Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)

Readiness Fund

Assessment Framework for the Readiness Package: Preliminary Proposed Approach

Draft for Discussion

October 5, 2012

The twelfth meeting of the FCPF Participants Committee (PC) defined the purpose, scope and assessment and endorsement process for the readiness package (R-Package), and tasked the FCPF Facility Management Team (FMT) to initiate the development of a readiness assessment framework. To update the PC and solicit feedback, a preliminary assessment approach is presented in this note as basis for discussion.

Expected PC13 action: *Participants provide FMT further guidance on the development of the R-Package assessment framework. A half-day workshop prior to PC13 (October 20, 2012) is organized to discuss the proposed draft assessment framework with Participants and Observers, and solicit feedback on (i) the format and presentation of the framework, (ii) the choice of assessment criteria and indicators, (iii) the assessment process, and (iv) ways to test the framework in a country setting prior to PC14.*

Background

1.   At the twelfth meeting of the PC in June 2012 (PC12), Participants adopted a resolution defining the purpose, scope, and assessment and endorsement process of the readiness package (R-Package). In short:

- The purpose of the R-Package is to (i) provide REDD Country Participants an opportunity to self-assess progress on REDD+ readiness, and to identify remaining gaps and further needs, (ii) demonstrate a REDD Country Participant's commitment to REDD+, and to (iii) generate feedback and guidance through a comprehensive assessment by the country and the PC;

- The scope of the R-Package is national and encompasses all readiness preparation activities, notably (1) readiness organization and consultation, (2) REDD+ strategy preparation, (3) reference levels and (4) monitoring systems for forests and safeguards (a total of nine corresponding subcomponents that mirror the activities in the national R-PP); and,

- The assessment and endorsement process consists of (i) a multi-stakeholder self-assessment by the country, and (ii) an assessment by the PC.[1]

2.   At PC12, Participants tasked the FMT to initiate the development of assessment framework for the R-Package on the basis of existing practices of self-assessment[2], and feedback from Participants and Observers with the view to produce a draft framework by PC14 for review and approval. The present

---

[1] See resolution PC12/2012/1 for the full description of the agreed purpose, scope, assessment and endorsement process.
[2] Annex I provides a concise synthesis of findings from a review of relevant assessment frameworks.

note proposes a format for the assessment approach – including assessment criteria corresponding to each of the nine subcomponents of the R-Package – with the objective of receiving input from Participants and guidance from PC13 for further development.

3.   The proposed assessment framework is to be applied to both the (i) national multi-stakeholder self-assessment performed by a REDD Country Participants; and (ii) an assessment by the PC (including input from the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) and the Delivery Partner). It builds on FMT Note 2011-14, which presented an early draft assessment framework and considers the scope and purpose of the R-Package that was agreed by the PC in June 2012. The proposed framework also incorporates the feedback that was previously received during an earlier commenting period.[3] Accordingly, the draft assessment framework is structured to be:

- Meaningful, comprehensive, and rigorous; but also,
- Practical, resource and cost-effective (it can build on existing outputs, processes and commitments);
- Flexible (to accommodate country capacity and circumstances);
- Actionable (focus on strengths, weaknesses, and actions going forward); and,
- Consistent with the UNFCCC process.

Proposed Assessment Framework

4.   The assessment framework follows the agreed structure of the R-Package and for each subcomponent provides:

- *Rationale* that describes the role and function of subcomponent activities in the readiness process;
- *Assessment criteria* that capture core aspects related to each subcomponent;
- *Progress indicators* that capture the desired outcome of readiness preparations activities. Here, indicators are formulated as diagnostic questions to focus the assessment on the relative progress in relation the respective assessment criteria[4]; and,
- *Guidance notes* that provide guidance, good practice examples, and references to support and inform the assessment.

5.   The assessment's results are summarized by subcomponent through:

- *Progress scores* that convey a synthesis of the overall achievement in an intuitive fashion. These scores can be qualitatively expressed on a four-color 'traffic light' scale as follows:
    - i.   Green: 'significant progress'
    - ii. Yellow: 'progressing well, further development required'

---

[3] Feedback on proposed assessment 'standards' was presented and discussed in detail at PC11 (see documents under agenda item 4, including FMT Note 2011-14): http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/node/375.

