

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

FIP/SC.18/4
May 23, 2017

Meeting of the FIP Sub-Committee
Washington D.C.
Friday, June 9, 2017

Agenda Item 4

STOCKTAKNIG REVIEW OF FIP MONITORING AND REPORTING SYSTEM

FY-2017

PROPOSED DECISION

The FIP Sub-Committee, having reviewed the document, FIP/SC.18/4, *Stocktaking Review of FIP Monitoring and Reporting System FY-17*, welcomes this assessment of the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the FIP M&R system, in response to the FIP Sub-Committee decisions from June 2011 and December 2016.

The Sub-Committee, welcomes the progress that has been made in advancing the FIP monitoring and reporting framework and notes with appreciation the inclusive, participatory and consensus-based approach used during this review.

The Sub-Committee, recognizes the importance of an effective FIP results framework and welcomes the changes proposed to the FIP M&R toolkit. The Sub-Committee endorses the conclusions, approves the recommendations of the stocktaking review and requests CIF Administrative Unit, FIP pilot countries and MDBs to make necessary adjustments for FIP M&R following the new guidance.

Executive summary	1
1. Introduction	6
2. FIP M&R stocktaking review.....	7
2.1 Scope	7
2.2 Methodology.....	8
3. Key findings	10
3.1 Design of the FIP M&R system	10
3.1.1 FIP reporting themes	10
3.1.2 Guidance in the toolkit.....	10
3.2 Implementation of Results Reporting.....	12
3.2.1 Data collection	12
3.2.2 Review of FIP reporting themes	13
3.2.3 M&R support provided by CIF AU and MDBs to FIP countries.....	17
3.3 Engagement of Pilot Countries and Stakeholders	19
3.3.1 Participation in the FIP M&R system.....	19
3.3.2 Scoring workshops and quality assurance	19
3.4 Integration into national systems.....	21
4. Conclusion and Recommendations	23
4.1 Conclusions.....	23
4.2 Recommendations	25
Annex 1: Agreed upon changes to the toolkit.....	26
Annex 2: MDB Template	28
Annex 3: Participants list.....	35
Annex 4 Interview questionnaires for FIP country representatives, MDBs and donors	36

Box 1: FIP M&R Toolkit.....	7
Box 2: Cross Cutting Challenges Concerning Results Reporting of Thematic Categories.	13
Box 3: Country Experiences with the Annual Scoring Workshop.....	20
Box 4: Country approaches to integrating FIP M&R into national systems.....	22

Table 1: FIP countries participating in annual FIP results reporting (2014-2016 reporting cycles)	9
Table 2: FIP countries that received financial support for M&R.....	18

Executive summary

Background, purpose and scope

- i. This document summarizes the findings of a stocktaking review of the monitoring and results (M&R) system of the Forest Investment Program (FIP), a program of the Climate Investment Funds (CIF). Since 2008, the CIF has been supporting six FIP pilot countries to develop M&R capacities. The FIP M&R system has been devised as a living system that evolves over time. It recognizes that monitoring and reporting is an iterative and learning process. As lessons are generated from its use, the system will be continuously reviewed and improved. Three years into implementation, and with the expansion of FIP investments into new countries, it was an opportune time to review progress under the FIP M&R system.
- ii. This stocktaking review was devised to provide an in-depth assessment of the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the CIF's monitoring and reporting systems for the FIP. The review was motivated by the FIP Sub-Committee decision by mail (June 2011):

“The CIF Administrative Unit and the MDB Committee are requested to report back to the FIP Sub-Committee and SCF Trust Fund Committee once experience is gained in operationalizing the framework, with view to adapting the framework to reflect experiences gained through field testing, as well as by the implementation to date and its already identified key challenges.”
- iii. The review was further called for in the FIP Sub-Committee meeting in early December 2016, where recipient countries and donors alike discussed the issue of M&R system limitations in generating interim project data on progress and results.
- iv. The review sought to answer the following framing questions:
 - a. *To what extent has the FIP M&R system design and guidance been effective?*
 - b. *To what extent has the FIP M&R system implementation been effective/relevant and generated knowledge/built capacity?*
- v. The findings of the review were then used to develop amendments to the FIP M&R system requirements leading to improvements and simplifying the FIP M&R process for next reporting rounds.

Methodology

- vi. The review focused on the perceptions of relevant stakeholders on the benefits (or lack thereof) generated by the FIP M&R system. The review adopted a 'mixed methods approach' encompassing both quantitative and qualitative analytical methods and tools. The review was carried out in three phases:
 - a. A documentation review of FIP policy, strategy and guidance documents pertaining to the results frameworks, a review of similar M&E toolkits from other relevant organizations in the field of climate change, and a SWOT analysis;
 - b. Interviews with key stakeholders including recipient stakeholders from six FIP pilot countries, five multilateral development banks (MDBs), three donor countries, CIF Administrative Unit staff, and the Global Executing Agency of the Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (DGM);
 - c. A stakeholder consultation workshop was convened on April 3-5, 2017 in Washington, D.C. to discuss suggested changes to the FIP M&R system. Participants in the workshop included representatives from eight countries, four MDBs, two donor countries, the DGM Global Executing Agency, and two technical expert organizations. The workshop shared findings of the stocktaking exercise and allowed participants to exchange experiences and propose solutions to define the way forward in enhancing the effectiveness and usefulness of the FIP M&R system.

Key findings of the stocktaking review

Successes:

- vii. The review found that, overall, the FIP M&R system is effective in its design and that it delivers its intended function. The review also found that it is essential that countries lead and drive the M&R process, supported by the MDBs as necessary. The country-driven nature of the FIP M&R system, and its engagement of a wider range of stakeholders, has been consistently identified as a strength and distinctive feature of the FIP. The annual scoring workshop that each FIP country organizes was regarded as an important multi-sectoral platform, allowing for information exchange that might not otherwise take place. It has also helped build capacity at the government level both in forest monitoring, as well as in monitoring and evaluation more broadly.
- viii. Guidance in the FIP M&R toolkit is perceived, in general, as adequate and easy to understand.
- ix. The FIP M&R system shows early signs of contributing towards sustainability. Although the FIP is at an early stage of the investment process, it is encouraging to see that most

FIP countries have FIP M&R indicators integrated in their national monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to some degree. This integration allows for easy data collection, better data quality, and sustainable use of the FIP M&R system. Also, the review found that most FIP countries use the FIP M&R system for other purposes beyond its intended scope, such as generating knowledge and building capacities with and for the national focal point, increasing awareness on forest--related issues across ministries, or drawing lessons learned for designing new projects.

- x. FIP reporting themes are, in general, suitable and relevant to the countries' contexts. They are flexible and practical, and take into account country circumstances and support building national monitoring systems. For FIP countries, the most useful reporting themes are the core themes (1.1 GHG emission reductions or avoidance/ enhancement of carbon stock, 1.2 Livelihood co-benefits) and reporting theme 2.4 Capacity development.
- xi. Both financial and technical assistance support provided by the MDBs and the CIF Administrative Unit were well appreciated by FIP pilot countries.

Challenges:

- xii. As many forest-related outcomes are incremental and long-term in nature, a major challenge of the FIP M&R system is capturing early results at nascent stages of implementation. This can be a missed opportunity for countries to highlight their early work and achievements, which can be significant for the sector. The activities implemented early in implementation are important to create an enabling environment, and to set the stage for other substantive results to materialize over time. To bridge the gap of interim results, the stocktaking review explored how existing and available project information from MDBs could be used to provide an enhanced picture of results at the early stages of FIP project implementation. It was also noted that this was, in fact, the initial intention when this system was designed in 2012¹.
- xiii. Inconsistencies in methodological approaches were a strong concern for some FIP countries. Lack of harmonized assessment methodologies is a challenge for reporting robust FIP results, especially for Theme 1.1 GHG emission reductions.

