant, or whether a more ambitious strategy should be developed for the facility that clearly positions FCPF within the overall objective as mention above. (Norway)	The Participants Committee may wish to discuss this proposal, possibly in a session dedicated for this purpose at a future PC meeting.
<b>How outcome indicators could be sharpened and made more relevant, actionable and measurable; and</b>		
7	<i>Comments on specific Outcomes: Countries are ready to reduce emissions from deforestation and/or forest degradation and have the capacity to benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives for REDD+ (Readiness Fund)</i>  - This program outcome has the most concrete outcome indicators, which will be straightforward to measure and assess progress. However, the rationale for the numbers is unclear, i.e. how was it decided that 10	Rationale for 10 readiness packages to be endorsed by the PC: This is a best estimate of minimum Readiness Packages that could be endorsed by the PC by 2015 and is based on the average time that countries are expected to take to complete readiness. It is estimated that countries may take up to 3 years to sufficiently advance on readiness and be able to submit a Readiness Package. On this basis countries that signed

	<p>Readiness Packages would be endorsed by the PC (by 2015)? (Canada)</p>	<p>readiness agreements in 2010-2011 are expected to have sufficiently advanced in the next 3 years to submit the Readiness Package in 2013-2014 (DRC, Mexico, Indonesia, Ghana, Nepal). An equal number of countries are expected to submit readiness packages in 2015. Ten is an indicative number and the actual could be higher as indicated in the indicator '10 (or more)'.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><i>Selected FCPF countries demonstrate key elements of performance-based payment systems for emission reductions generated from REDD+ activities with a view to ensuring equitable benefit sharing and promoting future large-scale positive incentives for REDD+ (Carbon Fund)</i></p> <p>- We would propose reversing the order of the elements captured within program outcome, to read: "With a view to ensuring equitable benefit sharing and promoting future large-scale positive incentives for REDD+, selected FCPF countries demonstrate key elements of performance-based payment systems for emission reductions generated from REDD+ activities." (Canada)</p>	<p>The language for this Program Outcome (and others) is taken directly from the objectives of the FCPF as stated in the FCPF Charter, Section 2.1. It is desirable to use the same language for consistency.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>-We are confused by the use of the terms "outcomes" and "outputs" throughout the Log Frame. Definitions would be highly appreciated. According to our understanding, most of the indicators refer to outputs or even activities and inputs, and only very few refer to outcomes. Nevertheless, some of these (output) indicators have improved since the last draft, notably those for objectives 1+2. They are relevant, actionable and measurable.</p> <p>For the remaining objectives (3+4), indicators still need to be sharpened, as the current ones are not specific enough or not easily measurable. Also, it seems that the FMT or Delivery Partners have no output responsibility in achieving objective number 3, but responsibility seems to rest solely with IPs, CSOs and other REDD country stakeholders. Considering the range of activities suggested within the Strategic Issues Note or triggered by the Common Approach, the FMT does not do justice to their own and DP's inputs for the achievement of this objective. (Germany)</p>	<p>Explanation of terms is added as footnotes 1 and 2.</p> <p>FMT and DP's role is added. Indicators list has been revised based on comments received</p>

