

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)
Carbon Fund**

Emission Reductions Program Document (ER-PD)

ER Program Name and Country: _____

Date of Submission or Revision: _____

WORLD BANK DISCLAIMER

The World Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in the Emissions Reductions Program Document (ER-PD) submitted by REDD+ Country Participant and accepts no responsibility for any consequences of their use. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in ER-PD does not imply on the part of the World Bank any legal judgment on the legal status of the territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

The Facility Management Team and the REDD Country Participant shall make this document publicly available, in accordance with the World Bank Access to Information Policy and the FCPF Disclosure Guidance (FMT Note CF-2013-2 Rev, dated November 2013).

GENERAL INFORMATION ON COMPLETING THE ER-PD

Purpose of the ER-PD

ER Programs that have been included in the pipeline of the FCPF Carbon Fund are expected to provide detailed information on the design of the ER Program using the template provided in this document. By completing and sending the ER Program Document, a REDD Country Participant or its authorized entity officially submits the ER Program to the Carbon Fund.

The ER Program Document, in combination with other documents such as the country's Readiness Package, provides the information required by the Carbon Fund Participants to decide whether to proceed to negotiating an ERPA for the proposed ER Program.

One type of information that ER Programs are expected to provide in order to be considered in the FCPF Carbon Fund, is a demonstration of conformity with the FCPF Carbon Funds' Methodological Framework. This Framework contains a set of criteria and indicators (C&I) that will be used by Carbon Fund Participants to select ER Programs. The ER-PD will assist ER Programs to provide information on how it meets the criteria and indicators of the Methodological Framework and it will assist review by the Carbon Fund. For ease of reference, and where applicable, the sections in this ER-PD refer to the corresponding criteria specified in the MF.

The Methodological Framework contains a glossary which defines specific terms used in the Methodological Framework. Unless otherwise defined in this ER-PD template, any capitalized term used in this ER-PD template shall have the same meaning ascribed to such term in the MF.

Guidance on completing the ER-PD

Please complete all sections of this ER-PD. If sections of the ER-PD are not applicable, explicitly state that the section is left blank on purpose and provide an explanation why this section is not applicable.

Provide definitions of key terms that are used and use these key terms, as well as variables etc, consistently using the same abbreviations, formats, subscripts, etc.

The presentation of values in the ER-PD, including those used for the calculation of emission reductions, should be in international standard format e.g 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one. Please use International System Units (SI units – refer to http://www.bipm.fr/enus/3_SI/si.html) and if other units are used for weights/currency (Lakh/crore etc), they should be accompanied by their equivalent S.I. units/norms (thousand/million).

If the ER –PD contains equations, please number all equations and define all variables used in these equations, with units indicated.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

>>

Please provide a short (2-page maximum) description of the proposed ER Program, highlighting the key characteristics of the ER Program and the methodological approach applied

2. STRATEGIC CONTEXT AND RATIONALE FOR THE ER PROGRAM

2.1 Current status of the Readiness Package and summary of additional achievements of readiness activities in the country

>>

Indicate the current status of the Readiness Package. Provide information when the Readiness Package was endorsed by the FCPF Participants Committee, and if applicable provide a brief update on REDD+ readiness activities that have taken place since this endorsement. Please reference all relevant supporting information and provide links.

2.2 Ambition and strategic rationale for the ER Program

>>

Please describe the ambition and strategic rationale for the proposed ER Program. Describe the ambition and significance of the ER Program in relation to the total forest-related emissions and removals in the country (please note that a detailed description of the estimation of the ERs expected from the ER Program is included in section 13, here describe the relative importance of the ER Program compared to the overall emissions and removals in the country).

Describe how the ER Program is consistent with national policies and development priorities and will contribute to the development and/or implementation of components of REDD+, specifically the current national REDD+ strategy through the implementation of a variety of interventions.

*Refer to **critterion 1** of the Methodological Framework*

2.3 Political commitment

>>

Please describe the highest level of political commitment to the ER Program, including the levels of support within the different levels of government and whether a cross-sectoral commitment exists to the ER Program and to REDD+ in general.