[4] Assessment criteria and progress indicators build on initial draft presented in FMT Note 2011-14. They convey the desired outcome of readiness preparation activities captured in the previous 'standards' but are presented in a format that more clearly sets out assessment criteria to be addressed and indications of progress.

        iii.   Orange: 'further development required'

        iv.   Red: 'Not yet demonstrating progress'

- Description of *significant achievements* and *areas requiring further development*; and,

- *Actions* that address identified areas for further work.

6.   To illustrate the basic structure of the assessment framework two examples are provided here. (The full set of criteria is presented in Annex II.)

Draft Example #1

Component 1: Readiness Organization and Consultation

Subcomponent 1b. Consultation, Participation, and Outreach

Rationale: The national body responsible for leading the REDD+ process conducts consultations with key stakeholders[1] 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?

---

[1] 'Key stakeholders' is defined as: government agencies that influence land use decisions, forest-dependent Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent local communities, civil society, and the private sector.

Draft Example #1 (continued)

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 of progress:

> *[Country to present a progress score that conveys a synthesis of the overall achievement]*

Green	Significant progress
Yellow	Progressing well, further development required
Orange	Further development required
Red	Not yet demonstrating

Significant achievements and areas for further development:

> *[Country to present description of its significant achievements as well as gaps where further work is needed going forward]*

Proposed actions:

> *[Country to propose actions to address identified areas for further work, and required funding as applicable]*

Draft Example #2

Component 3: Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels

Rationale: Estimates of changes in forest area and carbon content over time and the corresponding emissions to and uptake from the atmosphere are used to measure the performance of REDD+ policy interventions relative to a forest reference emissions level (REL) or reference level (RL). Recent UNFCCC decisions[1] request countries to develop a REL/RL as a benchmark for assessing performance in implementing REDD+ activities at a national level, with subnational approaches as interim measures. The REL/RL should be established transparently taking into account historical data, and adjusted for national circumstances.

Information presented in the R-Package reflects the general approach used to establish a REL/RL. This includes compilation and analysis of relevant data, capacity building in the application of proven methods and fundamental techniques (e.g., mapping, field sampling), and assessment of different methodologies. Preliminary results of this work generate fundamental inputs to allow first-order estimates of emission at the national or subnational level and the construction of REL/RL.

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 defendable?

- Is sufficient data and documentation provided to allow for the reconstruction of the REL/RL?

Consistency with UNFCCC guidance and IPCC guidance and 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?

_____

[1] Relevant UNFCCC decisions include Decision 2/CP.13 and Annex; Decision 4/CP.15; Decision 1/CP.16 (paragraphs 69–71 and Appendices I and II); Decision 12/CP.17 (paragraphs 7-15 and Annex).

Draft Example #2 (continued)

Guidance notes: Information should be consistent with UNFCCC guidance[2] and the most recent IPCC guidance and guidelines. Countries are urged to pursue reference level work in a stepwise and iterative approach, with later refinement as improved data, methodologies, and UNFCCC guidelines become available.

- The RL/REL should be expressed in tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year[3].
- The rationale for the approach to RL/REL should be provided[4].
- The information used in the construction of the RL/REL should be transparent, complete, consistent and accurate[5], allowing for the reconstruction of the RL/REL.
- The RL/REL should be established transparently, taking into account historical data[6] or, if adjusted for national circumstances, should include rationale for making adjustments including details on these national circumstances and how they were considered[7].
- The RL/REL should maintain consistency with anthropogenic forest-related greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks as contained in each country's greenhouse gas inventories[8].
    - o The definition of forest used should be clearly provided[9].
    - o The pools and fluxes included should be clearly provided, along with a rationale for the exclusion of any pools or fluxes[10].
    - o The activities included should be clearly provided, along with a rationale for the exclusion of any activities[11].