10.	<p>Also, a more balanced number of indicators between objective 2 (Carbon Fund, currently 5 indicators) and 3 (Co-Benefits, currently 2 indicators) would be appreciated. Merging the previously 2 indicators for livelihoods and biodiversity into one does not make the indicator any SMARTer. Instead, it could be split into 3, e.g.</p> <p>1) R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to the FCPF demonstrate that relevant stakeholders have actively engaged in implementation of national REDD+ Readiness processes.</p> <p>2) R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to the FCPF demonstrate that ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities are being tested.</p> <p>3) R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to the FCPF demonstrate that ways to conserve biodiversity are being tested.</p> <p>Further work would be needed by M&amp;E specialists in order to agree on how to make such qualitative indicators measurable. (Germany)</p>	Suggestion incorporated in revised draft.
11.	<p>Perhaps the “outcome indicator” with respect to outcome 3 (“enhance livelihoods and conserve biodiversity”) needs to specifically refer to the completion of SESA work (e.g.: “x number of countries have included SESA and ESMF in the readiness packages and/or emissions reduction programmes”). The logic here is that the SESA is supposed to be used to identify priorities and opportunities for enhancing livelihoods and conserving biodiversity (as an output). Thus, the completion (and use) of such studies will be an important (and useful...) outcome indicator. Otherwise the indicators that are mentioned with respect to outcome 3 (“identify ways...”, “provide inputs on ways...”) are a bit vague and perhaps difficult to measure. (Denmark)</p>	Suggestion is incorporated
12.	<p>This question depends on the purpose of the exercise. Many of the proposed indicators are phrased as objectives rather than indicators. Indicators – if used – should enable us to verify the status of outcomes (measuring the degree of achievement/outcome level) and should further be phrased as a variable (number of.., share of..). Otherwise it cannot handle results that fall short of the objective. E.g. what if the score in the first indicator is 29? Also, a baseline is necessary.</p>	Suggestion for rephrasing the indicators is a good one and will add clarity to the framework. This suggestion will be incorporated in the revised version of the log frame, if the PC decides to retain the log frame in addition to the M&E framework as this will require substantive changes. (see response to comments 15 and 16).

Program outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Status	Target	<p>The choice of indicators is based on the key milestones that are envisaged to be completed for achieving the desired outcome. For example, completion of due diligence by countries in preparation of signing the readiness grant indicates the beginning of readiness process in the country. The completion of mid-term review is a measure of advancement made in readiness; and successful assessment of Readiness Package by the PC indicates that country is sufficiently advanced in readiness and prepared for undertaking implementation of its strategy.</p> <p>Some indicators, such as methodological framework for the carbon Fund and pricing approach are prerequisites to enable countries to participate in the Carbon Fund. These are thus measures of progress made in creating necessary frameworks to allow countries to demonstrate performance based payments for emission reductions generated from REDD+.</p>
	Number of countries that have undergone due diligence	15	22 (Q1 2014)	30 (Q4 2015)	
<p>A number of the indicators in the log-frame are copies of the outputs, and thus stating that the output has been completed, not what its effect was. It is important to clarify what each indicator is measuring and why they are being used. (Norway)</p>					
<p><b>Additional or alternative outputs (key deliverables) that would help the FCPF achieve the respective outcomes.</b></p>					
13.	<p>Yes, especially with relation to Objective 3 + 4, e.g., south-south-learning activities, workshops, PC knowledge-sharing panels etc., multi-stakeholder and public consultation of R-Package Assessment Standards as happening right now, the FMT's presence in relevant international fora and expert meetings, PC members feedback to their own institutions - all help to disseminate the knowledge gained in the FCPF and to promote objective 3. Further outputs might be identified with the help of an M&amp;E team. (Germany)</p>				<p>Suggestions are included in the revised draft of the log frame.</p>
14.	<p>The listed Program outcomes are not what normally are considered outcomes. Outcomes should be effects – i.e. the consequences of one or more outputs. All four outcomes have characteristics of activities/outputs at a lower level. What will these outcomes lead to? Why are they purposeful? Program outcome 2 mixes two different things into one statement: The introduction of performance-based payment and ensuring equitable benefit sharing should be separated – at least for measuring purposes if we are to</p>				<p>The FMT acknowledges the differences in interpretation resulting from the differences in terminology used for ‘outcomes’ and ‘outputs’. The outcomes which are by default the FCPF objectives as stated in the Charter should eventually result in achieving the overall objective of the FCPF i.e. reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.</p>