3. ER PROGRAM LOCATION

3.1 Accounting Area of the ER Program

>>

Please present a description (including location and size, in hectares) of the proposed Accounting Area of the ER Program, including the administrative jurisdictions or national-government-designated area(s) covered by the ER Program and its location in the country. Also provide a map of the Accounting Area, preferably as a GIS shape file (using WGS 84)

*Refer to **critterion 2** of the Methodological Framework*

3.2 Environmental and social conditions in the Accounting Area of the ER Program

>>

Please provide a brief (maximum 2 pages) description of the present environmental and social conditions in the

Accounting Area of the ER Program including:

- Existing vegetation types, including the presence of undisturbed natural forests (short description of the major types and estimation of area as percentage of the total accounting area);
- Climatic conditions and the occurrence (frequency and estimation of areas affected as percentage of the accounting area) of catastrophic climate related events such as those related to wind (hurricanes), drought (fire) or precipitation (floods);
- Soil characteristics (short description of the major soil types, their organic matter content (if known) and estimation of area per soil type as percentage of the total accounting area);
- Presence of rare and endangered species and their habitat;
- Overview of stakeholders and rights-holders, including from the point of view of linguistic and socio-cultural diversity;
- Population demographics and growth;
- Main livelihoods and economic activities in and around the Accounting Area and the dependence of local populations on forest resources.

4. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIONS AND INTERVENTIONS TO BE IMPLEMENTED UNDER THE PROPOSED ER PROGRAM.

4.1 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

>>

Please present an analysis of the drivers, underlying causes and agents of deforestation and forest degradation. Also describe any policies and other activities that are already in place and could contribute to conservation and enhancement of Carbon Stocks. Please provide clearly referenced sources for the analysis.

Please distinguish between both the drivers and policies within the Accounting Area of the proposed ER Program, and any drivers or policies that occur outside the Accounting Area but are affecting land use, land cover and Carbon Stocks within the proposed ER Program Accounting Area. Draw on the analysis produced for the ER-PIN and the country's Readiness Package (R-Package), and identify any remaining gaps in information/data.

*Refer to **critterion 27, indicator 27.1** of the Methodological Framework*

4.2 Assessment of the major barriers to REDD+

>>

Please describe the major barriers that are preventing the drivers from being addressed, and/or preventing conservation and Carbon Stock enhancement from occurring. Draw on the analysis produced for the ER-PIN and the country's Readiness Package (R-Package).

4.3 Description and justification of the planned actions and interventions under the ER Program that will lead to emission reductions and/or removals

>>

Please describe the proposed ER Program Measures (new or enhanced actions, measures, policy interventions or projects), including those related to governance, and justify how these ER program Measures will address the drivers and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation and/or support Carbon Stock enhancement, to help overcome the barriers identified above (i.e., how will the ER Program contribute to reversing current unsustainable resource use and/or policy patterns?). Please explain the prioritization and timelines of the planned ER Program

Measures based on the implementation risks of the activities and their potential benefits.

*Refer to **critterion 27, indicator 27.2** of the Methodological Framework*

4.4 Assessment of land and resource tenure in the Accounting Area

>>

Please describe the land and resource tenure regimes in the Accounting Area based on the assessment carried out during the Readiness phase and, if applicable, an additional assessment of any issues related to land and resource tenure regimes in the Accounting Area that were considered critical for the successful implementation of the ER Program.

If any additional assessment of land and resource tenure regimes in the Accounting Area was necessary, provide the outcome of this assessment including:

- I. 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);*
- II. 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;*
- III. 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*
- IV. Any potential impacts of the ER Program on existing land and resource tenure in the Accounting Area*
Please elaborate how the additional assessment has been conducted in a consultative, transparent and participatory manner, reflecting inputs from relevant stakeholders.

Please describe any relevant issues gaps, conflicts, contested claims and potential impacts related to land and resource tenure regimes in the Accounting Area that have been identified and that are considered critical for the successful implementation of the ER Program and explain how these have been or will be taken into consideration in the design and implementation of the ER Program.