_____

[2] Relevant UNFCCC decisions include Decision 2/CP.13 and Annex; Decision 4/CP.15; Decision 1/CP.16 (paragraphs 69–71 and Appendices I and II); Decision 12/CP.17 (paragraphs 7-15 and Annex).
[3] Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph 7
[4] Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph 9
[5] Decision 4/CP.15 paragraph 7; Annex to Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph (b)
[6] Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph 8; Decision 4/CP.15 paragraph 7
[7] Decision 4/CP.15 paragraph 9
[8] Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph 8
[9] Annex to Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph (d)
[10] Annex to Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph (c)
[11] Annex to Decision 12/CP.17 paragraph (c)

Assessment of progress:

[Country to present a progress score that conveys a synthesis of the overall achievement]

Green	Significant progress
Yellow	Progressing well, further development required
Orange	Further development required
Red	Not yet demonstrating

Significant achievements and areas for further development:

[Country to present description of its significant achievements as well as gaps where further work is needed going forward]

Proposed actions:

[Country to propose actions to address identified areas for further work, and required funding as applicable]

7.   The criteria proposed are considered essential and represent a core set for the readiness assessment. In the current proposed framework, the total number of assessment criteria is 35 (i.e., approximately four per subcomponent), which is considered a manageable set of criteria to guide the assessment. [5] Using a standard set of criteria and corresponding indicators provides a clear structure and assures a degree of consistency and comprehensiveness in the assessment. That is, by including a certain criteria in the framework prompts an evaluator, stakeholders or TAP member to consider the progress that has been made. At the same time, countries may include additional criteria if they are relevant and important in the given country context (e.g., related to issues that have emerged at the R-PP formulation stage or during implementation).

Key Steps in the Assessment Process

Multi-stakeholder self-assessment

8.   The multi-stakeholder self-assessment by the country is a consensus-based process to assess progress on each R-Package subcomponent. Countries have flexibility to conduct the self-assessment process in a manner that is appropriate given the country-specific context and use existing platforms or protocols (e.g., those established through the SESA or existing government procedures for program monitoring and evaluation). The following are basic steps that are considered essential based on the practices and experiences of other frameworks (e.g., forest governance assessment toolkits and country practices):

- *Identification* of organizer, sponsor and funder[6] of the assessment process. These three roles could be fulfilled by the same or separate entities. The assessment may be organized, sponsored and funded by the Government. It is also conceivable that a bilateral development partner or non-government organization (NGO) is tasked by the Government to organize the process.

- *Preparation*: This step includes:

    i.   compilation of inputs into the assessment process, including relevant documents or outputs of readiness preparation activities (reports, notes, legislation etc.);

    ii. review of the assessment framework (and possibly adding country-specific assessment criteria); and,

    iii. development of a process schedule for the assessment.

- *Facilitation*: An efficient and effective way to conduct the self-assessment is through a multi-stakeholder workshop using mechanisms that were established or enhanced during the readiness preparation phase (e.g., working groups, technical committees, or fora that have a representative cross-section of stakeholders). However, it may not always be possible or appropriate to hold workshops and the assessment may be performed through a series of workshops (possibly with topical focus), focus groups, stakeholder interviews, field visits, desk review etc. or a combination of different formats. Countries may also wish to consider additional assessment components, such as expert/independent inputs or review. It is

---

[5] A full set of proposed assessment criteria and progress indicators (diagnostic questions) is presented in Annex III.
[6] Funding may come from a country's existing budget for monitoring and evaluation activities. Countries that have not explicitly budgeted for monitoring and evaluation may need to source additional funding. Funding may come from a variety of sources.

critical, however, that the methodology for arriving at the assessment's outcome (e.g., by consensus and the interrelationship of the various inputs) is clear. [7]

- *Synthesis*: It is important to capture feedback and the outcome of the self-assessment. Key elements of the synthesis include:

  i. Subcomponent progress scores (color);

  ii. Significant achievements and areas for further development; and,

  iii. Forward-looking actions (and required funding, as applicable).

- *Dissemination* and *validation*. A clear process for public dissemination of all inputs, outputs and outcomes. Could allow for multi-stakeholder validation (of accuracy and completeness) of the draft report before finalization.

