



# Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

## 4a. PC decision-making modalities

Twentieth meeting of the Participants Committee (PC20)

San Jose, Costa Rica

November 4-6, 2015

# Background and Rationale

- To date, most PC decisions are made in-person at PC meetings. Charter and PC Rules of Procedure allow virtual decision-making.
  - PC Meeting:
    - (1) In-person,
    - (2) by telephone or other communications facilities as permit all members participating in the meeting to hear each other
    - (3) by other electronic means.
  - Action without Meeting (as determined by FMT): no-objection process
- Virtual decision-making is needed to achieve goals in both the Readiness Fund and the Carbon Fund.
  - FCPF requires reviews/decisions at many points, so delays have a domino effect.
- Action without Meeting relieves pressure from meeting agendas, decreases time needed for PC meetings. Significant workload expected going forward.
- FMT seeks guidance from PC on virtual decision-making regarding Mid-Term Progress Reports (MTRs) with additional funding requests.

# General Practice To-Date

- “Action without Meeting” process has been used for:
  - Amendments to Charter
  - M&E framework
  - Approval of revised R-PPs when required
  - Approval of revised requests for grant funding when required
  - Approval of enhanced support for grievance/redress mechanisms
- FMT sought guidance from PC on other virtual reviews/decisions:
  - R-PPs (for feedback)
  - Allocation of \$3.8 million Readiness preparation grants (for decision)
  - Mid-Term Progress Reports (if no additional funding is being requested) (for feedback)
- No guidance yet from PC on virtual decision on the allocation of \$5 million additional grant funding or virtual endorsement of R-Packages.

# MTRs with Requests for Additional Funding: Status Quo

- PC12 agreed the process for submitting/reviewing MTRs and requests for Additional Funding.
  - MTRs with requests for Additional Funding are presented at a PC meeting.
  - While the Charter allows for a Participant to participate by telephone or other communications facilities, standard practice has been that the REDD Country Participant be physically present at the meeting.
  - MTR presentations through communication facilities have been allowed on an exceptional basis only, e.g., Liberia.

Week	Mid-Term Reports with requests for additional funding
Week 1	Country submits to FMT (for <u>completeness check</u> ).
Week 3	FMT sends to PC for 6-week <u>review</u> .
Week 9	Country presents MTR at PC meeting, and PC provides feedback.  PC decides whether or not to allocate the requested additional funding to the Country, and adopts a resolution accordingly. (While not required, PC meetings typically form contact groups to discuss the MTR and additional funding request to inform the final resolution.)

# Status Quo is Unsustainable

	Mid-Term Progress Reports	Additional Funding Requests
PC21 (Spring 2016)	7	5
PC22 (Fall 2016)	12	Up to 12 (funding available for up to 5-6 AF grants)
PC23 (Spring 2017)	8	
PC24 (Fall 2017)	4	
PC25 (Spring 2018)	2	
PC26 (Fall 2018)		
PC27 (Spring 2019)		
PC28 (Fall 2019)		

- These are in addition to other FCPF business items.
- Continuing in-person review and decision-making is **unsustainable**. Since process was agreed,
  - PC shifted from 3 to 2 meetings per year;
  - PC expanded from 36 to 47 REDD Countries;
  - There is a natural bunching of Country deliverables.

Need to allow more flexibility in our practices given changing circumstances.

- Could slow Countries' Readiness progress if their progress does not coincide with a scheduled meeting, and impacts processes in both the Readiness Fund and Carbon Fund.

# Additional Funding Decisions: Options as per Charter and Rules of Procedure

Options	Implications
1. In-person meeting	Unsustainable
2. Meeting by telephone or other communications facilities that allow all members to hear each other (e.g. video conference, etc.)	Difficult to manage for numerous repeated items for decision; entails: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Quorum;</li><li>• FMT reaching out to individual Participants for active approval;</li><li>• 2/3 vote if no consensus.</li></ul>
3. Meeting by other electronic means (e.g. email, etc.)	
4. Action without Meeting	Most streamlined process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No-objection basis;</li><li>• 1 PC member may object;</li><li>• May be complemented by virtual exchanges for discussion/feedback.</li></ul>

**FMT recommends option 4 (Action without Meeting)**



# Action without Meeting process (very similar to in-person process)

Week	Mid-Term Progress Reports without [with] requests for additional funding
Week 1	Country submits to FMT (for <u>completeness check</u> ).
Week 3	FMT sends to PC for 6-week <u>review</u> .
Week 9	<p>Deadline for <u>feedback on MTR/request for additional funding</u> (clarifications, strengths, areas for improvement, key issues). <del>If request received, goes to in-person review at PC.</del></p> <p>FMT summarizes feedback and compiles list of key issues if relevant. FMT organizes virtual exchange (e.g., teleconference, Webex, email) if needed. Key issues should be agreed before resolution is sent for virtual adoption.</p> <p>FMT sends <u>draft resolution</u> to PC for 2-week no-objection, <b>if appropriate.</b></p>
Week 11	<p>Deadline for no-objection on draft resolution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If no objection received, resolution deemed adopted.</li> <li><del>If needed, FMT organizes teleconference to discuss feedback</del> If additional time is warranted to address questions or comments raised, the FMT may extend the period by up to 1 week.</li> <li>If questions or comments are received on the draft resolution which require a revision to the <b>draft resolution</b>, FMT will send a <u>revised draft resolution</u> to PC to restart the 2-week no-objection process.</li> <li>If <u>any</u> objection to a draft resolution is received <b>and cannot be resolved virtually</b>, draft resolution goes to in-person review/decision at next PC meeting.</li> </ul>

# Recommendations

- FMT will assess whether Action without Meeting process is appropriate for a certain case:
  - Based on timing (i.e., if documents from REDD Countries are submitted at a time that would result in a significant delay)
  - Based on agenda constraints (i.e., if many documents are submitted at the same time).
  - If there are no timing or agenda pressures, in-person process will be the default.
- When Action without Meeting process is used, FMT will continue to submit items to the PC on a rolling basis as the need arises.
  - i.e., no fixed deadlines for submitting items for virtual review to the PC.
  - Consistent with existing practice and PC Rules of Procedure.
  - FMT will submit items to the PC in batches to the extent possible (e.g., if multiple requests are received within a couple weeks of each other).
  - Provides FMT with flexibility to manage review schedules as appropriate, and respond to REDD Countries' needs.



# Recommendations

- FMT proposes to use Action without Meeting process for virtual review/decision of MTRs with requests for funding, if the need arises. In the near future, Action without Meeting process would be used as a tool for managing country work and PC meeting agendas, not as a default.
- PC should recall that if any objections are received during Action without Meeting process, action can be deferred to an in-person PC meeting.
- To ensure that learning and knowledge exchange continues, FMT may organize knowledge events at PC/PA meetings.
- Action without Meeting would not be used as a default, but as an optional tool to manage meeting workloads and facilitate timely progress in REDD Countries.



THANK YOU!