*Refer to **critterion 28, indicators 28.1 and 28.2** of the Methodological Framework*

4.5 Analysis of laws, statutes and other regulatory frameworks

>>

Please provide an analysis of the planned ER Program Measures in the context of relevant local, regional and national laws, statutes and regulatory frameworks, including relevant international conventions and agreements. . Please identify any potential compliance issues of the actions and interventions with these laws, statutes, regulatory frameworks, conventions and agreements; and identify legal and regulatory gaps. If applicable discuss how these issues will be addressed.

4.6 Expected lifetime of the proposed ER Program

>>

Please describe the period over which the planned actions and interventions under the ER Program will be implemented, including proposed start and end dates.

5. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION, AND PARTICIPATION

5.1 Description of stakeholder consultation process

>>

Please describe the stakeholder information sharing and consultation mechanisms or structures that have been used in the design of the ER Program, including the identification of the priority Non-Carbon Benefits, the implementation of necessary safeguards and so forth. As part of this description, explain how the information sharing and consultation mechanisms or structures were in a form, manner and language understandable to the affected stakeholders for the ER Program.

Separately, for the implementation phase of the ER Program, provide an overview of the plans for consultations and meetings, a description of publications and other information used and the mechanisms for receiving and responding to feedback, in order to show how the consultation process will be structured and maintained during this phase.

Describe how the sum of these actions will result in the full, effective and on-going participation of relevant stakeholders. Provide information on how the process builds on the stakeholder outreach and consultation process implemented as part of national REDD Readiness activities.

*Refer to criterion 24, criterion 28, criterion 31 and **indicator 34.2** of the Methodological Framework*

5.2 Summary of the comments received and how these views have been taken into account in the design and implementation of the ER Program

>>

Please provide a summary of the comments received from stakeholders including the main topic, the type of stakeholder and a concise description of the comments (detailed minutes of meetings can be annexed or referenced if publicly available). Describe how these views have been, or will be taken into account in the design and implementation of the ER Program to ensure broad community support

6. OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

6.1 Institutional and implementation arrangements

>>

Please describe the institutional and implementation arrangements for the day-to-day operations of the ER Program. Describe how the ER Program Participants and other involved entities have sufficient capacity to undertake the proposed ER Program operations and to implement ER Program measures, including but not limited to: i) administrative oversight of the ER program; ii) development and operation of the Reference Level and Forest Monitoring System; iii) financial management; iv) Implementation of Benefit Sharing Plan and relevant Safeguard Plan(s); v) feedback and grievance redress mechanism(s); vi) stakeholder consultations and information sharing; vii) implementation of ER Program measures. Describe how the implementation arrangements for the ER Program are linked to any national REDD implementation framework

*Refer to **indicator 27.2** of the Methodological Framework*

6.2 ER Program budget

>>

Please use the table in Annex 1 to provide a budget for the ER Program covering costs and revenues of setting up and operating the ER Program until the end of 2020; and any budget available for proposed operations beyond the end date of the Carbon Fund ERPA. The budget should include cost estimates for measures and components of the ER Program along with any revenue the ER Program Measures may generate. The budget should include the different

sources of funding, including payments from the Carbon Fund, other funders or buyers of ERs, grants, etc. that are available for the ER Program.

In this section, identify any financial shortfalls and propose a strategy to address these funding gaps.

7. CARBON POOLS, SOURCES AND SINKS

7.1 Description of Sources and Sinks selected

Use the table below to state all sources and sinks, associated with any of the REDD+ Activities in the ER Program, which will be accounted as part of the ER Program (add rows as necessary). The same sources and sinks will be accounted for, measured, and reported, and included in the ER Program Reference Level.

Also state sources or sinks, associated with any of the REDD+ Activities in the ER Program, that have been excluded, and justify their exclusion by making conservative assumptions for example on the magnitude of the sources and sinks omitted. 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 (more than 10% of total forest-related emissions in the Accounting Area, during the Reference Period and during the Term of the ERPA). Emissions from forest degradation are estimated using the best available data (including proxy activities or data).

*Refer to **critterion 3** of the Methodological Framework*

Sources/Sinks	Included?	Justification / Explanation
Emissions from deforestation	Yes	At a minimum, ER Programs must account for emissions from deforestation.
Emissions from forest degradation	Yes/No	
Source/sink 3		
...		

