



Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

7b. Facilitating decision making in the PC

Sixteenth meeting of the Participants Committee (PC16)

Geneva

December 12-15, 2013

Background and Rationale

- After PC16, FCPF will change from 3 to 2 PC meetings per year.
- To date, most PC decisions are made in-person at PC meetings.
- But progress in REDD Countries should not be slowed down because of fewer PC meetings per year.
- Rules of Procedure allow for virtual decision-making.

Procedure for virtual decision-making

- Existing procedure for “action without meeting” (Rules of Procedure):
 - Material circulated for review and approval on a no-objection basis, for at least 14 days.
 - Any Member may object to the proposed action.
 - If any questions/comments are received, FMT provides clarification copying all Members and invited observers.
 - FMT may extend the question/comment period for up to 7 days.
 - If no objection is received, the decision is approved.
 - If an objection is received, the proposed action is included as an item in the agenda for the next Meeting.

Procedure for virtual decision-making

- 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.
- Virtual decision-making is used by other carbon funds in the World Bank Carbon Finance Unit.

Key questions

- Which reviews and decisions is the PC comfortable undertaking virtually?
 - 1) R-PPs and requests for \$3.8 million Readiness Preparation grants (for decision)
 - 2) Mid-term Progress Reports (for feedback)
 - 3) Requests for \$5 million additional grant funding (for decision)
 - 4) Readiness Packages (for feedback and/or decision)
- Is the existing virtual procedure sufficient for these reviews and decisions, or are adjustments/additional steps needed?

Potential options

- For decisions on grant allocations (Readiness grants; additional grants):
 - Use existing “action without meeting” procedure
 - FMT drafts resolution, circulates to PC.
 - During review period, FMT may revise the proposed decision based on comments received and re-circulate for approval, according to the same procedure. (Similar to the FIP virtual decision-making process)
 - If a Member objects, the item is carried over for decision-making at the next PC meeting.
- For reviews of Mid-Term Progress Reports:
 - Use same procedure except for review of the document only.
 - A Member may request that an item be carried over for discussion at the next PC meeting.
- For R-Packages:
 - Important stocktaking of country progress, but waiting till PC meetings to review them can also delay ER-Program Document progress.
 - Use same procedure as for Mid-Term Progress Reports?

Proposals and options

- Potential additional procedure:
 - FMT creates a “virtual” contact group of self-selected PC Members and Observers. This could be used only in cases where a resolution is required, or other cases that the PC pre-defines.
 - FMT facilitates the contact group via email, video-conferences and/or conference calls.
 - Contact group is responsible for drafting a resolution.
 - Existing virtual decision-making procedure is used thereafter.
 - This would enable more in-depth discussions, though add time to the process and require additional FMT resources.



THANK YOU!

www.forestcarbonpartnership.org