9.   Following the self-assessment process, the R-Package can be compiled relatively efficiently by producing a concise document that:

- Summarizes the readiness preparation process and the key outcomes related to the nine subcomponents of the R-Package; and,

- Includes references to (or includes in an Appendix) supporting documents that are output of the readiness preparation process, e.g., a national REDD+ strategy document or legislation; an ESMF document, technical reports that detail REL/RL work or the proposed MRV system etc. (these documents would have been compiled to support and inform the self-assessment process).

The summary, supporting documentation, and the self-assessment report are then submitted to the PC for assessment and review.

PC assessment

10.   The assessment of the R-Package by the PC can follow the practice established through the R-PP review process whereby the PC tasks the TAP to independently review a REDD+ country's progress. The TAP uses the same assessment framework (nine subcomponents, assessment criteria and progress indicators) and may choose to include additional criteria and indicators in the assessment on the basis of previously identified issues (e.g., in the PC resolution for the FCPF grant allocation). The TAP documents its assessment, provides feedback and proposes guidance actions as input to the PC assessment. That is, the PC receives the country's self-assessment and the TAP's assessment as independent inputs to the overall assessment of the R-Package. In addition the PC will receive reports from the Delivery Partner (annual grant reporting or final report) and others to inform the assessment. A possible modification to the current TAP process at the R-Package stage may include in-country assessment by TAP members.

---

[7] The R-Package document is to be produced at a stage when the majority of readiness activities are well advanced or completed, and participatory and consultative approaches were used to perform them. In that sense, producing an R-Package largely entails the synthesis and validation of the activities prior to submission to the PC for assessment. At the same time, conducting a multi-stakeholder self-assessment will incur costs to ensure adequate preparation, an inclusive process, and validation, though these are estimated to be small relative the costs associated with the formulation and implementation of the R-PP activities.

PC endorsement

Upon completion of the assessment process specified above, the PC will consider the R-Package with a view to adopting a resolution endorsing the R-Package. [8]

Next steps

11.   The following steps are anticipated to further develop the assessment framework:

- PC 13 workshop (October 20, 2012): Participants discuss the proposed draft assessment framework and provide feedback on the:

    i. format and presentation of the framework;

    ii. assessment criteria and indicators; and,

    iii. assessment process.

- Public comment period: tentatively November/December 2012 (after Participants' feedback from PC13 is incorporated).

- Testing in REDD+ countries: the revised draft framework is tested in a small number of countries (tentatively one per region). REDD+ Country Participants may wish to consider hosting a short mission to pilot-test the framework.

- Draft framework presented to PC14.

---

[8] Resolution PC12/2012/1.

ANNEX I: Lessons learned from existing and relevant practices of self-assessment

Key findings[9] suggest the assessment framework should:

- Be generic enough for wide application, while also allowing for tailoring at the country level (indicators were generated or adapted at the country level in all assessment frameworks examined).
- Use 'intelligent indicators' that demonstrate how and why decisions are made, rather than what those decisions are (PROFOR, WRI).
- Indicators should be actionable, identifying strengths and weakness in line with national priorities, and actions needed for reform (PROFOR, UN-REDD, LGAF).
- Use the smallest possible indicator set: assessing key issues rigorously is preferable to the superficial assessment of a very broad set of issues (LGAF, UN-REDD).
- Focus on overall system performance, cumbersome approaches (which may be appropriate from a disciplinary perspective) lead to incomplete and unsustainable assessments. In practice assessments used a smaller number of indicators than the framework provides (PROFOR Uganda and Burkina Faso pilots, LGAF), or have been subsequently simplified/streamlined (WRI and CCBA).
- Promote national ownership: Allow for prioritization of issues important to participants and relevant to the national context in order to ensure meaningful assessment and subsequent implementation of reforms (UN-REDD, PROFOR, CCBA, LGAF).
- Use a multi-stakeholder workshop to reach agreement on assessment: Facilitated workshops have proven to be the most useful means of receiving meaningful stakeholder feedback (CCBA).
- Be lead by an organizing team (sometime these are government led, sometimes they are joint government and other relevant stakeholders[10]) with some local expertise in the sector, credibility with stakeholders to encourage participation and acceptance of results, and the ability to run a productive, consensus-orientated stakeholder workshop (PROFOR, LGAF, UN-REDD).
- Be piloted, which offers an opportunity for refinement.