7.2 Description of Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases selected

Please use the tables below to state all Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases that will be accounted as part of the ER Program (add rows as necessary). The ER Program should account for significant Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases except where their exclusion would underestimate total emission reductions. For the purpose of the FCPF Carbon Fund, significant Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases are those that contribute to more than 10% of total forest-related emissions in the Accounting Area during the Reference Period).

Explain whether any Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases have been excluded, and if so, justify their exclusion by

making conservative assumptions for example on the magnitude of the Carbon Pools and greenhouse gases omitted.

*Refer to **critterion 4** of the Methodological Framework*

Carbon Pools	Selected?	Justification / Explanation
...

Greenhouse gases	Selected?	Justification / Explanation
CO ₂	Yes	The ER Program shall always account for CO ₂ emissions and removals
...		

8. REFERENCE LEVEL

8.1 Reference Period

>>

Please provide the Reference Period used in the construction of the Reference Level by indicating the start-date and the end-date for the Reference Period. If these dates are different from the guidance provided in the FCPF Carbon Fund Methodological Framework, please provide justification for the alternatives date(s).

*Refer to **critterion 11** of the Methodological Framework*

8.2 Forest definition used in the construction of the Reference Level

>>

Please describe the forest definition used in the construction of the Reference Level and how this definition follows the guidance from UNFCCC decision 12/CP.17¹. 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 FREL/FRL to the UNFCCC) and the definition used in the construction of the Reference Level, then explain how and why the forest definition used in the Reference Level was chosen. If applicable, describe the operational definition of any sub-classes of forests, (e.g., degraded forest; natural forest; plantation) used.

*Refer to **critterion 6, indicator 6.1 and critterion 12** of the Methodological Framework*

8.3 Average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period

Description of method used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period

>>

Please provide a transparent, complete, consistent and accurate description of the approaches, methods, and assumptions used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period, including, an

¹ UNFCCC SBSTA 12/CP.17 Annex Para. 4

explanation how the most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change guidance and guidelines, have been applied as a basis for estimating forest-related greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks.

*Refer to **critterion 5,6 and 13** of the Methodological Framework*

Activity data and emission factors used for calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period

Activity data

Please provide an overview of the activity data that are available and of those that were used in calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period in a way that is sufficiently detailed to enable the reconstruction of the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period. Use the table provided (copy table for each parameter). Attach any spreadsheets, spatial information, maps and/or synthesized data.

If different data sources exist for the same parameter, please list these under the 'Sources of data'. In this case, discuss the differences and provide justification why one specific dataset has been selected over the others.

*Refer to **critterion 6, 7, 8 and 9** of the Methodological Framework*

<p>Description of the parameter including the time period covered (e.g. forest-cover change between 2000 – 2005 or transitions between forest categories X and Y between 2003-2006):</p>	
<p>Explanation for which sources or sinks the parameter is used (e.g deforestation or forest degradation):</p>	
<p>Data unit (e.g. ha/yr):</p>	
<p>Value for the parameter:</p>	
<p>Source of data (e.g. official statistics) or description of the method for developing the data, including (pre-)processing methods for data derived from remote sensing images (including the type of sensors and the details of the images used):</p>	
<p>Spatial level (local, regional, national or international):</p>	
<p>Discussion of key uncertainties</p>	

for this parameter:	
Estimation of accuracy, precision, and/or confidence level, as applicable and an explanation of assumptions/methodology in the estimation:	

Emission factors

Please provide an overview of the emission factors that are available and of those that were used in calculating the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period in a way that is sufficiently detailed to enable the reconstruction of the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period. Use the table provided (copy table for each parameter). Attach any spreadsheets, spatial information, maps and/or synthesized data used in the development of the parameter and if applicable, a summary of assumptions, methods and results of any underlying studies.

If different data sources exist for the same parameter, please list these under the 'Sources of data'. In this case, discuss the differences and provide justification why one specific dataset has been selected over the others.