¹ The reporting responsibility for reporting on progress in implementing individual projects/programs under the IP rests with the respective MDB. The MDBs will report progress in implementing their portfolio within their own institutional and organizational reporting requirements. However, for assisting the countries in developing comprehensive IP implementation progress reports, the MDBs will share for reporting purposes, to the extent possible, their project/program reporting with the pilot country and the CIF Administrative Unit. Source: FIP/SC.X/X November, 2012 Meeting of the FIP Sub-Committee PROPOSAL FOR REVISED FIP RESULTS FRAMEWORK VERSION: SEPTEMBER 10, 2012

- xiv. FIP countries reported that the scoring system (for Category 2) is difficult to use. Attributing scores is subjective and scorecard instructions are unclear. FIP countries prefer to report progress with narrative responses than with scores.
- xv. FIP reporting themes require a medium to longer-term time frame to adequately capture results. Considering this, some FIP M&R assessments are too frequent, especially for those reporting themes that need longer timeframes to achieve results (i.e., GHG emission reductions, governance, biodiversity).
- xvi. There are inherent capacity challenges around results reporting, because FIP investment plans consist of several projects implemented by different MDBs. While this arrangement allows countries to benefit from the comparative advantages of different MDB partners, it can be challenging to manage and monitor the investment plan holistically. Capacity strengthening is embedded within the M&R approach; however, a number of shortcomings were noted. For example, concerns emerged most strongly on assessing progress and setting baselines for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Also, there are different levels of expertise in the scoring workshops, making it difficult to reach consensus on the process.

Recommendations for FIP M&R system improvement

- xvii. Based on the findings of the FIP M&R stocktaking review, a set of improvements to the FIP M&R system was proposed, discussed, and endorsed by all parties attending the April 2016 workshop. Four recommendations emerged from the process:
- xviii. **Recommendation 1:** The countries should continue to lead and drive the M&R process, supported by the MDBs as necessary. The FIP M&R system should maintain alignment with national M&E systems to the extent possible and should allow flexibility to FIP countries for greater simplification of FIP M&R requirements. Reporting burdens and gaps in results can be alleviated by improved use of available information systems from the MDBs.
- xix. **Recommendation 2:** The capacities and role of FIP focal points should be strengthened, and additional capacity building for FIP M&R should be pursued. Furthermore, lessons learned from the FIP M&R system should continue to be exchanged, which is especially important for new FIP countries.
- xx. **Recommendation 3:** The M&R system should evolve with a two-tier approach.
 - Under Tier 1, FIP countries will report annually, with greater flexibility on narrative reporting on investment plan implementation progress. The new FIP M&R system will focus more on the narratives responses to the reporting

themes than scores. For example, progress achieved for themes that used scorecards (Category 2) will be replaced with narrative texts. Questions for each one of the reporting themes will be significantly reduced in Category 2.

- Under Tier 2, FIP countries and/or MDBs will ensure annual reporting on more granular project-level progress to capture early results. FIP countries can report the quantitative data for core themes 1.1 and 1.2 to the CIF Administrative Unit and/or this data can be provided by MDBs. In the case where countries report directly to the CIF Administrative Unit, the same template will be used as in the previous system. In the case where MDBs share information with the CIF Administrative Unit on the progress of their projects, they will submit a template that includes a narrative section and a progress update of the project results framework (with numeric values). **It is the decision of the country whether to provide the project level progress data to CIF Administrative Unit directly or let the MDBs share this information.**

xxi. **Recommendation 4:** The toolkit will be updated to ensure its ongoing effectiveness and utility.

1. Introduction

1. This report summarizes the 2017 stocktaking review of the monitoring and reporting (M&R) system of the Forest Investment Program (FIP). It is one of the four programs of the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), which was established in 2008 to provide scaled-up climate financing to developing countries via multilateral development banks (MDBs) to initiate transformational change towards low carbon, climate resilient development.
2. To assess progress and results of FIP investments, FIP pilot countries are required to report annually on core indicators (or “common themes”) specified in the FIP approved results framework (see Box 1). These core indicators are consistently measured by all FIP countries so that, over time, the CIF can report meaningfully on FIP achievements at the country and fund level.
3. Since 2014, FIP pilot countries have used the FIP M&R system to fulfill the CIF’s annual results reporting requirement. Now that it has been in operation for three years, and with the expansion of the FIP to new countries, it is an opportune time to take stock and assess to what extent and how the FIP M&R system has delivered on its intended function.
4. Anchored in the CIF’s core principle of “learning by doing,” the FIP M&R system was devised as a living system meant to evolve over time. It recognizes that monitoring and reporting is an iterative and learning process, and lessons learned from its use must inform system reviews and improvements. The stocktaking review was conducted from this perspective to examine the effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability of the system and to address key issues and challenges identified in its implementation.
5. The stocktaking review also responds to the FIP Sub-Committee decision by mail (June 2011):

“The CIF Administrative Unit and the MDB Committee are requested to report back to the FIP Sub-Committee and SCF Trust Fund Committee once experience is gained in operationalizing the framework, with view to adapting the framework to reflect experiences gained through field testing, as well as by the implementation to date and its already identified key challenges.”
6. The review was further called for in the FIP Sub-Committee meeting in early December 2016, where recipient countries and donors alike discussed M&R system limitation in generating interim project data on progress and results.

2. FIP M&R stocktaking review

2.1 Scope

7. The FIP M&R stocktaking review covered the FIP framework for annual reporting of results between the years 2014-2016. In particular, it considered the design and implementation of the FIP M&R toolkit, a central component of the FIP M&R system (see Box 1). This included assessment of the usefulness of the common themes, scorecards, and tables. The review covered all aspects of the implementation of the results frameworks, including the quality assurance aspects country ownership, and the annual reporting process as a whole.

Box 1: FIP M&R Toolkit²

The FIP M&R toolkit was designed to support the implementation of the document *Results Monitoring and Reporting in the FIP*³, and together they set out the framework for annual reporting. The toolkit consists of guidance and reporting tools to assist FIP countries in providing annual reporting to the FIP Sub-Committee on progress in implementing endorsed investment plans.

The toolkit provides practical direction to map or align project/program-level data to the agreed FIP reporting themes, and uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data and information by using computed estimates (quantitative data) and scorecards (qualitative data). The toolkit also includes a narrative section that focuses on core elements of the FIP programmatic approach, including the theory of change for each country and information related to their projects and programs implemented under the endorsed investment plans⁴.

Category 1: FIP Common Themes

- GHG emission reductions / enhancement of carbon stocks
- Livelihood co-benefits

Category 2: Other Relevant Co-Benefits Themes

- Biodiversity and other environmental services
- Governance
- Tenure, rights and access; and
- Capacity building

Category 3: Narrative (on other common topics)

8. The review took a formative learning approach to generate valuable insights on the implementation of the toolkit and necessary adjustments that may be needed for future improvement of the FIP M&R toolkit and wider FIP M&R system. The review applied classical evaluation definitions, such as effectiveness and relevance, in

² <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/knowledge-documents/fip-monitoring-and-reporting-toolkit>

³ FIP/SC.11/6/Rev.1

⁴ FIP M&R Toolkit, updated March 2016

combination with formative learning questions with an aim to provide a full overview of the experience to date as well as recommendations going forward.

9. In particular, the FIP M&R stocktaking review was organized around two framing objectives, which consider:
 - ***To what extent has the FIP M&R system design and guidance been effective?***
The review focuses mainly on the suitability of indicators and toolkits, the arrangements for data collection and reporting, and the mechanisms put in place to ensure quality review. See Sections 3.1 and 3.2.
 - ***To what extent has the FIP M&R system implementation been effective/relevant and generated Knowledge/built capacity?*** This part of the review examines implementation, recipient country engagement, and linkages to national systems. The quality of support provided to recipient countries by MDBs and the CIF Administrative Unit is also considered. See Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.
10. The primary audience of the FIP M&R stocktaking review is the recipient countries that are the main implementers of the system. Another key group is the Strategic Climate Fund (SCF) SCF Committee (specifically the FIP Sub-Committee), whose members will be called upon to make decisions on the future design of the FIP M&R toolkit.
11. The review is also relevant for other CIF stakeholder groups, such as the MDBs, donors, civil society, and others. Given increased financing and demands for monitoring and results around climate change initiatives, it is expected that the review will also interest other organizations and financing institutions, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Adaptation Fund, and Green Climate Fund (GCF) among others.