---

[9] Assessment frameworks that were reviewed in detail included: UN-REDD Participatory Governance Assessments; The Program on Forests (PROFOR) Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance; The Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA)/CARE International REDD+ Social &Environmental Standards; WRI Governance of Forest Initiative Framework of Indicators; World Bank Land Governance Assessment Framework (LGAF). The review focused on practical aspects of relevance to the R-package assessment framework. In addition, the review included: Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management of the Montreal Process and of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO); UN-REDD/Chatham House Draft Guidance for the Provision of Information on REDD+ Governance; European Commission's FLEGT; CIFOR Criteria and Indicators Toolbox; WWF/World Bank/IIED The Pyramid; World Bank Framework for Forest Governance Reform; FAO Forest Governance Indicator Development: Early Lessons and Proposed Indicators for Country Assessments; UNFF Use of Criteria and Indicators for Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting on Progress; FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Stewardship.

[10] WRI is the exception, which is intended as a civil society tool.

ANNEX II: Proposed Core Assessment Criteria (by R-Package subcomponent)

Component/Subcomponent	Assessment Criteria
1. Readiness Organization and Consultation	
1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements	1) Accountability and transparency 2) Operating mandate and budget 3) Coordination with national or sector policy frameworks 4) Technical supervision capacity 5) Funds management capacity 6) Feedback and grievance redress mechanism
1b. Consultation, Participation, and Outreach	7) Engagement of key stakeholders 8) Consultation processes 9) Information sharing 10) Implementation of consultation outcomes
2. REDD+ Strategy Preparation	
2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	11) Assessment and analysis 12) Prioritization of direct and indirect drivers 13) Links between drivers and REDD+ activities 14) Actions plans to address natural resource rights, land tenure, governance 15) Implications for forest law and policy
2b. REDD+ Strategy Options	16) Presentation and prioritization of REDD+ strategy options 17) Feasibility assessment 18) Consistency with other policies 19) Integration with relevant strategies and policies
2c. Implementation Framework	20) Adoption of legislation and regulations 21) Transparent and equitable framework 22) National REDD+ information system or registry
2d. Social and Environmental Impacts	23) SESA coordination and integration arrangements 24) Analysis of safeguard issues 25) REDD+ strategy design with respect to impacts 26) Environmental and Social Management Framework
3. Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels	
	27) Clear, step-wise methodology 28) Historical data, and adjustment for national circumstances 29) Consistency with UNFCCC/IPCC guidance and guidelines

4. Monitoring Systems for Forests and Safeguards	
4a. National Forest Monitoring System	*30) Documentation of step-wise approach* *31) Demonstration of early implementation* *32) Institutional arrangements and capacities*
4b. Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards	*33) Identification of non-carbon aspects* *34) Monitoring and reporting capabilities* *35) Information sharing*

ANNEX III: Proposed Assessment Criteria and Diagnostic Questions (by R-Package subcomponent)[11]

Component 1: Readiness Organization and Consultation

Subcomponent 1a: National REDD+ Management Arrangements

Rationale: National REDD+ readiness management has five main functions: (1) manage implementation of FCPF grant-funded activities (e.g., studies), (2) co-ordinate REDD+ readiness activities as defined in the R-PP (e.g., including those funded through other sources), (3) integrate REDD+ into broader national or sector strategies (e.g., national development plan, low-carbon development strategies), (4) manage inquiries, complaints and potentially grievances by stakeholders that may arise during the implementation of preparation activities, and (5) organize information sharing and stakeholder consultation and participation.

Effective readiness management during the preparation phase is indicative of the country's capacity to manage emission reduction programs under REDD+ implementation in the future. This part of the assessment focuses on national REDD+ management arrangements and their effectiveness in fulfilling core functions.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators):

1) *Accountability and transparency*
   - How are national REDD+ institutions and management arrangements demonstrating they are operating in an open, accountable and transparent manner?
2) *Operating mandate and budget*
   - How is it shown that national REDD+ institutions operate under clear mutually supportive mandates with adequate, predictable and sustainable budgets?