*Refer to **critera 6, 7, 8 and 9** of the Methodological Framework*

Description of the parameter including the forest class if applicable:	
Data unit (e.g. t CO₂/ha):	
Value for the parameter:	
Source of data (e.g. official statistics, IPCC, scientific literature) or description of the assumptions, methods and results of any underlying studies that have been used to determine the parameter:	
Spatial level (local, regional, national or international):	
Discussion of key uncertainties for this parameter:	
Estimation of accuracy, precision, and/or confidence level, as applicable and an explanation of assumptions/methodology in the estimation:	

Calculation of the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period

Based on the method, activity data and emission factors described above; please provide a step-by-step calculation of the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period. Attach any spreadsheets used in the calculation.

8.4 Upward or downward adjustments to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period (if applicable)

Explanation and justification of proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period

>>

If applicable, please provide a transparent and complete explanation and justification of any proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period. This should include an executive summary of assumptions, methods and results of any underlying studies that have been used to determine the adjustment.

If an upward adjustment above the average annual historical emissions is proposed, please describe:

- a) How the ER Program meets the eligibility requirements for these type of adjustments as described in the FCPF Carbon Fund Methodological Framework;*
- b) Provide a credible justification for the upward adjustment 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. Please attach or provide reference to the documentation that supports the justification.*

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.

*Refer to **critterion 13** of the Methodological Framework*

Quantification of the proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period

>>

If applicable, please provide a transparent and complete calculation for the quantification of the proposed upward or downward adjustment to the average annual historical emissions over the Reference Period. Provide a step-by-step estimation of the expected emissions that would result from documented changes in ER Program circumstances. Attach any documents or spreadsheets used in the calculation.

*Refer to **critterion 13** of the Methodological Framework*

8.5 Estimated Reference Level

Please use the table below to state the estimated Reference Level for the ER Program.

Refer to **critterion 10, indicator 10.1** of the Methodological Framework

ER Program Reference level

ERPA term year <i>t</i>	Average annual historical emissions from deforestation over the Reference Period (tCO _{2-e} /yr)	If applicable, average annual historical emissions from forest degradation over the Reference Period (tCO _{2-e} /yr)	If applicable, average annual historical removals by sinks over the Reference Period (tCO _{2-e} /yr)	Adjustment, if applicable (tCO _{2-e} /yr)	Reference level (tCO _{2-e} /yr)
1					
2					
3					
...					
...					
<i>T</i>					

8.6 Relation between the Reference Level, the development of a FREL/FRL for the UNFCCC and the country's existing or emerging greenhouse gas inventory

>>

Please explain how the development of the Reference Level can inform or is informed by the development of a national FREL/FRL, and explains the relationship between the Reference Level and any intended submission of a FREL/FRL to the UNFCCC. In addition, please explain what steps are intended for the Reference Level to achieve consistency with the country's existing or emerging greenhouse gas inventory.

Refer to **critterion 10, indicators 10.2 and 10.3** of the Methodological Framework

9. APPROACH FOR MEASUREMENT, MONITORING AND REPORTING

9.1 Measurement, monitoring and reporting approach for estimating emissions occurring under the ER Program within the Accounting Area

>>

Please provide a systematic and step-by-step description of the measurement and monitoring approach for estimating the emissions occurring under the proposed ER Program. Be specific and complete, so that future measurement and monitoring can be carried out in a transparent way, using the same standards for measurement, and subjected to verification.

As part of the description, provide an explanation how the proposed measurement, monitoring and reporting approach is consistent with the most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change guidance and guidelines. Where appropriate, describe in the "Source of data or measurement/ calculation methods" the role of communities in monitoring and reporting of the parameter.

Describe how the proposed measurement, monitoring and reporting approach is consistent with the method for

establishing the Reference Level as described in section 8.

Using the table provided, clearly describe all the data and parameters to be monitored (copy table for each parameter).

*Refer to **critterion 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14 and 16** of the Methodological Framework*

Parameter:	
Description:	
Data unit:	
Source of data or measurement/calculation methods and procedures to be applied (e.g. field measurements, remote sensing data, national data, official statistics, IPCC Guidelines, commercial and scientific literature), including the spatial level of the data (local, regional, national, international) and if and how the data or methods will be approved during the Term of the ERPA	
Frequency of monitoring/recording:	
Monitoring equipment:	
Quality Assurance/Quality Control procedures to be applied:	
Identification of sources of uncertainty for this parameter	
Process for managing and reducing uncertainty associated with this parameter	
Any comment:	