2.2 Methodology

12. The review focused on the perceptions of relevant stakeholders on the benefits (or lack thereof) generated by the FIP M&R system. The review adopted a mixed methods approach encompassing both quantitative and qualitative analytical methods and tools. The main methods included the following:
 - A documentation review of FIP policy, strategy, and guidance documents pertaining to the results frameworks, as well as a review of similar monitoring and evaluation (M&E) toolkits from other relevant organizations in the field of climate change.
 - Interviews with key stakeholders, including recipient stakeholders, country focal points, development partners, donors, MDBs, CIF Administrative Unit staff. Standardized interview protocols were developed for each group. See Annex 3 for participants list and Annex 4 for interview questionnaires.
 - A stakeholder consultation workshop was convened from April 3-5, 2017 in Washington, D.C., where a set of suggested changes to the FIP M&R system was

presented for discussion. Workshop goals were to share findings of the research conducted for the stocktaking exercise and determine how to enhance the effectiveness and usefulness of the FIP M&R system moving forward. The workshop also shared information on forest indicators to shed light on what has worked well and common challenges.

13. The review assessed the effectiveness relevance and sustainability from a perceptual viewpoint, with a focus to learn from the experience to date. This, however, was affected by certain limitations.
14. Firstly, the current FIP M&R system had only been in place for five years and was only completing a third implementation reporting cycle in 2016 (following system-wide revision in 2012/13). Table 1 provides an overview of which countries reported each year.
15. Secondly, the review did not include an assessment of the reporting for the two additional funding mechanisms established under the FIP, namely the Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (DGM) and the Private Sector Set-Aside (PSSA). as these had only recently started. The review did include suggestions on how the DGM and PSSA can be better incorporated into the current results framework.

Table 1: FIP countries participating in annual FIP results reporting (2014-2016 reporting cycles)

	Reported in 2014	Reported in 2015	Reported in 2016
Countries	Brazil, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Indonesia, Mexico, Peru	Brazil, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR), Mexico	Brazil, Burkina Faso, DRC, Ghana, Lao PDR, Mexico

3. Key findings

3.1 Design of the FIP M&R system

Findings:

- *The overall suitability and relevance of the FIP reporting themes to the country's context is good.*
- *The current FIP M&R system fails to report on interim project results at early stages of implementation.*
- *The guidance provided in the FIP M&R toolkit was perceived in general as adequate and easy to understand.*

3.1.1 FIP reporting themes

16. The review indicated a number of successes in the overall design of the FIP M&R reporting themes and the supporting toolkit. More than half of FIP countries⁵ find that overall suitability and relevance of the six FIP reporting themes to their country's context is good⁶. The reporting themes were perceived as suitable, as they covered the transformative impact and FIP programmatic outcomes. For FIP countries, the most useful reporting themes are theme 1.1 GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock, 1.2 Livelihood co-benefits and 2.4 Capacity development.
17. The reporting themes under the FIP Investment Plan (IP) were also seen as flexible and practical, taking into account country circumstances and supporting building national monitoring systems. Countries highlighted how FIP reporting themes captured the impact of the programmatic approach of Investment Plans, and were aligned with the indicators from the FIP IPs' results frameworks of all countries. There was an appreciation for how well the reporting themes reflected the objectives, principles and criteria of the FIP. FIP reporting themes allow for the review of effectiveness and impact of FIP programs, as well as for the learning and evaluation.

3.1.2 Guidance in the toolkit

18. The guidance provided in the FIP M&R toolkit was perceived in general as adequate and easy to understand⁷. Countries who rated the toolkit with a high score highlighted that the toolkit was designed on the basic principles of flexibility, pragmatism and efficiency; which enabled integration with national and sub-national reporting systems.
19. The review identified a number of challenges concerning the design of indicators and the toolkit: It is evident that the FIP M&R system is most suited to generate higher-

⁵ Six FIP pilot countries have experience of three rounds of reporting.

⁶ Four countries rated the suitability of the reporting themes with a 4 (good), and two countries with a 3 (fair). Responses were recorded as scores ranging from 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good). Because of the confidentiality agreement the CIF AU has with FIP countries, responses are shown as aggregated.

⁷ One country scored the suitability of the toolkit with a 5 (very good); two countries scored it with a 4 (very good) and two others with a three (good).

level results. The existing FIP M&R system fails to report on interim project results, which happen at the early stages of implementation. The FIP M&R system could better capture information about the project activities early on in implementation. These activities are important to create an enabling environment, and to set the stage for other substantive results to happen later on. In order to bridge the gap of interim results, the review explored how existing and available project information from MDBs could be leveraged to provide a better picture of results at the early stages of FIP project implementation. It was also noted that this was in fact the initial intention when these systems were designed in 2012⁸.

20. Feedback indicated that the toolkit could be strengthened to provide methodologies, especially for reporting Category 2 themes. It is notable that the reporting themes found to be less useful were 2.1 Biodiversity and environmental services, followed by 2.2 Governance. Countries highlighted the lengthy and subjective nature of the current scorecard system under Category 2, and the absence of detailed methodologies to support this. A clear lesson from the review was that narrative elements were easier to compile, and could be applied to reporting themes under Category 2. This issue is explored further in the next section.
21. Finally, a key shortcoming identified by FIP countries is the attribution of results to the FIP investments. It should be clear that the FIP is a 'catalyst for results', as in many cases FIP investments are implemented at the same time and in the same place as others. With the current M&R system, it is challenging to attribute the results collected through the reporting themes exclusively to the FIP intervention. FIP investments contribute to results achieved in a certain area for a specific theme and results achieved should not be attributed exclusively to FIP investments. The issue of attribution versus contribution is a common challenge within M&R and can be better clarified in the toolkit.

⁸ The reporting responsibility for reporting on progress in implementing individual projects/programs under the IP rests with the respective MDB. The MDBs will report progress in implementing their portfolio within their own institutional and organizational reporting requirements. However, for assisting the countries in developing comprehensive IP implementation progress reports, the MDBs will share for reporting purposes, to the extent possible, their project/program reporting with the pilot country and the CIF Administrative Unit. Source: FIP/SC.X/X November, 2012 Meeting of the FIP Sub-Committee PROPOSAL FOR REVISED FIP RESULTS FRAMEWORK VERSION: SEPTEMBER 10, 2012

3.2 Implementation of Results Reporting

Findings:

- *FIP M&R system is based on the country's Investment Plan, which allows monitoring the transformational impact of the FIP at the programmatic level.*
- *Theme 1.1 GHG emission reductions is challenging because of lack of harmonized assessment methodology.*
- *Category 2 scorecards are difficult to use and are subjective.*
- *Some assessments are too frequent, especially for those reporting themes that need longer timeframes to achieve results.*

3.2.1 Data collection

22. A clear success of the FIP M&R system relates to the country-driven process for data collection and results reporting. This was a recurrent theme throughout the review, and presents a distinctive hallmark of the FIP M&R system relative to standard monitoring approaches. One of the key tenets of the FIP M&R system is to achieve as much integration with the national M&E systems as possible. Feedback suggests that this approach provides a high degree of flexibility and should be maintained.
23. In each country, the FIP IP establishes the programmatic approach and sets out the expected transformative impact and expected results at the country level, which will be delivered through the implementation of individual projects under the umbrella of the programmatic approach. The transformative impact of the programmatic approach is especially captured in the Category 2 and Category 3 reporting themes of the FIP M&R toolkit. The information reported in the Category 2 themes goes beyond the project-level outputs and explains how the programmatic approach contributes to sustained impact over time in the national context in terms of biodiversity, governance, capacity building, and land tenure.
24. Data reported in the Category 3 themes provides additional information about the transformational impact of the programmatic approach and IP. Category 3 includes information about the progress of the programmatic approach on the theory of change, and about the additional context (Contribution to national REDD+; Link of DGM to investments) and enablers (Support received from other partners including the private sector) for the IP to achieve the transformational impact holistically.
25. Notwithstanding the considerable successes involved in data collection and results reporting, the review underscored many implementation challenges that need to be addressed. A synopsis of cross cutting thematic challenges is outlined in Box 2 and relate to issues on the timing and frequency of data collection, consistency of methodologies, capacities to undertake results reporting and concerns around data duplication. The challenges raised in this part of the review, were often specific to each reporting theme. Accordingly, each reporting theme is noted below. The review notes

in particular the strong challenges related to the GHG reporting theme, as well as the scoring approach for Category 2 Themes.