	<p>measure them (which again is not clear) (if the Charter text must be used). (Norway)</p>	<p>The outcome indicators for performance based payments and equitable benefit sharing have been separated.</p>
<p><b>Need for M&amp; E framework</b></p>		
<p>15.</p>	<p>We support the development of an overall M&amp;E framework, which would go beyond the monitoring of outputs that are captured in the logical framework and link the four program outcomes to the overall objective. We would note that, in addition to fully addressing the recent program evaluation's recommendation, a comprehensive M&amp;E framework would place the FCPF in a strong position for the upcoming evaluation by the Independent Evaluation Group, which we understand is planned for the fourth quarter of FY2012 (is this also the understanding of the FMT? (Canada)</p>	<p>We are not aware of an FCPF evaluation planned in fourth quarter by the IEG. Global Program Review of the FCPF by the IEG is ongoing, the findings of which are expected to become available in second quarter of 2012. IEG representatives leading this review will be present in Paraguay. The M&amp;E framework could be useful for future evaluation of the FCPF. The PC may wish to consider the need for and timing of a second evaluation as per FCPF Charter.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>Even though the log frame captures the strategic thrust of the FCPF, it does not respond to the need for a Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Framework as identified by the Evaluation report. The M&amp;E has been discussed before (Draft 2009, FMT Note 2010-13) but the proposed log frame doesn't make any reference to these previous discussions. When defining short- to mid-term outcomes and indicators, we should be able to deduct those from the more long-term desired impacts, outcomes and respective indicators, not the other way around. Otherwise, we risk working towards blurry goals and not being able to evaluate our achievements on the ground. Thus, we suggest engaging an M&amp;E specialist team for the elaboration of a robust long-term M&amp;E framework which can guide future evaluations as well as short- and mid-term log frames. (Germany)</p>	<p>Please note that the logical framework as presented was developed to capture the strategic thrust of the FCPF only, using the objectives as the basis for prioritizing FCPF work programs for the coming years. As mentioned in the preamble to the Logical Framework, the logical framework is not the M&amp;E framework. It therefore does not include an exhaustive list of indicators or outputs that should be monitored. Rather only a core set of indicators have been included to ensure that the activities undertaken are in line with the strategic objectives.</p> <p>FMT has noted the suggestion to create an M&amp;E framework in addition to the logical framework, taking into consideration the earlier draft 2009, FMT Note 2010-13, and will follow up on this request after PC11. The M&amp;E framework is targeted towards impact assessment of the FCPF, its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and would be broader and comprehensive in scope and would likely include the indicators and</p>

		outputs presented in the log frame. Taking note of the comments received, it seems rational to develop a complete M&E framework to serve as basis for monitoring progress.
17.	Further we would like to get information about how the log frame is related to the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Framework as proposed in the FCPF Evaluation Report of June 2011. (Norway)	See response to comment 16.

**B. Summary of comments and possible PC action**

1. The FMT would like acknowledge the very useful comments received on the logical framework from Participants. The key observations made in the comments received are as follows:
  - I. The logical framework captures the main strategic thrust of the FCPF for the next 3 to 4 years (FY15) and could be possibly used to report progress and complement the reporting currently made through the FCPF annual report. Suggestions have been made on improving the logical framework, and clarifying specific indicators and outputs.
  - II. The purpose of the logical framework and the relevance and use of FCPF objectives as the basis of logical framework is not clear. Several comments indicate that indicators are not exhaustive and emphasis of the outputs and indicators used is for tracking key interim activities and deliverables. In this sense, the logical framework does not go far enough in including appropriate indicators that capture effects and impacts of the FCPF program.
  - III. Nearly all comments received propose the need for a more comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the FCPF and/or clarifying the link between the logical framework and the M&E Framework that would be developed based on recommendation of the first FCPF evaluation.

Possible PC action:

2. As was already mentioned in the preamble to the draft logical framework, the scope of the logical framework is not as comprehensive as would be expected from an M&E framework. The exercise was undertaken at the time of consideration of strategic issues emerging from the first FCPF evaluation with the purpose of providing a vision of core activities that should guide the FCPF work in the short term with a view to being on track to meet the FCPF objectives as stated in the FCPF Charter. The M&E framework as the name suggests, would include a framework for future FCPF evaluation, in addition to serving as basis for periodic monitoring of the program.

3. In view of the comments received and the FMT's response, the PC may wish to discuss and guide the FMT on the following questions:
  - I. Should the FMT proceed with the development of an M&E framework only, which would include the relevant elements already captured in draft logical framework and incorporating suggestions?
  - II. Should the logical framework be revised based on the comments received and finalized for monitoring progress in addition to the M&E framework?
  - III. Is there a need for a second evaluation of the FCPF, and, if so, when?