9.2 Organizational structure for measurement, monitoring and reporting

>>

Please describe the organization of the measurement, monitoring and reporting including:

- *Organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies;*
- *Methods and standards for generating, recording, storing, aggregating, collating and reporting data on monitored parameters.*
- *Whether and how the measurement, monitoring and reporting system builds upon existing systems, as appropriate*

9.3 Relation and consistency with the National Forest Monitoring System

>>

Please discuss if the approach for measurement, monitoring and reporting is consistent with standard technical procedures in the country and how the approach fits into the existing or emerging National Forest Monitoring System. If applicable, provide a rationale for alternative technical design.

Refer to **critterion 15** of the Methodological Framework

10. DISPLACEMENT

10.1 Identification of risk of Displacement

>>

Using the table below and building on the analysis in sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, please asses the risk for Displacement of emissions from the ER Program Accounting Area to areas outside the Accounting Area as a result of the proposed ER Program Measures.

Refer to **critterion 17, indicator 17.1** of the Methodological Framework

Driver of deforestation or degradation	Risk of Displacement. (Categorize as High, Medium or Low)	Explanation / justification of risk assessment

10.2 ER Program design features to prevent and minimize potential Displacement

>>

Please identify possible risk mitigation strategies associated with each of the risks identified in section 10.1 above. Describe the strategy to mitigate and/or minimize, to the extent possible, potential Displacement, prioritizing the key sources of Displacement risk and justifying how this strategy can impact the Displacement risk ratings.

Refer to **critterion 17, indicator 17.2** of the Methodological Framework

11. REVERSALS

11.1 Identification of risk of Reversals

>>

Please provide an assessment of the anthropogenic and natural risks of Reversal that might affect ERs during the Term of the ERPA and as feasible, the potential risk of Reversals after the end of the Term of the ERPA.

*Refer to **criterion 18, indicator 18.1** of the Methodological Framework*

11.2 ER Program design features to prevent and mitigate Reversals

>>

Please identify possible risk mitigation strategies associated with each of the risks identified in section 11.1 above. Describe how the ER Program design and implementation will contribute to the mitigation of significant risks of Reversal, and will address the long term sustainability of its Emission Reductions, both during the Term of the ERPA and beyond the Term of the ERPA.

*Refer to **criterion 18, indicator 18.2** of the Methodological Framework*

11.3 Reversal management mechanism

Selection of Reversal management mechanism

Please select one of the options identified in the Methodological Framework to account for Reversals from ERs that have been transferred to the Carbon Fund during the Term of the ERPA.

*Refer to **criterion 19** of the Methodological Framework*

Reversal management mechanism	Selected (Yes/No)
Option 1: The ER Program has in place a Reversal management mechanism that is substantially equivalent to the Reversal risk mitigation assurance provided by the ER Program CF Buffer approach	
Option 2: ERs from the ER Program are deposited in an ER Program -specific buffer, managed by the Carbon Fund (ER Program CF Buffer), based on a Reversal risk assessment.	

For option 1, explanation of Reversal management mechanism

If option 1 has been selected above, please describe the Reversal management mechanism that has been put in place and explain how the Reversal management mechanism:

- *Is substantially equivalent to the Reversal risk mitigation assurance provided by the ER Program CF Buffer approach; and*
- *Is appropriate for the ER Program's assessed level of risk; and*
- *Will, in the event of a Reversal during the Term of the ERPA, be used to fully cover such Reversals*

Refer to **critterion 19** of the Methodological Framework

For option 2, explanation of Reversal management mechanism

If option 2 has been selected above, please provide a summary of the Reversal risk assessment and the resulting number of ERs from the ER Program that will be deposited in the ER Program CF Buffer (full risk assessment should be annexed to the ER-PD).

Refer to **critterion 19** of the Methodological Framework

11.4 Monitoring and reporting of major emissions that could lead to Reversals of ERs

>>

Please describe the monitoring mechanism that will be put in place to monitor and report major emissions in the Accounting Area or changes in ER Program circumstances that could lead to Reversals of ERs transferred to the Carbon Fund during the Term of the ERPA.