Box 2: Cross Cutting Challenges Concerning Results Reporting of Thematic Categories.

- **Frequency of data collection:** A shortcoming highlighted in the review is that some assessments are too frequent, especially for those reporting themes that need longer timeframes to achieve results (i.e. GHG emission reductions, governance, biodiversity...).

Respondents suggested using alternative indicators for some reporting themes. For example, it would be interesting to know how the FIP M&R approach has been integrated in the INDCs.

- **Consistency of methodologies.** Inconsistencies in methodological approaches were a strong concern among projects and countries. A key area of focus related to the improving the GHG Emission reductions assessments. As noted previously the use of scorecards for Category 2 themes was considered both subjective, lengthy and not well defined.

- **Capacities:** There are inherent capacity challenges around FIP results reporting, due to the fact that investment plans consist of several projects implemented by different MDBs and are often not managed as a country program, so it is difficult to monitor as such. While capacity strengthening is embedded within the M&R approach, a number of particular shortcomings were noted. For example, concerns emerged most strongly in the context of assessing progress and setting baselines for the GHG. Respondents also highlighted the different levels of expertise in the scoring workshops, which resulted in a challenge to reach consensus on the process.

- **Duplication:** With the current system, there is some duplication of M&R data. FIP countries have to report to the CIF AU, and also to MDBs independently. However, data often comes from the same source and is mainly collected by the national implementing agencies.

3.2.2 Review of FIP reporting themes

26. *Theme 1.1: GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock*⁹

The FIP M&R system does not effectively support assessment of GHG emission reductions, especially on an annual basis. This is due to the lack of a uniform methodology for assessing the GHG emission reductions for all projects and all countries. FIP countries highlighted the challenge of reporting emission reductions at early stages of the project implementation and the inconsistent reporting systems from different implementing agencies. MDBs usually only report on GHG emissions reductions at the project level at start, mid-term and end of project. Even projects in one country, and under one IP have used different methodologies for assessing emission reductions, making it difficult to aggregate results. In 2016, the CIF AU hosted

⁹ There were three countries that scored the utility of Theme 1.1 GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock with a 5 (very good). There were two countries that scored it with a 2 (poor). There was one country that scored it with a 4 (good).

a workshop in Washington DC and invited the technical experts from FIP countries to discuss possible new solutions to harmonize the GHG emission reductions assessments¹⁰. However, despite this effort, not all FIP countries implemented the agreed outcomes in the following reporting cycle.

27. FIP countries reported that there is a lack of capacities at the country level for assessing progress or setting the baseline (i.e. lack of MRV). Establishing the GHG emission baseline is very expensive and not all data required is easily available. Some countries expressed that they would prefer to report this indicator only using area covered under management (i.e. under sustainable land management, or sustainable forest management), instead of tons of GHG emission reductions.
28. The reporting template is not well suited for all Investment Plan (IP) projects activities leading to emission reductions. For example, use of improved cookstoves, or replacing fuelwood stoves with biodigesters, which reduce deforestation are not easy to factor in or capture the current reporting template.
29. *Theme 1.2 Livelihood co-benefits*¹¹
Livelihood co-benefits may take some time to materialize, therefore it is difficult to provide annual data in the initial years.
30. Beneficiary reporting units vary widely and are not always expressed as individuals, as required in the guidance. For example, in some cases, FIP countries reported on the number of forest co-operatives, or enterprises benefitting.
31. Financial resources are required in addition to funds from the current projects in order to carry out studies or surveys to measure this indicator. Resources are needed to train surveyors, for example.
32. In some cases the indicator just measures participation in trainings, which does not directly imply actual benefits. For example, “number of participants in consultation activities during the project implementation” was reported under this theme.
33. *Theme 2.1 Biodiversity and other environmental services*¹²

¹⁰ The agreed outcomes of the GHG harmonization workshop were: i. Conservative factors should be used when uncertainty/inaccuracy is known; ii. Same conservative factors for the same country when applicable should be used. Justification should be added in the narrative; iii. MDBs should use the consistent carbon data (carbon stocks and deforestation rates) for the same country and strata or region; iv. Quality of data should be improved whenever possible; v. Carbon data should be coming from MRV systems or carbon accounting tool; vii. If projects do not have as a direct objective to reduce emissions, then countries are not obliged to report on Theme 1.1

¹¹ Shows key monetary and non-monetary benefits received by beneficiaries through FIP interventions. In most cases, this information is reported disaggregated by gender. In general, these indicators are the same ones as those in the Results Frameworks of the individual FIP projects. For example, some of the indicators used are “People in forest and adjacent communities with monetary/non-monetary benefits from forest and Climate Smart Agriculture” or “People in forest and adjacent community with increased monetary/non-monetary benefits from the forest”. There were two countries that scored the utility of Theme 1.2 Livelihood co-benefits with a 5 (very good). There was one country that scored it with a 4 (good). There were two countries that scored it with a 2 (poor).

¹² Reports how FIP investments enhance, or at least avoid loss of biodiversity in terms of richness of local species typical for a habitat, ecosystem or biome, as well as other ecosystem services. There were four countries that scored

FIP countries highlighted that the reporting frequency is not realistic for this theme. Benefits related to biodiversity need longer timeframes to materialize. It is not possible to attribute these benefits exclusively to the FIP. Many times there are several interventions in one same area, which also lead to biodiversity benefits.

34. FIP countries reported that the scorecards system is difficult to use for this indicator; attributing scores is subjective and instructions for the scoring system are unclear.
35. Measuring biodiversity is very complex and challenging. For this reason, FIP countries focused on the forest cover as the natural habitat for biodiversity, and sustaining ecosystem services. For example, Lao PDR reported that they are not directly monitoring keystone species, although the FIP is contributing to habitat protection. “The existence of Protected Forest Area (PFA) designation and law enforcement may help to protect biodiversity within PFAs”. Mexico reported that the FIP improves measuring forest cover change, and the forest inventory, which contribute to identify measures to protect against loss of natural habitats and other environmental services”.
36. *Theme 2.2 Governance*¹³

There is a lack of criteria for rating this indicator. It is challenging to score the benefit sharing and it is difficult to measure the change in attitudes. For example, Lao PDR highlighted FIP’s contribution to forest and wildlife law enforcement; work was done compiling a legal compendium of relevant legislation for forest law enforcement. In DRC, all the components of the FIP IP contribute to the formulation of a legal framework that favors access to land, through the implementation of a coherent land development plan and the implementation of community-based forestry.
37. The scorecard system is difficult to use. FIP countries reported that attributing scores was subjective and instructions are unclear.
38. There are 17 sub-questions under this theme, making it very laborious to report on and score.
39. *Theme 2.3 Tenure, rights and access*¹⁴

Some FIP countries found that the formulation of this indicator is not well adapted to their national contexts. It lacks criteria for rating these indicators.
40. Monitoring of land ownership is a challenge.
41. The scorecards system is difficult to use for this indicator. FIP countries reported that attributing scores was subjective and instructions are unclear.

the utility of Theme 2.1 Biodiversity and other environmental services with a 3 (fair). There were two countries that scored it with a 4 (good).

