

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism  
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**  
(interim, December 13, 2012, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)

**Review of R-PP of NIGERIA**

**Reviewer: United States (Lead) and IP Observer (Bank Information Center)**

**Date of review: November 29, 2013**

**Standards to be Met by R-PP Components**

*(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6:)*

**Component 1. Organize and Consult**

**Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:**

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process, and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

More frequent meetings of the National Advisory Council and National REDD Sub-may be helpful, at least for the first year.

On page 16, the R-PP states, "Nigeria does not have...single marginalized ethnic groups or indigenous people." Can this statement be clarified in light of the mention of indigenous people, for example in component 4b (page 95)?

As noted in the TAP review, the number of institutions/working groups is likely too many for an efficient system. Review and streamlining would be beneficial.

Breaking down the budget by indicative activity would be helpful, as would more detail on the expected expansion to two new states.

***Largely meets the standard***

**Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:**

The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus, and commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The campaign's major objective is to establish an early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process that sets the stage for the later consultation process during the implementation of the R-PP work plan. This effort needs to reach out, to the extent feasible at this stage, to networks and representatives of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers and forest dependent communities, both at national and local level. The R-PP contains evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that a reasonable amount of time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD-plus including the SESA.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

Are there yet any tangible outputs from the four years of discussions on REDD? Given the full year of UNREDD program being operational, results thus far are not always clearly described.

Is there a proposed work plan or budget for supporting awareness and capacity building and participation for forest dwelling communities? Have any groups or bodies (i.e., civil society or governmental) been identified to help provide this support?

More clarity and detail could be offered on Nigeria's REDD Communications plan (as mentioned in the TAP review, how websites, informational materials, and other media will be used to communicate).

Elaboration on how REDD+ will be included in the climate change awareness-raising campaign would be useful.

Further information on the many good forms of media use mentioned in the budget line items would be helpful in the above text, as would elaboration on the "REDD+ University."

***Meets the standard***

**Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process**

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far<sup>3</sup> (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

<sup>3</sup> Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Program Steering Committee).

Will \$350,000 be sufficient for the consultation and participation process in the two new states?  
 Can the R-PP be more specific about how the consultation already undertaken will contribute to and inform upcoming consultation and participation, especially for the two new states?

*Largely meets standard*

**Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy**

**Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:**

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

Is there quantitative information on how deforestation/degradation will be measured at the national level, or what the plans are for developing this capacity? It is noted that REL framework design is included in the budget, but details on measuring deforestation are few in the text. (Or move this section to component 3.)

**Meets standard**

**Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:**

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD-plus strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and a summary of the emerging REDD-plus strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD-plus strategy options. This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy; consideration of environmental and social issues; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD-plus strategy; and a plan of how to assess the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits. The assessments included in the R-PP eventually should result in an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD-plus strategy over time.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

It is unclear what the work plan going forward on governance is, and how this relates to the ongoing PGA being carried out with UNREDD support. More clarity should be provided on how the GoN plans to deal with governance issues, and the role of the UNREDD in supporting this.

Are legal analysis, land tenure, and governance planned for in the two additional states?

Can more be added about measuring degradation?

Overall, in the RPP to this point it is sometimes unclear which activities are focused on the two new pilot states, and which are meant for the national REDD program. A chart in the executive summary describing this may be useful.

*Largely meets standard*

**Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:**

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

Greater clarity on carbon rights is required given state ownership of the land.

It is unclear why the Forestry Department has the legal authority to “revisit and update the legal framework to properly indicate ownership, address land use decree and tenure” and to “elaborate on carbon ownership rights and benefit sharing mechanisms.”

With respect to the grievance mechanism, it is unclear how Village Councils would deal with complaints to land (p.62) in the absence of federal and state level legal frameworks.

The budget for this section seems to have some significant overlaps in relation to legal and land issues with what is already budgeted from UNREDD in 2.b, this should be clarified.

***Largely meets standard***

**Standard 2.d: Social and Environmental Impacts during Readiness Preparation and REDD-plus Implementation:**

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence in the form of an assessment of environmental and social risks and impacts as part of the SESA process. It also provides a description of safeguard issues that are relevant to the country's readiness preparation efforts. For FCPF countries, a simple work plan is presented for conducting the SESA process, cross referencing other components of the R-PP as appropriate, , and for preparing the ESMF.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

Is there more country-specific context that can be included?

The R-PP raises important issues of how FCPF and UNREDD work on social and environmental issues diverges and should be harmonized. Coordinated planning will be needed to ensure these processes are well coordinated, non-duplicative, and do not undermine each other.

***Largely meets the standard***

**Component 3. Develop a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level**

**Standard 3: a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level**

Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (monitoring system design).

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

This component could benefit from more detail, e.g., what data in addition to Landsat will be needed, and where might wall-to-wall coverage not be needed?

For the forest inventory, will any modeling be done to estimate carbon in the areas that are not planned for measurement? On what time scale can an inventory be completed? Who are the necessary forest inventory partners? On what time interval will repeat inventory and remote sensing data be collected? (This information could also go in the following component.)

For reference levels, what approach does Nigeria plan to take for establishing reference levels?

Can more specific information be offered for Nigeria's approach to accuracy and QA/QC?

How will state level RELs be linked to a national level REL? (p67)

***Meets the standard***

**Component 4. Design Systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards**

**Standard 4a: National Forest Monitoring System:**

The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD-plus strategy in the forest sector.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.

**Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:**

Figure 4 on p.86 includes information on REDD safeguards in the monitoring system, stating that it feeds into the REDD information system, but then it calls for a system design based on RS/GIS. Can this be clarified?

Elaboration of the link between state and national level reporting is appreciated.

It is not fully elaborated why a wall to wall approach has been selected over sampling. (p73)

Can more information be provided on how/what non-carbon/biomass data will be collected in the inventory (biodiversity, socio-economic, traditional forestry)?

Where might a database be housed, and how might it be updated?

*Meets the standard*

**Standard 4b: Designing an Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards :**

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities), for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

(The FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:**

This section would benefit from clarifying its relationship with the C&P plan and the SESA, in terms of both process steps and outcomes.

Is the entire \$150,000 for the budget of this section truly for a consultant?

The R-PP states that the UNREDD SEPIC will be used as the basis of the SIS. If so, the relationship of the ESMF to both should be clarified.

Which benefits have GoN and stakeholders prioritized and should therefore be monitored?

*Largely meets standard*

**Component 5. Schedule and Budget**

**Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements**

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD readiness, and identifies capacity building and financial resources needed to accomplish these activities. A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF and/or UN-REDD, as well as from other international sources (e.g., bilateral assistance), are summarized by year and by potential donor. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP, and is sufficient to meet the costs associated with REDD-plus readiness activities identified in the R-PP. Any gaps in funding, or sources of funding, are clearly noted.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

The budget needs a timeline and allocation by activity.

*Partially meets the standard*

**Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**

**Standard 6:** The R-PP adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.

**Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

Putting these into the UNREDD framework would be a desirable next step, as would indications of duration.

The statement on p. 113 that "the M&E framework...only becomes fully operational...after the actual preparation process of REDD readiness has been achieved..." is confusing and should be clarified; an M&E system should be operational before activities start.

*Largely meets the standard*