Refer to **critterion 21** of the Methodological Framework

12. UNCERTAINTIES OF THE CALCULATION OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS

12.1 Identification and assessment of sources of uncertainty

>>

Please systematically identify and assess sources of uncertainty associated with calculation methods that contribute to the uncertainty of the estimates of emissions and removals and assess their relative contribution to the overall uncertainty of the emissions and removals.

Refer to **critterion 7** of the Methodological Framework

12.2 Quantification of uncertainty in Reference Level setting

>>

Please describe how the uncertainty of the estimate of Emission Reductions will be quantified and reported at the time of measurement, monitoring and reporting. If applicable describe the different approaches for separately reporting uncertainty of Emissions Reductions associated with deforestation, forest degradation and enhancements.

Refer to **critterion 9, indicator 9.3** of the Methodological Framework

13. CALCULATION OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS

13.1 Ex-ante estimation of the Emission Reductions

>>

Using the table below, please provide a simplified ex-ante estimation of the expected Emission Reductions of the ER Program within the Accounting Area based on the approach outlined in the FCPF Carbon Fund Methodological

Framework. Where the calculation requires monitored data that is not available yet, use best estimates based on expected impacts of the ER Program and data that might be available from other actions (either in the country or in other countries). List all assumptions, and provide the values used for each parameter and the sources for these data.

*Refer to **critterion 22** of the Methodological Framework*

Ex-ante estimation of the ERs expected from the ER Program

ERPA term year <i>t</i>	Reference level (tCO _{2-e} /yr)	Estimation of expected emissions under the ER Program (tCO _{2-e} /yr)	Estimation of expected set-aside to reflect the level of uncertainty associated with the estimation of ERs during the Term of the ERPA (tCO _{2-e} /yr)	Estimated Emission Reductions (tCO _{2-e} /yr)
1				
2				
3				
...				
<i>T</i>				

14.SAFEGUARDS

14.1 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+

>>

Please describe how the ER Program, through its design and implementation, 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 Please list and briefly describe the Safeguards Plan(s) that have been developed and how said Plan(s) will be implemented in the course of the ER Program.

*Refer to **critterion 24, indicator 24.2** of the Methodological Framework*

14.2 Description of arrangements to provide information on safeguards during ER Program implementation

>>

Please describe the arrangements for providing information 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. Where relevant, provide reference to the descriptions in the Safeguards Plan(s).

*Refer to **critterion 25** of the Methodological Framework*

14.3 Description of the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) in place and possible actions to improve it

>>

Please summarize the assessment of existing FGRM(s), including any applicable customary FGRMs, in place and describe the FGRM procedures for the ER Program. Where applicable refer to descriptions available in other documents such as Benefit Sharing Plan and/or relevant Safeguards Plans. If applicable, provide a description of planned actions to improve the FGRM(s)

*Refer to **critterion 26** of the Methodological Framework*

15. BENEFIT-SHARING ARRANGEMENTS

15.1 Description of benefit-sharing arrangements

>>

Please provide a description of the benefit-sharing arrangements for Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits of the ER Program. Summarize the Benefit-Sharing Plan including the categories of potential Beneficiaries and the types and scale of potential Monetary and Non-Monetary Benefits. Where available, provide a link to the publicly available Benefit Sharing Plan or inform when the Benefit Sharing Plan is expected be concluded and available.

*Refer to **critterion 29 and indicator 30.1** of the Methodological Framework*

15.2 Summary of the process of designing the benefit-sharing arrangements

>>

Please provide a summary of the overall process of designing the benefit-sharing arrangements, including who has been participating in this process and how the process was informed by and builds upon the national Readiness process, including the SESA. Please describe how the benefit sharing arrangements have been prepared as part of the consultative, transparent and participatory consultation process for the ER Program. Please attach evidence of the process and how it reflects inputs by relevant stakeholders, including broad community support by affected Indigenous Peoples as an annex to this document.

*Refer to **critterion 31** of the Methodological Framework*

15.3 Description of the legal context of the benefit-sharing arrangements

>>

Please describe how the design and implementation of the Benefit-Sharing Plan complies with relevant applicable laws, including relevant international conventions and agreements and customary rights if any.

