



Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

Selecting New Countries into the FCPF

Sixteenth meeting of the Participants Committee (PC16)

Geneva

December 12-15, 2013

Outline

- Background
- Status of Countries
- Selection criteria (including terms of funding)
 - a. Quality of R-PP;
 - b. Commitment of a Delivery Partner; and
 - c. Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve
 - d. Other factors PC considers relevant
- Proposals and next steps

Background

- In the run-up to PC14 (March 2013), 17 REDD countries expressed interest in joining the FCPF and provided the information requested of them.
- PC14 adopted a resolution on the status of REDD Country Participants and the inclusion of new countries:
 - For existing REDD Country Participants:
 - Set deadlines to submit Revised R-PPs and sign Grant Agreements, to maintain guaranteed access to grant funding.
 - For the selection of new countries:
 - The 17 eligible countries were requested to submit complete R-PPs by July 31, 2013, in part to demonstrate commitment to and progress in Readiness.
 - Countries that did so may present their R-PP for selection at PC16 and/or PC17.
 - Any countries not selected by PC17 will not be selected into the FCPF for funding, unless the PC decides otherwise.
 - Selection criteria were established.

Background

- Task at PC16 is to discuss and decide on:
 1. which new REDD+ countries to select into the FCPF, and
 2. on what terms.

Outline

- Background
- Status of Countries
- Selection criteria (including terms of funding)
 - a. Quality of R-PP;
 - b. Commitment of a Delivery Partner; and
 - c. Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve
 - d. Other factors PC considers relevant
- Proposals and next steps

Status of existing REDD Country Participants: Progress in meeting milestones

- Countries allocated Readiness Preparation grants: 31
- Countries that submitted their Revised R-PP by September 30, 2013: 18/18
- Countries that submitted their Revised R-PP before December 31, 2013: 8/10
 - 2 (Peru, Thailand) will lose guaranteed access to funding if they do not submit by December 31.
- Countries requested to sign Grant Agreement by May 31, 2014: 12/31
 - 19 have not, and will lose guaranteed access to funding if they do not do so by May 31.
- 3 (Bolivia, Gabon, Paraguay) have not submitted an R-PP, losing guaranteed access to funding. They remain eligible subject to the availability of funding.
- Madagascar submitted an informal R-PP, but must submit their R-PP for formal assessment at or before PC17 to maintain guaranteed access to funding.

Status of existing REDD Country Participants: Funding

**Table 3. Summary of Long Term Sources and Uses of Readiness Funding
(in \$ million, as of November 2013)**

Explanation	of which	Totals
Committed Funding (Currently no pledges)		258.5
Committed Uses for funds		
Commitments (grants) to REDD+ Countries (36 @ \$3.8 million) ¹	136.8	
Additional grant funding to DRC (for REDD+ Countries that demonstrate significant progress on readiness)	5	
Less grants to REDD+ Countries who have not submitted an R-PP fo formal assessment by PC14 (3 @ \$3.8) ²	(11.40)	
Net Grant Commitments		130.4
Administrative, Operations, and Country Support of which:		
FY09-13 Actual costs	29.2	
FY14 Budgeted costs	10.6	
FY15-20 Projected costs ⁴	33.6	
Reserve for Delivery Partner capacity for dispute resolution	2	
Total Uses	0.0	205.8
Estimated Reserve: Committed funding less Total Uses		52.7
Reserve allocation for new countries (1/3 of reserve)⁵		17.6
Proposed Commitments		
	Per country	Totals
Reopening of the FCPF to new countries (\$5.8 million per country ⁶ , assuming 3 new countries)	5.8	17.4
Remaining reserve for new countries		0.2

Status of Qualified Eligible REDD Countries

- 17 eligible Countries were requested to submit complete R-PPs to the FMT by July 31, 2013, in part to demonstrate commitment to and progress in Readiness.
- 11 did so, and remain eligible for selection into the FCPF:
 - 1) Belize
 - 2) Bhutan
 - 3) Burkina Faso
 - 4) Cote d'Ivoire
 - 5) Dominican Republic
 - 6) Fiji
 - 7) Nigeria
 - 8) Pakistan
 - 9) Republic of the Sudan
 - 10) Togo
 - 11) Uruguay

Outline

- Background
- Status of Countries
- Selection criteria (including terms of funding)
 - a. Quality of R-PP;
 - b. Commitment of a Delivery Partner; and
 - c. Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve
 - d. Other factors PC considers relevant
- Proposals and next steps

Qualified Eligible REDD Countries: Criteria for selection

- PC14 agreed key criteria to help guide selection of new Countries:
 - a. Quality of the submitted R-PP, as informed by the TAP review;
 - b. Commitment of a Delivery Partner; and
 - c. Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve to provide support to the Country. Until PC17:
 - 2/3 of Estimated Reserve is designated to support existing REDD Country Participants and any other activities approved in the annual budget.
 - 1/3 for support to new Countries selected into the FCPF.
 - d. In addition to (a)-(c), the PC may take into account other factors it considers relevant, such as availability of funding from non-FCPF sources and the demonstrated level of commitment to REDD+.