¹³ Reports the processes, legal provisions and enforcement in the management and conservation of forest resources There were three countries that scored the utility of Theme 2.2 Governance with a 3 (fair). There was one country that scored it with a 5 (very good). There were two countries that scored it with a 4 (good).

¹⁴ Reports on land tenure security, resources rights and access, and benefit sharing as a benefit arising from legal or regulatory frameworks There were two countries that scored the utility of Theme 2.3 Tenure, rights and access with 4 (good), and two countries that scored it with a 3 (fair). There was one country that scored it with a 5 (very good).

42. *Theme 2.4 Capacity development*¹⁵.

Whilst FIP recipient countries noted that the capacity development theme was especially useful at the early stages of the implementation of the investment plan, the formulation of indicators for capacity development was not well adapted. FIP countries find that there is a lack of criteria for rating the indicators and that these qualitative indicators are very difficult to score. Different countries approached this challenge in different ways. Lao PDR for example, reported FIP progress on capacity building of university and college forestry students on forest inventory techniques; government staff and villagers received capacity building regarding participatory sustainable forest management and extension approaches.

43. Some of the questions on capacity development are found under other sub-themes, so they are considered to be repetitive.

44. *Narrative 3.1: Theory of change and assumptions*

Whilst FIP recipient countries noted the utility of the narrative on Theory of change (ToC) and assumptions as a reporting theme, the frequency of reporting remained a central challenge. It was felt that these themes required a medium term framework for reporting and should be reported at the start, mid-term and end of an investment plan, rather than on an annual basis. While reducing the frequency of reporting on the ToC the reporting could be expanded to include a more in-depth process, testing of assumptions and reviewing of the ToC itself¹⁶.

45. *Narrative 3.2: Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies and uptake of FIP approaches*

The narrative 3.2: Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies is considered a relevant theme, as the FIP is a driving force in the implementation of the national strategy REDD+. For example, for Mexico this theme is very relevant, since the initiatives in the field, FIP or others, must operate in a coordinated way, in order to meet the goals of national strategies.

46. *Narrative 3.3 Support received from other partners including the private sector*

Support received from other partners, including the private sector is a useful reporting theme, as it allows for inter-sector collaboration and sharing of lessons learned. It was evident that FIP countries are not always aware of the progress of private sector led projects under the FIP IPs in their countries and better arrangements could be made to

¹⁵ It refers to any activity that aims to improve the competence of stakeholders to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. There were three countries that scored the utility of *Theme 2.4 Capacity development* with a 5 (very good). There was one country that scored it with a 3 (fair). There were two countries that scored it with a 4 (good).

¹⁶ The timing of the reporting at mid-term of the ToC of the IP should be decided upon with flexibility and taking into consideration the maturity of the various projects – but should in general take place around year 5 since the approval of the IP.

ensure FIP projects' private sector representatives take part in the annual workshops and share the progress with other stakeholders.

47. Narrative 3.4 Link of Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) to FIP investments

The FIP countries feel that they do not generally have much information on the implementation of the DGM projects. These projects are implemented by the World Bank, consisting of 14 country projects and a global learning and knowledge exchange project, and are still in their stages of implementation. Conservation International (CI) is appointed to undertake the role of Global Executing Agency (GEA) for the Global Component. In its role as GEA, CI facilitates knowledge sharing and capacity building for indigenous and local community networks and partnerships, develops a platform for sharing information and experience on the results and impacts of the country DGM programs, and supports the participation of indigenous and local community representatives in international policy dialogues and processes.

48. Results reporting on the DGM will be included in the CIF annual results reporting for the FIP as per the set out results framework of the DGM¹⁷ as discussed and agreed upon in the consultation workshop. Information on projects and DGM global progress will come from Conservation International and from the World Bank progress reports on these projects¹⁸. Also, stakeholders agreed to invite DGM representatives to the countries annual workshops to share the progress on their projects in the corresponding countries.

3.2.3 M&R support provided by CIF AU and MDBs to FIP countries

49. FIP countries are overall satisfied with the support and guidance received from the CIF AU. Countries consider the pilot countries meetings an opportunity for capacity building and lessons learning. All countries agree that in-country FIP M&R trainings conducted by the CIF AU are very useful. The CIF AU conducted the following FIP M&R trainings in 2015 and 2016: Kinshasa, DRC July 2015; Accra, Ghana, May 2016; Guadalajara, Mexico, June 2015; Oaxaca, Mexico, June 2016. Some countries have expressed that they would like to have more/new FIP M&R trainings (Ghana, Brazil, Burkina Faso).

¹⁷ The following five common indicators measure progress towards achievement of the DGM program objective and are applied to all Country projects in FIP pilot countries:

1. - % of sub-projects successfully completed and achieved their objectives which are consistent with FIP objectives
2. - People in targeted forest and adjacent communities with increased monetary and non-monetary benefits from forests, disaggregated by gender (number) (Forestry CSI)
3. - % of participants in the capacity development activities with increased role in the FIP and other REDD+ processes at local, national, or global levels
4. - % of grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits that are actually addressed (Participation and Civic Engagement CSI)
5. - % of DGM stakeholders that perceive DGM governance and processes as transparent and inclusive

There are also three specific indicators for the Global Learning and Knowledge Exchange Project are applied for the DGM Global Project.

¹⁸ Such as form the WB Implementation Status Reports and similar and CI semi-annual and annual reports.

50. FIP countries received financial support, methodological guidance, technical advice and coordination support from MDBs. In most countries, the financial support from MDBs is used to organize the annual workshop. Table 2 shows the funds provided by CIF AU to support M&R in FIP countries. The disbursement of these funds was done through the MDBs.
51. In 2015, Burkina Faso received \$ 101,000 from the CIF AU through the World Bank, which was used in 2015 and 2016, to train stakeholders on the FIP M&R toolkit, to conduct the annual workshop with all stakeholders, to conduct workshops for quality assurance, and to hire an international consultant.

Table 2: FIP countries that received financial support for M&R

Pilot Country	Amount received (USD)	Date approved
Burkina Faso	101,000	4/16/15
Indonesia	80,000	4/6/16
Ghana	60,000	5/13/16
Lao PDR	60,000	5/13/16

52. Indonesia received \$80,000 from the CIF AU through the World Bank in 2016, which were used to translate the FIP M&R materials into Bahasa, hire a consultant, organize a multi-stakeholder workshop for reporting, and develop knowledge learning products (materials and disseminations).
53. Brazil highlighted the support of the MDBs in the preparation, negotiation of the investment plan at the government level, and the consultation for the investment plan. The MDBs are supporting implementation of each project, including project level M&E. Most FIP countries are overall satisfied with the support received by MDBs.
54. FIP countries received financial support, methodological guidance, technical advice and coordination support from MDBs. Brazil highlighted the support of the MDBs in the preparation, negotiation of the IP at the government level, and the consultation for the IP. The MDBs are supporting implementation of each project. Most FIP countries are overall satisfied with the support received by MDBs.

3.3 Engagement of Pilot Countries and Stakeholders

Findings:

- *Programmatic reporting of country-level results is achieved thanks to the inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders at the FIP workshops.*
- *Scoring workshops are an important multi-sectorial platform, allowing for information exchange among stakeholders who would otherwise not have met.*
- *Scoring workshops promote a useful multi-stakeholder dialogue even before and after the FIP scoring workshops.*

3.3.1 Participation in the FIP M&R system

55. The country driven nature of the FIP M&R system, and its engagement of a wide range of stakeholders, has been consistently identified as a strength and distinctive feature of the FIP. In this regard the FIP has introduced a novel approach to development planning and financing, namely the programmatic approach. Under this approach, an investment plan (IP) is developed for each FIP country, targeting investments, which are in line with, and reinforce, national development priorities.
56. The participatory M&R system is seen to reinforce the programmatic approach of the country's FIP, and helps to track the transformative process of FIP pilot countries. FIP M&R systems require that countries develop their own theory of change, based on indicators embedded within the national M&E system, with clear assigned organizational roles and responsibilities. This is crucial to create a sense of ownership of the FIP M&R system among FIP countries. Creating a sense of ownership is very important to ensure a sustained and lasting impact of the FIP M&R system. The programmatic value of the FIP M&R includes enhancing the human and technical capacities to consolidate data and prepare reports.