*Refer to **critterion 33** of the Methodological Framework*

16. NON CARBON BENEFITS

16.1 Outline of potential Non-Carbon Benefits and identification of Priority Non-Carbon Benefits

>>

Please outline the potential Non-Carbon Benefits for the ER Program. Identify priority Non-Carbon Benefits, and describes how the ER Program will generate and/or enhance such priority Non-Carbon Benefits. The priority Non-Carbon Benefits should be culturally appropriate, and gender and inter-generationally inclusive, as relevant

*Refer to **critterion 34** of the Methodological Framework*

16.2 Approach for providing information on Priority Non-Carbon Benefits

>>

Please indicate how information on the generation and/or enhancement of priority Non-Carbon Benefits will be provided during ER Program implementation, as feasible, by providing a description of the preferred methods for collecting and providing information on priority Non-Carbon Benefits taking note of existing and emerging guidance on monitoring of non-carbon benefits by the UNFCCC, CBD, and other relevant platforms.

*Refer to **critterion 35, indicator 35.1** of the Methodological Framework*

17. TITLE TO EMISSION REDUCTIONS

17.1 Authorization of the ER Program

Using the table below, please identify the national authority assigned with the responsibility to approve ER Programs in accordance with national laws and regulations, as well as national REDD+ management arrangements. Where applicable, provide a reference to the decree, law or other type of decision that identified this national authority.

*Please include as an annex to this document, the formal letter of approval for the ER Program issued by this national authority***Error! Reference source not found.** . The written approval shall confirm that:

- a) *The REDD Country Participant endorses the proposed ER Program and its consideration for inclusion in the FCPF Carbon Fund; and*
- b) *The ER Program Entity that is proposing the ER Program, whether it be the national government or another entity authorized by the national government, is authorized to enter into an ERPA with the Carbon Fund. This authorization can be provided through the letter of approval or by providing reference to an existing legal and regulatory framework stipulating such authority.*

*Refer to **critterion 36, indicator 36.1** of the Methodological Framework*

Name of entity	
Main contact person	
Title	
Address	
Telephone	
Email	
Website	
Reference to the decree, law or other type of decision that identified this entity as the national authority on REDD+ that can approve ER Programs	

17.2 Transfer of Title to ERs

>>

Please demonstrate the ER Program entity's ability to transfer Title to ERs to the Carbon Fund and provide a tentative risk rating that this ability is clear or uncontested. As part of this demonstration, include a discussion on the implications of the land and resource regime on the ability to transfer Title to ERs to the Carbon Fund. If significant difficulties in the ability to transfer ER titles have been identified, please indicated what proportion of the Accounting Area might be affected and what measures will be taken to establish this ability.

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 section 4.4), and benefit-sharing arrangements under the Benefit-Sharing Plan

*Refer to **critterion 28, indicator 28.3 and criterion 36, indicator 36.2 and indicator 36.3** of the Methodological Framework*

18. DATA MANAGEMENT AND REGISTRY SYSTEMS

18.1 Participation under other GHG initiatives

>>

Please indicate whether the ER Program, or any part of the ER Program, has transferred, or is planning to transfer, any ERs to any other GHG Mitigation Initiative. This would include parts of the Accounting Area that are registered or are seeking registration under project level standards such as the CDM or the VCS.

Please also indicate any actions that might not be included in the ER Program but which could address the drivers of deforestation within the Accounting Area and that have transferred, or are planning to transfer, emission reductions to other GHG Mitigation Initiatives (i.e., improved cook stoves programs under the CDM).

Where the ER Program, or any part of the ER Program, has been registered under any other GHG Mitigation Initiative, provide the registration number(s) and details for each of these.

18.2 Data management and Registry systems to avoid multiple claims to ERs

>>

Please indicate how the ER Program works with the host country to select an appropriate arrangement to avoid having multiple claims to an ER Title. Discuss the choice and implementation of a Program and Projects Data Management System and how this meets the requirements of the Methodological Framework.

In addition please indicate how the ER Program will ensure that any ER from REDD+ activities under the ER Program are not generated more than once; and that any ER 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. Discuss the choice and implementation of an ER transaction registry and how this meets the requirements of the Methodological Framework.

*Refer to **critterion 37 and 38** of the Methodological Framework*

