

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

November 28, 2011

PROCEDURES FOR THE PREPARATION OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEWS OF INVESTMENT PLANS UNDER THE FOREST INVESTMENT PROGRAM (FIP)

Principles and Objectives

1. As agreed by the SCF Trust Fund Committee in November 2011, an independent quality review will be undertaken for FIP Investment Plans (hereinafter referred to as “investment plans”) under the SCF. Such a review should be independent and part of the process of developing these plans. The review should:

- a) add value to the design process of the investment plan;
- b) be part of the country-led preparation process of an investment plan;
- c) reflect the objectives and investment criteria of the relevant program under the SCF; and
- d) provide knowledge and experience for interested stakeholders, including the members and observers to the SCF governing bodies.

7. It is recognized that the investment plans are country-owned. The main objective of the quality review is to support the development of a high quality investment plan and ensure that investment plans meet the objectives, principles and criteria of the FIP. The review will be carried out by independent experts and should facilitate the process of endorsement. The review should focus on technical, social and environmental aspects for quality enhancement.

Process Overview

8. FIP Investment Plans will be subject to an independent quality review. This review should complement the existing quality assurance procedures of the multilateral development banks (MDBs)¹. Pilot countries, MDBs and reviewers should make all efforts to ensure a thorough review whose main objective is to support the development of high quality investment plans that meet the objectives, principles and criteria of the FIP.

9. The review should be prepared by two reviewers selected from the roster (see paragraphs 12-17)².

10. The review will consist of the following:

- a) The reviewers will jointly review the first complete draft of the investment plan in accordance with the criteria contained in Annex A and prepare a review with recommendations for consideration by the pilot country and the relevant MDBs in the preparation of the final version of the investment plan.
- b) The country and the MDBs may request a meeting (to be organized by video or telephone conference) with the independent reviewers to discuss the review.

¹ Such procedures usually include decision meetings (a formal management led review with participation of independent reviewers), quality enhancement reviews (informal meetings of independent reviewers and experts to discuss the plan), public disclosure and consultations, as well as multiple reviews of individual projects.

² The total cost of the review should not exceed the cap agreed by the Sub-Committee.

- c) The country and the MDBs will prepare a note that describes how the suggestions and recommendations from the review have been considered in the final document. They may decide to share this note with the reviewers and, if required, they may also choose to revise the note after any discussion with the reviewers.
- d) The review and the note will be submitted to the FIP Sub-Committee together with the proposed investment plan when it is submitted for endorsement.

11. The team leader may also be requested to participate in one or more meetings of the FIP Sub-Committee to present the outcomes of the review, offer advice, and serve as expert for any discussion or questions that arise on review methods, results, or general technical issues. Such participation may be arranged through video conferences.

Roster of Experts

12. The CIF Administrative Unit and the MDBs will use the roster of experts eligible to serve as members of the Technical Advisory Panel established by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)³. If necessary, the CIF Administrative Unit will explore with the FCPF opening a call for additional experts to join this roster. These additional experts may be proposed by the pilot countries, the MDBs or the FIP Sub-Committee.

Appointment of the reviewers

13. The process to appoint experts to prepare a review should be initiated as early as possible. The pilot country and MDBs will develop the terms of reference for the review on the basis of generic terms of reference provided in Annex B.

14. Once the terms of reference have been agreed by the country and the MDBs, the CIF Administrative Unit early in the preparatory process of the investment plan. The CIF Administrative Unit will circulate the resumes of the proposed reviewers to the pilot country and the MDB Committee for approval within five working days. In proposing experts, efforts should be made to avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest⁴.

15. After approval by the pilot country and the MDB Committee, the terms of reference and the resumes of the reviewers will be circulated to the Sub-Committee for review with an invitation to express any objections within 5 working days.

16. The review of the investment plan should be led by one of the selected experts who will serve as the team leader.

17. With regards to an approved request for a second review, as described in paragraph 29 below, the procedures identified in paragraphs 13-16 above will also be followed.

³ See <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/node/23>

⁴ A potential conflict of interest exists whenever a reviewer, his or her family, or an associated entity of the reviewer possesses or appears to possess a financial or other interest in the outcome of the investment plan.

Responsibilities of the reviewers

18. The reviewers will be responsible for:
 - a) conducting a joint review of the first complete draft version of the investment plan in accordance with the criteria listed in Annex A and the outline attached to the terms of reference (Annex B);
 - b) submitting within the agreed timeframe the review to the pilot country and the relevant MDBs;
 - c) discussing with representatives from the government and MDBs the findings of the review and, if necessary, submitting a final version of the review after this discussion has taken place. The purpose of these discussions will be to advance understanding of how the findings of the review may be responded to in the investment plan or the government's response.