3.3.2 Scoring workshops and quality assurance

57. The annual scoring workshops were found to be a particular highpoint of the FIP M&R process for results reporting. The FIP recipient countries highlighted the fact that scoring workshops were an important multi-sectorial platform, allowing for information exchange among stakeholders that would otherwise not have met. The annual workshop aims to engage key stakeholders in an in-depth discussion on implementation progress using the FIP and its M&R toolkit and its indicator themes as a basis. Key stakeholders include government institutions at national, regional and local levels, as well as civil society, indigenous peoples groups, the private sector and academic institutions. The workshops encourage inter-ministerial collaboration and allow for a discussion on what has been achieved on a programmatic level, which is a key feature of the FIP. They provide the countries with a practical framework to continuously discuss relevance, synergies and complementarity amongst the different projects and programs in the FIP investment plan. The workshops have proven a valuable opportunity for stakeholders from different projects to meet and share

progress achieved. Furthermore, before and after the FIP scoring workshops, there were additional meetings among the project implementation units to exchange information about the projects and their experiences. See Box 3 for further country level perspectives on the annual scoring workshops.

58. Countries appreciated efforts to support quality assurance throughout the process of data collection and reporting, although this is an area that could be further strengthened. The FIP toolkit requires that a multi-stakeholder national-level steering committee¹⁹ conducts the quality assurance of the reported results. The FIP country focal point, in collaboration with MDB task teams invite stakeholders to critically review the provided data and information included in the reporting tables as part of an annual multi-stakeholder national-level steering committee in addition to the scoring workshop on the implementation of the FIP investment plan. However, the review found that the quality control mechanisms put in place are not always followed as described in the toolkit. FIP countries explained that setting up a multi-stakeholder national-level steering committee to review the results data, in addition to the FIP scoring workshop is challenging because of lack of resources, time, and experts with knowledge about the FIP.

Box 3: Country Experiences with the Annual Scoring Workshop

On average, there are 50 participants attending the annual scoring workshops. The majority of participants are from relevant government agencies. In general, scoring workshops had representation of government agencies, indigenous people, local communities, NGOs and Civil Societies Organizations (CSOs), MDBs and private sector. For example in Burkina Faso's workshop there were representatives from CSOs involved in forest management: Amicale des forestières du Burkina (AMIFOB), Confédération paysane du Faso and Centre International de recherche sur la foresterie. In Ghana, there were six representatives from two NGOs: Forest Watch and National Forest Forum. In DRC, there were representatives from an indigenous group, the network of indigenous peoples and local communities for the sustainable management of forest ecosystems in the Democratic Republic of Congo (REPALEF-DRC). In Burkina Faso and Mexico there were also indigenous people who participated in the workshop. In Ghana, there were 10 representatives from local communities, and in DRC there were representatives from the Federation of Churches of Congo. Participation of academia did not take place in any of the FIP country scoring workshops. In some cases, the number of women participating in the workshops is not very high, and this is a concern for FIP countries. Brazil was the only country that did not have a scoring workshop, due to the intense political crisis that took place in 2016. Some countries reported that scoring workshops can be expensive. One country reported that the total cost of their last scoring workshop was about \$20,000. Expenses included in the scoring workshop are transportation costs for all attendees, including those coming from remote areas, rent of meeting room, catering for all participants, and workshop materials. Countries reported that securing additional funds to conduct the annual scoring workshops is necessary and not always easy.

¹⁹ This committee led by the Government should include representatives of relevant government agencies, indigenous peoples and local communities, local NGOs, the private sector, and other members of civil society.

59. The FIP scoring workshops are seen as an important platform to promote engagement and buy-in across a range of stakeholders. The aggregation of country-level results at the Investment Plan is achieved thanks to the inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders at the FIP workshops, which allow for programmatic reporting. Scoring workshops promote a useful multi-stakeholder dialogue even before and after the FIP scoring workshops.
60. One of the identified best practices of the FIP M&R system is the focus on capacity building. Capacity building allows FIP beneficiaries to enhance their skills and FIP countries to strengthen their reporting system and the skills of their focal points and other government staff. Enhancing the FIP M&R system has a positive impact in the national M&E capacities. For example, bringing in resources to conduct field surveys for FIP, will directly improve the national M&E systems if the indicators and data collected are the same.
61. Although country ownership and stakeholder engagement was seen as a particular success of the FIP M&R system, some challenges were identified. As previously noted, an inherent challenge in the FIP is the fact that Investment Plans, consisting of several projects implemented by different MDBs, are often not managed as a country program. As such it can be difficult both to monitor and engage the relevant stakeholders. In this regard coordination between MDBs Task Team Leads and Focal points could be further strengthened.
62. FIP recipient countries also noted that further funding would be required to build necessary capacities. A number of unanticipated costs have been identified for results reporting, including costs for particular reporting themes (e.g. GHG), as well as the increasing costs for the scoring workshops. Stakeholders agreed that the capacities and role of FIP focal points should be strengthened. Furthermore, lessons learned from the FIP M&R system should continue to be exchanged, which is especially important for new FIP countries.
63. Finally, a number of technical reporting challenges are noted in the context of undertaking a highly participatory M&R system. As noted in the previous section, a challenge of the scoring workshop was the different levels of expertise and capacities, which made it a challenge to reach consensus. Data collection at the country level also required cooperation across multiple agencies, and buy in of the private sector and CSOs/NGOs.

3.4 Integration into national systems

Findings:

- *Most FIP countries have FIP M&R indicators integrated in their national M&E systems to some degree.*
- *Integrating FIP M&R in the national M&E systems allows for easy data collection, better data quality and a sustainable use of the FIP M&R system approach.*
- *Most FIP countries use the FIP M&R system for other purposes beyond its intended scope.*

64. Integrating FIP M&R in M&E systems is crucial because it allows for countries to have easy data collection, better data quality and ultimately a pathway for improved results. Improving the FIP M&R system directly strengthens the capacity of the national FIP focal point and this also contributes to the sustainability of the system and its indicators. Many FIP countries have FIP M&R integrated in their national M&E systems to some extent. More than half of the countries have a fair or good integration of the FIP M&R system with the national M&E system²⁰. Some FIP countries are in the process of setting up their MRV system and reference scenario, which will increase the FIP M&R integration with their national M&E system. Box 4 illustrates how different FIP countries have integrated the FIP M&R with national systems.

Box 4: Country approaches to integrating FIP M&R into national systems

In the cases where the integration was high, the M&R information required by the FIP is the same as that in the national systems. For example, in Burkina Faso the FIP indicators are aligned with the National Program of the rural sector (Programme national du secteur rural, PNSR) indicators for forest management. For the forestry sector, the FIP has been strongly committed to existing indicators in order to facilitate the collection of data. In DRC, The information required by the FIP is the same as that in the national system. The FIP monitoring system is aligned with the Ministry of the Environment's monitoring and evaluation system of the National Environment, Forests, Water and Biodiversity Program (PNEFEB). Those in charge of the follow-up of the PNEFEB participate in the working group in order to collect data for the monitoring and reporting of the FIP. The FIP M&R will be integrated into the national MRV system that is being developed. In Ghana, FIP indicators are a subset of national MRV data. In Mexico, the FIP M&R builds on mechanisms that already operate in the country, such as the MRV national system and the indicator framework of the FIP projects already under way. When the FIP was initiated, support was also received from the Government of Norway for the project to strengthen REDD + and South-South Cooperation, focused on MRV. In the Mexico Investment Plan, the logical framework indicators were established, and was determined with MRV information.