3) *Coordination with national or sector policy frameworks*
   - How are national REDD+ institutions and management arrangements ensuring readiness activities are consistent with, coordinated, and integrated into the broader national or sector policy frameworks?
4) *Technical supervision capacity*
   - How effectively and efficiently are national REDD+ institutions and management arrangements leading and supervising multi-sector readiness activities, including the regular supervision of technical preparations?
5) *Funds management capacity*
   - How are institutions and arrangements demonstrating effective, efficient and transparent fiscal management?
6) *Feedback and grievance redress mechanism*
   - What evidence is there to demonstrate the mechanism is operating transparently and impartially, has a clearly defined mandate, and adequate expertise and resources?

Subcomponent 1b. Consultation, Participation, and Outreach

Rationale: The national body responsible for leading the REDD+ process conducts consultations with key

---

[11] Annex III contains the proposed set of assessment criteria and progress indicators (diagnostic questions). Guidance notes for each subcomponent will need to be developed.

stakeholders[12] and facilitates their participation in both stages of 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 how 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):

7) *Engagement of key stakeholders*
   - How is the full and effective participation of key stakeholders demonstrated?
8) *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?
9) *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)?
10) *Implementation of consultation outcomes*
   - 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?

Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation

Subcomponent: 2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance

Rationale: The purpose of the assessment of land use, land- change drivers, forest law, policy and governance, is to identify key drivers of deforestation and/or forest degradation, as well as activities concerning conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks. The assessment also addresses how shortcomings in current land use, and forest law, policy and governance contribute to the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and develops potential solutions. Taking into account the country's past experience in addressing these shortcomings (including the issues that led to underperformance of previous programs), the assessment directly informs the country's REDD+ strategy and identifies ways to address the key deforestation and degradation drivers in a prioritized fashion.

---

[12] 'Key stakeholders' is defined as: government agencies that influence land use decisions, forest-dependent Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent local communities, civil society, and the private sector.

This part of the readiness assessment focuses on the causal relationship between the economic, legal, policy setting of the country and associated patterns of land use change, deforestation and forest degradation.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators):

11) Assessment and analysis
- Does the summary of the work conducted during the R-PP formulation and implementation phases for this component present a complete and comprehensive analysis of recent historical land use trends and assessment of relevant land tenure, natural resource rights and governance issues?

12) Prioritization of direct and indirect drivers
- How was the analysis used to prioritize key direct and indirect drivers to be addressed by the programs and policies included in the REDD+ strategy?

13) Links between drivers and REDD+ activities
- What evidence demonstrates that systematic links between key drivers and REDD+ activities were identified?

14) Actions plans to address natural resource right, land tenure, governance
- Do action plans to make progress in the short-, medium- and long-term towards addressing relevant land tenure, natural resource rights and governance issues in priority regions related to specific REDD+ programs, outline further steps and identify required resources?

15) Implications for forest law and policy
- Does the assessment identify implications for forest law and policy in the long-term?

Subcomponent: 2b. REDD+ Strategy Options

Rationale: The REDD+ strategy forms the basis for the development of a set of policies and programs to reduce emissions from deforestation and/or forest degradation and enhancing carbon uptake from the other REDD+ activities. The strategy needs to address the drivers of deforestation and/or forest degradation identified in the assessment above, including drivers linked to other sectors competing for the same land resources, in the context of the national priorities for sustainable development.

This part of the assessment focuses on the motivation and rationale for countries to engage in any or all of the five REDD+ activities, and the strategic options that were identified and analyzed during preparation to ascertain that actions taken on REDD+ are beneficial, feasible and cost-effective.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators):

16) Presentation and prioritization of REDD+ strategy options
- Are REDD+ strategy options prioritized based on comprehensive assessment of direct and indirect drivers of deforestation, and via a transparent and participatory process?

17) Feasibility assessment
- Are REDD+ strategy options assessed for their social and environmental feasibility, risks and opportunities, and analysis of costs and benefits?

18) Consistency with other policies
- Have major inconsistencies between the priority REDD+ strategy options and policies or programs in other sectors (e.g., transport, agriculture) been identified?