**(C) Revised Draft Logical Framework (March 16, 2012)****Background:**

1. The draft logical framework (log frame) has been prepared to guide the FCPF work program. It builds directly on the FCPF's objectives as defined in its Charter and the pilot role of the Facility in the next few years.
2. The log frame lays out, against the overall FCPF objective, the short- to mid-term goals (2012-2015) for the program in the form of (i) an overall objective; (ii) targeted program outcomes; (iii) progress indicators for these outcomes; and (iv) key outputs for each of these outcomes. The outcomes in the log frame are the four objectives of the FCPF as stated in the Charter.
3. The log frame is not a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework per se. The scope of an M&E framework would go beyond the monitoring of outputs and more into assessment of the impact of the FCPF on REDD+, its effectiveness and sustainability. The PC may wish to discuss the need to define an M&E framework and the timing of future evaluations, at PC meetings in 2012.
4. The outcomes and indicators in the draft log frame are defined to enable REDD Country Participants to achieve REDD+ Readiness and transition to testing performance-based payments in an effective and efficient manner. In this process, REDD Country Participants would submit a Readiness Package and pilot Emission Reductions Programs. The lessons generated by these early movers would help other REDD+ countries to advance to REDD+ Readiness in relatively less time. For this to happen efficiently, the technical support and knowledge management aspects of the FCPF will need to be enhanced.
5. It is important to note that the four program outcomes in the log frame are not independent but are interlinked, although they have different scopes. Specifically, outcomes 1 and 2 are specific to what is to be achieved under the Readiness Fund and Carbon Fund, respectively, and are sequential in that work under the Readiness Fund is necessary to achieve the desired outcomes under the Carbon Fund (e.g., the signing of an Emission Reductions Payment Agreement requires the endorsement of the Readiness Package). Outcomes 3 and 4 are cross-cutting and can progress in parallel with outcomes 1 and 2. For this reason, the indicators and outputs against each of the outcomes differ in scope.
6. For simplicity, the roles and responsibilities for each of the outputs are provided in square brackets.
7. The FMT welcomes feedback from the Participants Committee on the following:
  - i. the extent to which the log frame captures the main strategic thrust of the FCPF for the next 3-4 years;
  - ii. how outcome indicators could be sharpened and made more relevant, actionable and measurable; and
  - iii. additional or alternative outputs (key deliverables) that would help the FCPF achieve the respective outcomes.

### Annex 1: FCPF Draft Logical Framework for FY12-15 (as of March 16, 2012)

Overall objective	Program outcomes	Outcome Indicators <sup>1</sup>	Outputs <sup>2</sup> [and party(ies) responsible]
Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) help mitigate climate change	1. Countries are ready to reduce emissions from deforestation and/or forest degradation and have the capacity to benefit from possible future systems of positive incentives for REDD+ (Readiness Fund)	30 countries undergo DP's due diligence after R-PP assessment by PC for signing of Readiness Preparation Grant Agreement	Timely completion of the R-PP Assessment Note and other procedural requirements [Country, DP]
		20 (or more) countries present mid-term progress reports	Timely implementation of grant funding (substantially equivalent readiness preparation performance by Countries regardless of the DP) [Country, DP, PC]
		10 (or more) Readiness Packages endorsed by PC	Effective technical assistance and guidance to Countries in Readiness process, including approval of Readiness Package guidelines and Readiness Package assessment framework by PC12 [DP, PC]
	2. Selected FCPF countries demonstrate key elements of performance-based payment systems for emission reductions generated from REDD+ activities with a view to ensuring equitable benefit	Operational procedures, business process for ER Programs discussed and endorsed by CF Participants	Operational procedures, business process for ER Programs developed [FMT]
		Working version of CF methodological framework and pricing approach adopted by PC in 2012 and updated periodically to reflect progress in UNFCCC process	CF methodological framework and pricing approach for preparation of high-quality ER Programs developed [PC, FMT]
		At least 5 REDD countries submitted ER-PIN by 2013; of which at least 3 undergo due diligence by WB in	ER Programs prepared for signature [Countries, CF Participants, WB, FMT]

<sup>1</sup> Outcome indicators are qualitative/quantitative measures to assess whether the program outcomes are on track to being achieved.