19. The independent reviewers will have the following obligations:
 - a) to work in his or her personal capacity and perform duties in an objective, neutral and professional manner;
 - b) to disclose any potential conflict of interest relating to review activities;
 - c) if requested by MDBs, to participate in MDB review meetings;
 - d) to protect any confidential information provided in the course of the reviews both during and after the term of service; and
 - e) to coordinate with each other during the review process and submit a joint review of the investment plan.

20. To achieve consistency, each individual expert selected to review an investment plan should complete his or her review according to the agreed criteria, and the team leader should synthesize the individual reviews into one summary expert-wide review.

Responsibilities of pilot countries and MDBs

21. Pilot countries and MDBs should involve the reviewers as early as feasible in reviewing the investment plan so that the review can be useful in shaping the final plan.

22. After the expert reviewers are selected, pilot countries and the MDBs will discuss with the reviewers, based on the terms of reference for the review, the process for conducting of the review.

23. Pilot countries will share the complete draft investment plan with the reviewers. The pilot country or the MDBs may choose to invite the reviewers to participate in any review meetings. Country visits by reviewers are not expected.

24. After receiving the review, pilot countries will consider its findings and prepare a note that describes how the findings and recommendations have been considered in the final document. They may decide to share this note with the reviewers and, if deemed necessary, they may request a virtual meeting with the reviewers.
25. The country will finalize the investment plan, taking into consideration the findings and recommendations from the review.
26. The review and the country's note responding to the review should be submitted to the FIP Sub-Committee together with the investment plan when it is submitted for endorsement.
27. In the event that the review is considered to be unsatisfactory by the pilot country, a second review may be requested, subject to approval by the MDB Committee. To this end:
- a) the pilot country and MDBs will inform the CIF Administrative Unit that they consider the product of the reviewers to be unsatisfactory, and that they wish a second review to be carried out. The request should specify the reasons why a second review is sought;
 - b) the CIF Administrative Unit will inform the FIP MDB Committee and will add the request for a second review to the agenda of the next meeting of the FIP MDB Committee;
 - c) The FIP MDB committee will consider the reasons for the request for a second review and, if agreed, approve it. The second review, to be prepared by different experts, will be subject to the same process as for the first review;
 - d) The review considered to be unsatisfactory together with an explanation of why it was considered to be so will be submitted to the FIP Sub-Committee together with the second review and the proposed investment plan when it is submitted for endorsement.

Role of the CIF Administrative Unit

28. The CIF Administrative Unit will be responsible for the administrative arrangements described in this paper, including the selecting and contracting of the reviewers. This includes, among other things:
- a) making available the most up-to-date FCPF roster of experts;
 - b) selecting the proposed reviewers;
 - c) circulating the terms of reference and resumes of the proposed reviewers to the government, the MDB Committee and the FIP Sub-Committee;
 - d) contracting the expert reviewers;

- e) preparing an annual overview of the reviews for consideration by the FIP Sub-Committee and
- f) performing other administrative tasks related to the reviews.

29. Once the appointment of the reviewers has been approved, the CIF Administrative Unit will make publicly available the reviewers' names on the CIF website.

Source of Funding

30. The Sub-Committee requests the SCF Trust Fund Committee to approve resources to finance the expert reviews through the FY12 CIF Administrative Budget drawing from resources approved for country programming.

Review of Expert Review Procedures

31. At the first FIP Sub-Committee meeting of each calendar year, the Sub-Committee will consider the content of quality reviews that have been submitted in the last 12 month period based on an overview prepared by the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the FIP MDB Committee, and will review the agreed procedures with a view to:

- a) determining whether the preparation of quality reviews adds value to the programming of CIF resources; and/or
- b) revising the procedures if necessary.

Annex A: Criteria for Undertaking the Review

In undertaking the review of a FIP investment plan, expert reviewers should assess whether the investment plan is consistent with FIP objectives, principles and investment criteria agreed in the following policy documents and operational guidelines:

- a) *FIP Design Document* (July 2009)
- b) *FIP Investment Criteria and Financing Modalities* (June 2010)
- c) *FIP Operational Guidelines* (June 2010)
- d) *FIP Results Framework* (May 2011)

Annex B

FOREST INVESTMENT PROGRAM

TERMS OF REFERENCE

INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF THE INVESTMENT PLAN OF [COUNTRY]