Criterion a: The quality of the submitted R-PP: TAP review

Table 2. TAP assessment of whether R-PP standards have been met

Component	Belize	Bhutan	Burkina Faso	Cote d'Ivoire	Dominican Republic	Fiji	Nigeria	Pakistan	Sudan	Togo	Uruguay
1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met	Met	Largely Met
1b: Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Partially Met
1c: Consultation and Participation Process	Largely Met	Largely met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2a: Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2b: REDD+ Strategy Options	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
2c: Implementation Framework	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met
2d: Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
3: Reference Level	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially met	Met	Met
4a: Monitoring – Emissions and Removals	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met
5: Budget	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met
6: Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met

Criterion a: The quality of the submitted R-PP: PC Working Group review

Table 3. PC Working Group assessment of whether R-PP standards have been met

	Belize	Bhutan	Burkina Faso	Cote d'Ivoire	Dominican Republic	Fiji	Nigeria	Pakistan	Sudan	Togo	Uruguay
1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
1b: Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met
1c: Consultation and Participation Process	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2a: Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
2b: REDD+ Strategy Options	Partially Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met
2c: Implementation Framework	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Met	Partially Met	Met	Largely Met
2d: Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met
3: Reference Level	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Not Met	Largely Met	Met
4a: Monitoring – Emissions and Removals	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Largely Met	Largely Met
4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Partially Met
5: Budget	Partially Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Met
6: Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Partially Met	Met	Met

Criterion b: Commitment of a Delivery Partner specified by the Country

- No new Country can work with a Delivery Partner other than the World Bank
 - (Unless the potential Delivery Partner of one of the ten already approved countries does not confirm it will act as such. The potential Delivery Partner is yet to confirm its role in CAR, Panama and Paraguay.)
- All 11 Countries have confirmed their willingness to work with the World Bank as Delivery Partner, if selected.
- The World Bank has confirmed its commitment to acting as Delivery Partner in ten of the candidate Countries, should they be selected. Discussions in one Country are ongoing.

Criterion c: Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve

- Estimated cost of including a new Country with access to grant of \$3.8 million: approximately \$5.8 million.
 - Includes \$650,000 for Delivery Partner support to each Country.
 - FMT time for country advisory services and secretarial support
 - Support to attend PC/PA meetings.
- Current funding available allows for selection of up to 8 new countries on the same terms as existing REDD Country Participants.
- If additional funding is available at PC17, any Country not selected at PC16 can re-submit their R-PP for consideration at PC17.

Criterion c: Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve

**Table 3. Summary of Long Term Sources and Uses of Readiness Funding
(in \$ million, as of November 2013)**

Explanation	of which	Totals
Committed Funding (Currently no pledges)		258.5
Committed Uses for funds		
Commitments (grants) to REDD+ Countries (36 @ \$3.8 million) ¹	136.8	
Additional grant funding to DRC (for REDD+ Countries that demonstrate significant progress on readiness)	5	
Less grants to REDD+ Countries who have not submitted an R-PP fo formal assessment by PC14 (3 @ \$3.8) ²	(11.40)	
Net Grant Commitments		130.4
Administrative, Operations, and Country Support of which:		
		75.4
FY09-13 Actual costs	29.2	
FY14 Budgeted costs	10.6	
FY15-20 Projected costs ⁴	33.6	
Reserve for Delivery Partner capacity for dispute resolution	2	
Total Uses	0.0	205.8
Estimated Reserve: Committed funding less Total Uses		52.7
Reserve allocation for new countries (1/3 of reserve)⁵		17.6
Proposed Commitments		
	Per country	Totals
Reopening of the FCPF to new countries (\$5.8 million per country ⁶ , assuming 3 new countries)	5.8	17.4
Remaining reserve for new countries		0.2

Criterion c: Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve

- PC14 considered other options, but FMT does not recommend these:
 - FMT does not recommend allocating smaller grants to some Countries to allow for selecting a greater number of Countries. All REDD Country Participants should have equal access to equal grant funding.
 - PC allocates “up to \$3.8 million” to each Country.
 - Country and Delivery Partner then determine exact amount of the Grant Agreement, based on the Country’s needs. (To date, all Grant Agreements have been for the maximum amount.)
 - Delivery Partner incurs a minimum level of costs regardless of grant size.
 - FMT does not recommend allowing Countries to be observers with no funding.
 - Additional costs if support meeting attendance (~\$7,000 for one PA/PC meeting).
 - Operational challenges for the FMT when organizing meetings.
 - Limited benefit in observing discussions once a year with no further support.
 - Countries have benefited from significant TAP/PC feedback/vetting on their Readiness; in a strong position to continue, seek support from other sources.

Consideration of other criteria

- In addition to the key criteria a-c, the PC may take into account other factors it considers relevant, such as the availability of funding from non-FCPF sources and the demonstrated level of commitment to REDD+.

Outline

- Background
- Status of Countries
- Selection criteria (including terms of funding)
 - a. Quality of R-PP;
 - b. Commitment of a Delivery Partner; and
 - c. Availability of sufficient resources in the Estimated Reserve
 - d. Other factors PC considers relevant
- Proposals and next steps

Proposals and Next Steps

- Select new Countries on the same terms as existing REDD Country Participants (\$3.8 million Readiness Preparation grant plus FMT/Delivery Partner support)
 - Limited benefit and even additional challenges in including Countries on lesser terms.
- Sufficient funds available in the 1/3 set-aside to support up to 8 new Countries on these terms.
 - Identify Countries to be selected.

Next Steps

- Countries not selected may revise/submit their R-PP for consideration at PC17.
 - Limited to any of the 11 eligible Countries that is not selected at PC16. No other Countries may submit.
 - Currently insufficient funds available for new Country selection at PC17. New funds would need to be contributed.
 - Countries would need to continue refining their R-PP with no guarantee that sufficient funds will be available (unless new funds are received).
 - However, Countries would benefit from additional TAP reviews and feedback to strengthen the Readiness work, and would be in a strong position to seek funds from other sources.



THANK YOU!

www.forestcarbonpartnership.org