19) Integration with relevant strategies and policies
- Is an agreed timeline and process is in place to resolve inconsistencies and integrate

REDD+ strategy options with relevant development policies?

Subcomponent: 2c. Implementation Framework

Rationale: The implementation framework defines institutional, economic, legal and governance arrangements necessary to implement REDD+ strategy options, and reflects the lessons learned from the implementation of relevant programs in the past. The implementation of REDD+ strategy options is specific to a given country's land uses and legal and social circumstances, and countries have flexibility to tailor their REDD+ interventions to their socioeconomic conditions, drivers of deforestation, and development objectives. Country-specific solutions need to be found to define the role of government, landowners, and other participants in REDD+ transactions, to share and deliver REDD+ benefits (e.g., to local communities), to clarify land tenure, and to mediate associated conflicts, and to manage carbon transactions through a transparent process.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators):

20) *Adoption of legislation and regulations*
- Have necessary legislation and/or regulations related to REDD+ programs and projects have been adopted?

21) *Transparent and equitable framework*
- What evidence is there that the implementation framework is operating in a transparent and equitable manner, and defines e.g., the process for participation in programs, carbon rights, benefits sharing/distribution of benefits, REDD+ financing mechanism/financial architecture and financing modalities, procedures for official approvals, monitoring systems and grievance mechanisms?

22) *National REDD+ information system or registry*
- Is a national geo-referenced REDD+ information system or registry operational, comprehensive of all relevant information (e.g., information on the location, ownership, carbon accounting and financial flows for sub-national and national REDD+ programs and projects), and does it ensure public access to REDD+ information?

Subcomponent: 2d. Social and Environmental Impacts

Rationale: The country receiving FCPF funding for readiness preparation through the World Bank will be required to ensure compliance with the Common Approach. All countries will prepare a country-specific Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). There may also be national legislative requirements related to safeguards or the management of social or environmental risks and impacts that should be identified and addressed. The readiness preparation phase is meant primarily for technical assistance and capacity building activities, with the objective to prepare the country for large-scale intervention yet to come. FCPF grants do not finance any implementation of REDD+ pilots on the ground (investments, pilot projects involving use of land or change in use of land and physical works), that hence could have adverse impacts on communities).

This part of the assessment focuses on implementation of the SESA and the resulting outputs, including the stand-alone ESMF document. It includes a summary describing the public consultation and participation process in which the SESA was embedded, and the main findings and results of SESA. The SESA will be reflected in the preparation of the R-Package components in an integrated way (not as a stand-alone document), mostly in the form of the final REDD+ strategy and the documentation of the consultation and participation process carried out during the R-PP formulation and readiness

preparation stages.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators):

23) SESA coordination and integration arrangements
- Are the necessary institutional arrangements for coordinating the integration of environmental and social considerations into the REDD+ process in place?

24) Analysis of safeguard issues
- What evidence is there that applicable safeguard issues have been fully addressed via relevant studies or diagnostics?

25) REDD+ strategy design with respect to impacts
- How are SESA results and the identification of social and environmental impacts (both positive and negative) used for prioritizing and designing REDD+ strategy options?

26) Environmental and Social Management Framework
- What evidence is there that the ESMF is in place and managing environmental and social risks and potential impacts during the REDD+ strategy implementation phase?

Component 3: Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels

Rationale: Estimates of changes in forest area and carbon content over time and the corresponding emissions to and uptake from the atmosphere are used to measure the performance of REDD+ policy interventions relative to a forest reference emissions level (REL) or reference level (RL). Recent UNFCCC decisions[13] request countries to develop a REL/RL as a benchmark for assessing performance in implementing REDD+ activities at a national level, with subnational approaches as interim measures. The REL/RL should be established transparently taking into account historical data, and adjusted for national circumstances.

Information presented in the R-Package reflects the general approach used to establish a REL/RL. This includes compilation and analysis of relevant data, capacity building in the application of proven methods and fundamental techniques (e.g., mapping, field sampling), and assessment of different methodologies. Preliminary results of this work generate fundamental inputs to allow first-order estimates of emission at the national or subnational level and the construction of REL/RL.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators)

27) 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?