65. The FIP M&R stocktaking review found that in general, FIP countries have used the FIP M&R systems for other purposes beyond its initial intended scope. This is a positive sign of the relevance, and utility of the FIP M&R system. Examples of utility beyond the M&R function itself were found as follows; the FIP M&R generated capacities at the national focal point; most FIP countries reported that they are now better able to handle the FIP and also other M&R processes, as a result of built capacities and there has been an increase in awareness on forest related issues across ministries. For example, in Ghana reports are used for discussions at the national level to improve ongoing and future projects. Lessons learned from FIP projects have been used for the development of a concept note for a new project. In Mexico, the project implementing

²⁰ The level of integration was scored with a 4 (good) by three countries, 3 (fair) by one country, and 2 (poor) by two countries.

agencies use the results reported to the CIF AU to understand how the IP is making progress and make decisions accordingly.

66. In terms of shortcomings, FIP countries reported that data available at the national level does not always have the same scope as data required for the FIP M&R system. For example, data on GHG emission reductions achieved or area covered might be available for a different biome or area to where the FIP project is implemented.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

67. The FIP M&R stocktaking exercise reviewed the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the CIF's monitoring and reporting system for the FIP. The review assessed the effectiveness of the M&R systems in its design and guidance, based on the objectives outlined in the FIP M&R Approach Paper. The review examined the implementation, recipient country engagement, country ownership of activities, integration, experience and also looked at the support provided to recipient countries by the MDBs and CIF AU in the implementation process.
68. The review found that it is key to have the countries lead and drive the M&R process, supported as necessary by the MDBs. The review further found that the FIP M&R system remains relevant, and can only be strengthened by a continuous learning by doing approach. One of the key added values of the FIP M&R system is how it strengthens the overall programmatic approach of the FIP Investment Plans and uses a country driven process to do so. The IP is developed through constructive consultations between the country government, multilateral development banks and key stakeholders, including civil society, indigenous peoples and the private sector. The participatory M&R system is seen to reinforce the programmatic approach of the country's FIP, and helps to track the transformative process of FIP pilot countries.
69. Both the reporting themes and general toolkit were seen as largely relevant, although there is potential to improve and streamline certain areas so that they are better adjusted to national contexts. For FIP countries, the most useful reporting themes are the core themes (1.1 GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock, 1.2 Livelihood co-benefits) and 2.4 Capacity development. The methodology for reporting Category 2 themes was seen in particular as an area that could be strengthened given the subjective and lengthy nature of the existing scoring process. Overall, the FIP M&R toolkit appears to pay adequate attention to the country systems, data quality and flexibility. The toolkit clearly indicates that countries may use existing national or sub-national monitoring systems where possible. Countries that have already developed methodologies for measuring and reporting REDD+ related results should use them for FIP M&R reporting. In this context, national systems of forest or REDD+ relevant monitoring already in place should be used to report on FIP.

70. The FIP stocktaking review found that, overall, the FIP M&R system is effective in delivering its intended function and is based on the tenets of pragmatism and flexibility. The country driven nature of the M&R system, and its engagement of a wide range of stakeholders, has been consistently identified as a strength and distinctive feature of the FIP. Alignment of the programmatic approach, with national systems, is seen to further increase a sense of ownership amongst FIP countries. A particular area of success in reporting of results has been the scoring workshops, which are seen as an important platform to promote engagement, knowledge and buy-in across a range of stakeholders. As the FIP M&R system evolves an annual country workshop should remain a core feature of the results reporting process. Finally, the FIP has been relatively effective in strengthening capacity at the national level for monitoring and results. One of the identified best practices of the FIP M&R system is the focus on capacity building, which helps FIP countries to strengthen their reporting system and the skills of their focal points and other governmental staff.
71. The effectiveness of the FIP M&R is weakened by a range of cross cutting challenges, relating to the implementation of results and monitoring processes. The stocktaking review identified a number of general challenges across the reporting and narrative themes including the frequency of data collection, consistency of methodologies, data duplication and some areas of capacity weakness.
72. A key message emerging from the review is that reporting themes require a medium to longer-term time frame to adequately capture results. Greater attention is needed to capture information at an early stage of project implementation. The current M&R system does report on the full range of results, representing a missed opportunity for countries to highlight their early work, successes and achievements. This can be addressed in large part through strengthened narrative reporting together with more granular reporting from the Countries and MDBs on project implementation.
73. Lastly, the FIP M&R shows early signs of contributing towards sustainability. Although the FIP is at an early stage of the investment process, it is encouraging to see integration of the FIP M&R system into national M&E mechanisms. The underlying approach within the FIP M&R is that indicators and processes that are well articulated within the national systems, are better suited to have longer-term effects. If the FIP M&R system is well integrated in the national M&E, investing in strengthening the data collection, staff capacities, or data management process will be a win-win for FIP reporting and for the national government. Once the national reporting systems are strengthened and working well, it is likely that they will remain over time, yielding long lasting results. Also, in countries that use the FIP M&R system for other purposes it is likely to be sustained over time. In these cases, FIP countries will rely on the data collected and reported through the FIP M&R system, and it is more likely that they will still use it even after the FIP IP completion.

4.2 Recommendations

74. Based on the findings of the FIP M&R stocktaking review and a validation workshop, the following recommendations are proposed:
75. **Recommendation 1:** The countries should continue to lead and drive the M&R process, supported by the MDBs, as necessary. The FIP M&R system should maintain the alignment with national M&E systems to the extent possible and should allow flexibility to FIP countries for greater simplification of FIP M&R requirements. Reporting burdens and gaps of results can be alleviated by improved use of available information systems from the MDBs.
76. **Recommendation 2:** The capacities and role of FIP focal points should be strengthened, and additional capacity building for FIP M&R should be pursued. Furthermore, lessons learned from the FIP M&R system should continue to be exchanged, which is especially important for new FIP countries. Coupling countries that have FIP M&R experience with new FIP countries through study tours (south-south) could be a useful way forward.
77. **Recommendation 3:** M&R system should evolve with a two tier approach, encompassing the following proposed steps;
- Tier 1: FIP countries will continue to report annually, with greater flexibility on narrative reporting on investment plan implementation progress, highlighting the programmatic approach of the FIP programs. The new FIP M&R system will focus more on the narratives responses to the reporting themes than scores. For example, progress achieved for themes that used scorecards (category 2) will be replaced with narrative texts. Questions for each one of the reporting themes will be significantly reduced in Category 2.
 - Tier 2: FIP countries and/or MDBs will ensure annual reporting on more granular project level progress to capture early results. FIP countries can report the quantitative data for core themes 1.1 and 1.2 to the CIF Administrative Unit and/or this data can be provided to the CIF Administrative Unit by MDBs. In the case where countries report directly to the CIF Administrative Unit, the same template will be used as in the previous system. In the case where MDBs share information with the CIF AU on the progress of their projects, they will submit a template to the CIF AU, that includes a narrative section, and a progress update of the project results framework (numeric values) see Annex 2. The MDBs also have the option of sending on their implementation status reports, progress reports or similar – containing this information to CIF AU. Countries will receive a copy of any reports used from the MDBs in the reporting for their country. **It is important to note that it is the decision of the country whether to provide the project level progress data to CIF AU directly or let the MDBs share this information with the CIF AU.**
78. **Recommendation 4:** The toolkit will be updated to ensure its ongoing effectiveness and utility. Annex 1 outlines the changes agreed upon in the stakeholder workshop in April 2017.