Background and Introduction

1. The Climate Investment Funds (CIF) are comprised of two funds, the Clean Technology Fund and the Strategic Climate Fund. The CIF are an important new source of funding through which five Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) will provide additional grants and concessional financing to developing countries to address urgent climate change challenges. The five MDBs are the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the World Bank Group.
2. The Strategic Climate Fund (SCF) funds the piloting of new development approaches or scale-up of activities aimed at a specific climate change challenge or sectoral response in the areas of sustainable management of forests to reduce deforestation and forest degradation management (the Forest Investment Program or FIP), climate resilience (the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience or PPCR), and scaling up renewable energy in low income countries (the Program for Scaling up Renewable Energy in Low Income Countries or SREP). MDB units and staff work with institutions in recipient countries to identify and prepare CIF opportunities in each of the above areas.
3. The FIP Sub-Committee has agreed that an independent quality review will be undertaken for each individual investment plan (hereinafter referred to as “investment plans”) under the FIP. Such a review should be independent and part of the process of developing these plans. The review should:
 - a) add value to the design process of the investment plan;
 - b) be part of the country-led preparation process of an investment plan;
 - c) reflect the objectives and investment criteria of the FIP;
 - d) provide knowledge and experience for interested stakeholders, including the members and observers to the FIP Sub-Committee.
4. The main objective of the quality review is to support the development of high quality investment plans. The review should assist pilot countries in ensuring that their investment plans meet the requirements of the FIP.

Duties and Responsibilities of the Reviewers

5. The reviewers would conduct a review of the first complete version of the investment plan of [country] in accordance with the procedures adopted by the FIP Sub-Committee (see *Procedures for the Preparation of a Independent Technical Review of FIP Investment Plans*). The reviewer should familiarize him- or herself with the FIP programming modalities, investment criteria, design document and other documents provided by the MDBs prior to undertaking this work.
6. The expert reviewers should assess whether the investment plan is consistent with FIP objectives, principles and investment criteria agreed in the following policy documents and operational guidelines:
 - e) *FIP Design Document* (July 2009)
 - f) *FIP Investment Criteria and Financing Modalities* (June 2010)
 - g) *FIP Operational Guidelines* (June 2010)
 - h) *FIP Results Framework* (May 2011)
7. The team leader should submit the review to the government, and the [MDBs], using the attached outline.
8. The reviewers should discuss, upon request, with representatives from [country] and [MDB] the findings and recommendations of the review and, if necessary, submit a revised version of the review after this discussion has taken place. Representatives from [MDBs] will indicate the date when they are expected to receive the final version of the review.
9. The team leader may also be requested to participate in one or more meetings of the FIP Sub-Committee⁵, to present the outcomes of the review, offer advice, and serve as expert for any discussion or questions that arise on review methods, results, or general technical issues. Such participation may be arranged through video conference.
10. The reviewers should participate in the following meetings:

[...]
11. The reviewers should:
 - a) make all efforts to ensure the development of high quality investment plans;
 - b) work in his or her personal capacity and perform duties in an objective, neutral and professional manner;
 - c) protect any confidential information provided in the course of the review both during and after the term of service;

⁵ The FIP Sub-Committee is the governing body of the FIP.

- d) disclose any potential conflict of interest relating to review activities; and
- e) coordinate with the other selected reviewers during review process and submit a joint review of the investment plan.

(Note: To achieve consistency, each individual expert selected to review an investment plan should complete his or her review according to the agreed criteria, and then the team leader synthesizes the individual reviews into one summary expert-wide review.)

Appointment of a Reviewer

12. Two experts will be selected from the FCPF roster of experts to perform the independent review. The reviewers are to be selected following the procedures approval by the FIP Sub-Sub-Committee (see *Procedures for the Preparation of Independent Technical Review of FIP Investment Plans*).

Timeframe

The CIF Administrative Unit will decide on the length of the appointment and specify this length and period within the terms of reference.

The reviewer will be hired for a total of [X] days, between [starting date of contract] to [end date of contract]

Reporting

The reviewer will collaborate with the Government of [country] and the [MDBs] on the preparation and timely delivery of the quality review.

The expert will submit the final review and a claim for payment to the CIF Administrative Unit once the review is complete.

**Attachment to Annex B:
Outline of the Review**

1. Title of the FIP investment plan
2. Country
3. Name of the reviewers
4. Team leader
5. Date of submission
6. Part I: General criteria
Please comment on whether the investment plan complies with the general criteria indicated in Annex A of the “Procedures for the preparation of independent technical reviews of FIP investment plans”.
7. Part II: Compliance with the investment criteria of FIP
Please comment on whether the investment plan complies with the criteria specific for FIP, as indicated in Annex A of the “Procedures for the preparation of independent technical reviews of FIP investment plans”.
8. Part III: Recommendations
Please provide any recommendations that could enhance the quality of the investment plan.