<sup>2</sup> Outputs are interim steps/key deliverables necessary to achieve the performance targets envisaged by the indicators. For example, for 30 countries to undergo due diligence, the R-PP Assessment Note and other procedural requirements for signing of Readiness Grant Agreement need to be completed.

Overall objective	Program outcomes	Outcome Indicators <sup>1</sup>	Outputs <sup>2</sup> [and party(ies) responsible]
	<b>sharing and promoting future large-scale positive incentives for REDD+ (Carbon Fund)</b>	preparation for signature of ERPAs (taking into account the need to ensure equitable benefit sharing)	
		CF capitalized up to \$350 million as a way of incentivizing large-scale ER Programs	Increased CF capitalization [FMT]
		Number of private participants in CF increased to 5 as a way of testing scaling up positive incentives through private sector engagement	Enhanced interaction with, and marketing to the private sector [FMT]
	<b>3. Within the approach to REDD+, ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities and to conserve biodiversity tested</b>	Activities to test equitable benefit sharing are included in design of ER Programs and developed in accordance with safeguards as per the FCPF guidelines and COP16 Decision	Pilots that test integration of innovative approaches to benefit sharing in readiness planning and through ER Programs [Countries]
		The IP and CSO capacity building programs support proposals that identify ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities	Through their participation in the IP and CSO capacity building programs, IPs and CSOs demonstrate enhanced capacity to identify and support ways to sustain and enhance livelihoods [DPs, Observers, REDD Countries, FMT]
		Inclusion of SESA and an advanced draft of ESMF in 10 [or more]}countries that submit their readiness packages and/or emissions reduction programmes	Through the analytical work conducted in the SESA priorities and opportunities for enhancing livelihoods and conserving biodiversity are identified and these are used in the development of Emission Reduction Programmes.
		1) R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to the FCPF demonstrate that relevant stakeholders have actively engaged in implementation of national REDD+ Readiness processes.	Through the identification of priorities and opportunities in the SESA, relevant stakeholders engage and collaborate in piloting approaches for enhancing local livelihoods and integrating biodiversity values in national

Overall objective	Program outcomes	Outcome Indicators <sup>1</sup>	Outputs <sup>2</sup> [and party(ies) responsible]
		2) R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to the FCPF demonstrate that ways to sustain or enhance livelihoods of local communities are being tested.	Readiness planning and/or ER Program development {REDD countries}
		3) R-Packages and ER Programs submitted to the FCPF demonstrate that ways to conserve biodiversity are being tested.	
	<p><b>4. Knowledge gained in the development of the FCPF and implementation of Readiness Preparation Proposals (under the Readiness Fund) and Emission Reductions Programs (under the Carbon Fund) broadly disseminated</b></p>	<p>Increased number of users, including from Countries, access the website for information and utilize and reference FCPF knowledge products</p> <p>New Countries express interest in observing or joining the FCPF</p> <p>Knowledge products distributed more widely and more frequently, using multiple media</p>	<p>Strategy for dissemination of knowledge at the global level is finalized [FMT].</p> <p>Lessons from piloting of Common Approach are disseminated [DPs, FMT]</p> <p>Global and Regional Dialogues with IPs are conducted [DPs REDD Countries, FMT]</p> <p>South-south-learning activities, workshops, PC knowledge-sharing panels at the PC meetings., multi-stakeholder and public consultation of all key documentation, the FMT's presence in relevant international fora and expert meetings, PC members feedback to their own institutions are used as means to help disseminate the knowledge gained in the FCPF [DPs, PC, Countries, Observers, FMT]</p> <p>Knowledge products and lessons learnt related to Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 are disseminated to targetstakeholders in accordance with global and/or national dissemination strategy [FMT at the global level; Countries at the regional and national levels]</p>

**Abbreviations and acronyms used in the log frame**

CF: Carbon Fund

Country: REDD Country Participant

CSO: Civil society organization

DP: Delivery Partner

ER: Emission reduction

ERPA: Emission Reductions Payment Agreement

ER-PIN: Emission Reductions Program Idea Note

FMT: Facility Management Team

IP: Indigenous Peoples

PC: Participants Committee

R-PP: Readiness Preparation Proposal

SESA: Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment

WB: World Bank