28) 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 defendable?

---

[13] Relevant UNFCCC decisions include Decision 2/CP.13 and Annex; Decision 4/CP.15; Decision 1/CP.16 (paragraphs 69–71 and Appendices I and II); Decision 12/CP.17 (paragraphs 7-15 and Annex).

- Is sufficient data and documentation provided to allow for the reconstruction of the REL/RL?

29) Consistency with UNFCCC/IPCC guidance and 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?

Component 4: Monitoring Systems for Forests and Safeguards

Subcomponent: 4a. National Forest Monitoring System

Rationale: The national forest monitoring system needs to be designed to generate information that allows comparison of changes in forest area and carbon content (and associated GHG emissions) to the baseline estimates used for the forest reference emissions level (REL) or reference level (RL). The development of an operational forest monitoring system is a long-term effort, generally serves multiple purposes (e.g., natural resource management more generally), and commonly entails a combination of remote sensing and field-based data collection from the national forest inventory or other sources. Countries may not be able to finalize the design of the national forest monitoring system for the emission reductions and removals in the absence of definitive guidelines from the UNFCCC, and thus use a step-wise approach to gradually develop the system (starting with data collection, analytic work, capacity building etc. with further refinements being made later as guidance becomes available). [14] A national forest monitoring system assimilates data collected nationally and locally (e.g., through sampling in community-managed forests), helps build trust among local constituencies via a participatory approach, and contributes to the national GHG inventory that countries report to UNFCCC in their National Communications and Biennial Update Reports.

This part of the assessment focuses on progress made in designing and developing operational forest monitoring systems. It describes the approach of how the system is expected to be enhanced over time as capacity increases, more data become available, and guidance from the UNFCCC is provided. It describes the information that is generated and its use and application, and includes output from early work (e.g., mapping forest cover change in high deforestation areas). It provides clear institutional arrangements, including budgeted action plans and human resource needs.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators):

30) Documentation of step-wise approach
- How is the system designed and proposed to be developed to monitor the specific REDD+ activities prioritized in the country's REDD+ strategy?
- Is there clear rationale or analytic evidence supporting the selection of the used or proposed methodology (systems resolution, coverage, accuracy, inclusions of carbon pools and gases) and improvement over time? Are potential sources of uncertainties identified to the extent possible?
- How does the system identify and assess displacement of emissions (leakage), and what are the early results?

31) Demonstration of early implementation

---

[14] Relevant UNFCCC decisions include 2/CP.13, 4/CP.15, 1/CP.16, 2/CP.17 and 12/CP.17.

- How has the step-wise design and early implementation of the forest monitoring system been demonstrated?
- How are key stakeholders participating/consulted in the development and early implementation of the system, including data collection and any potential verification of its results?

32) Institutional arrangements and capacities
- Are mandates to perform task related to forest monitoring clearly defined (e.g., satellite data processing, forest inventory, information sharing)?
- What evidence is there that a transparent means of publicly sharing forest and emissions data are presented and are in at least an early operational stage?
- Have associated resource needs been identified and estimated, required capacities, training, hardware/software, and budget?

Subcomponent: 4b. Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards

Rationale: The R-Package specifies the non-carbon aspects prioritized for monitoring by the country (e.g., key quantitative or qualitative variables representing rural livelihoods enhancement, conservation of biodiversity, ecosystem services provision, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD+ implementation in the country, and the impacts of the REDD+ strategy on the forest sector). The system should be capable of reporting how safeguards are being addressed and respected during the implementation of REDD+ activities, with due attention to the specific monitoring provisions included in the country's ESMF.

Assessment criteria and diagnostic questions (progress indicators):

33) Identification of non-carbon aspects
- How have priority non-carbon aspects of REDD+ implementation been identified?

34) Monitoring and reporting capabilities
- How is the system transparently providing consistent and periodic information on non-carbon aspects of REDD+ implementation, including all UNFCCC safeguards?

35) Information sharing
- How is the following information being made available: key quantitative and qualitative variables about impacts on rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, ecosystem services provision, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD+ implementation, and the implementation of safeguards, paying attention to the specific provisions included in the ESMF?