Annex 1: Agreed upon changes to the toolkit

Major Changes

- FIP countries will report on core themes voluntarily, and/or MDBs would share information on themes 1.1 GHG, 1.2 Livelihood co-benefits and on the area covered under the management plan²¹ to the extent this is included in the projects results frameworks (depending on the preference of the country).
- FIP countries will no longer be required to use scorecards. Instead of using these scorecards, they will report narratives. This is applicable for reporting themes 2.1 to 2.4.
- FIP countries will report on the collaboration / synergies achieved with the DGM projects on a voluntary basis. The CIF AU will also collect DGM data from Conservation International and from World Bank progress reports on DGM projects.
- Countries / MDBs would share information with the CIF AU on progress of FIP projects utilizing their already existing reporting systems and their projects results frameworks. The Countries / MDBs would share this information with the CIF AU using a template²², which consists of a narrative section, and a progress update of the project results framework (see Annex 2). **It is important to note that it is the decision of the country whether to provide the project level progress data to CIF AU directly or let the MDBs share this information with the CIF AU.**

Minor changes

- Scoring workshop will change its name to 'FIP annual workshop'
- FIP countries will no longer have to report progress on theory of change (Reporting themes 3.1) annually. It will be reported at mid-term and end of the investment plan.
- Number of questions in themes 2.1-2.4 was reduced
- FIP countries will invite representatives from DGM National Executing Agency or DGM National Steering Committee and private sector to present at the workshop. This information exchange will be useful for making all stakeholders aware of the progress of the DGM and private sector projects in the country.
- Narrative 3.4 will be changed to only include a voluntary open question on collaboration and synergies with DGM.
- The issue of contribution vs attribution will be further clarified in the revised toolkit. It is understood that the FIP interventions contributes to achievements and that no attempt for attribution will be made.
- Participants in the FIP M&R stocktaking consultation workshop agreed on the following text to go along with the Reporting themes 1.1 and 1.2 – Core themes:

O FIP countries will be required to report on the themes 1.1 and 1.2 as per the results frameworks of the projects.

²¹ Hectares of forests (or land) under improved or sustainable management

²² The CIF AU developed a universal template, to harmonize the data coming from MDBs on project progress. The rationale for developing this template is that each MDB reporting template was different, and in some cases they were confidential.

O FIP countries can report the annual results achieved to the CIF Admin Unit or they can have the MDBs share this data directly with the CIF AU

-A new approach should be adopted for the CIF AU to report DGM results in the FIP annual report. Information on projects and DGM global progress will come from Conservation International and from the World Bank progress reports on these projects. The DGM and private sector representatives should be invited to the annual workshop to share the progress on their projects in the corresponding countries.

-The new revised FIP M&R system will be implemented for the 2016 reporting exercise to the extent possible. The old format can be used while putting an increased focus on the narratives (and using the scorecards only on a voluntary basis) as the reporting period is imminent. Annex 2 lays out the format for early results from projects.

Annex 2: MDB Templateⁱ

Introduction

This template is designed to support the wider FIP Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) system by including project-level indicators within its reporting. The new FIP M&R system will be based on the following two annual components: i) this template, which the FIP implementing MDBs are asked to share information on the progress of the FIP projects being implemented; and ii) the report that FIP pilot countries currently complete on their FIP Investment Plans following the FIP M&R toolkit already in place.

The structure of this template is as follows:

Section A. General Progress: Information about the overall status of the project's implementation and progress on key activities that took place during the reporting period;

Section B. Critical Bottlenecks: Information or updates on current /potential challenges that are delaying project implementation and brief recommendations for follow-up;

Section C. Contributions to Lessons Learned: Information on lessons learned

Section D. Updated Achieved results. MDBs are required to either fill out this section with the achieved results, or share the corresponding implementation status reports, progress reports, or equivalent reports with the CIF Administrative Unit. The example displayed in this section is an illustration based on a World Bank project. It is recognized that the template and format used by each MDBs are different, but we expect that the updated project results frameworks include at least this fundamental information: **Indicators; baselines; actual results numbers, and targets.**

Deadline for reporting: The completed template should be submitted **annually** to the CIF Administrative Unit by **no later than June 30**. The time period to include in the report and the deadline will be the same as for the annual reports submitted by FIP pilot countries.



Forest Investment Program

MDB Monitoring and Reporting Template

Project Name **EXAMPLE: SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION IN AREAS PREVIOUSLY CONVERTED TO AGRICULTURAL USE PROJECT**

Country: Brazil

Lead MDB IBRD

Reporting Date:

A. GENERAL PROGRESS

Please briefly describe the overall implementation status of the project and any progress on key activities that took place during the reporting period.

B. CRITICAL OPERATIONS BOTTLENECKS

If applicable, please provide a brief update on current (or potential) challenges that are delaying project implementation. Please also include brief recommendations for follow-up.

--

Recommendations for follow-up:

C. CONTRIBUTIONS TO LESSONS LEARNED
Please briefly illustrate any important lessons learned from the project.

--

Section D. Updated Achieved Results (quantitative information on project implementation)

(Please copy and paste what appears in your latest internal result reporting document; e.g. Implementation Status Reports, Progress Report or similar; and Project Results framework /Log frame including actual results or equivalent or attach the document to this template).

Example : ISR of the SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION IN AREAS PREVIOUSLY CONVERTED TO AGRICULTURAL USE PROJECT (for illustration purposes)

CATEGORY 1: COMMON THEMES

THEME 1.1: GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR AVOIDANCE / ENHANCEMENT OF CARBON STOCK

	Baseline	Actual	TargetY 1	Actual T1	TargetY 2	Actual T2	TargetY 3	Actual T3	TargetY 4	Actual T4	Final target	Actual Final Target
SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION IN AREAS PREVIOUSLY CONVERTED TO AGRICULTURAL USE PROJECT												
Increase in the agricultural area using the technologies recommended by the ABC Plan in relation to the total productive area of the participating producers	0		0		0		10		15			
Land area where sustainable	0		0		0		450,000		90,000			

land mgt. practices were adopted as a result of project Hectare (Ha)													
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

THEME 1.2: LIVELIHOOD CO-BENEFITS

	Baseline	Actual	TargetY 1	Actual T1	TargetY 2	Actual T2	TargetY 3	Actual T3	TargetY 4	Actual T4	Final target	Actual Final Target
SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION IN AREAS PREVIOUSLY CONVERTED TO AGRICULTURAL USE PROJECT												
Increase in the number of participating producers adopting at least one selected technology compared with the control group (Percentage)	0		0		0		5		10			
Direct project beneficiaries	0		0		6,000		9,000		12,000			
Clients who have adopted an improved	0		0		1200		2400		3,600			

agr. Technology promoted by the project												
Producers and technicians trained	0		0		6,000		9,000		12,000			
Percentage of trained producers requesting credit through the ABC line of credit (percentage)	0				15		15		15			
The percentage of training content retained by each cohort of producers and technicians six months after the training sessions (percentage)	0		0		50		50		50			

CATEGORY 2: OTHER RELEVANT CO-BENEFIT THEMES

Theme 2.1: Biodiversity and other environmental services - If applicable to your project

Theme 2.2: Governance - If applicable to your project

Theme 2.3: Tenure, rights and access - If applicable to your project

Theme 2.4: Capacity development- If applicable to your project

Note: All FIP MDBs have agreed to the above template content and design. FIP countries also agreed to the template during the FIP M&R consultation workshop on April 3-5, 2017.

Annex 3: Participants list

The FIP country representatives participating in the interviews were:

- Brazil: José Ari Lacerda Braga, Executive Manager Ministry of Environment; Joberto Freitas, Director Brazilian Forest Service; and Marco Aurélio dos Santos Araújo, Coordinator of International Development and Sustainability.
- Burkina Faso: Ibrahim LANKOANDE (written responses), FIP coordinator ; Pauline ZABA, M&E responsible.
- DRC : MULENDA Félicien, Coordinateur national des réformes des finances publiques ; Clément VANGU LUTETE, Coordinateur UC-PIF, Min Env. ; Vincent CAPDEJELLE, Assistant technique International, UC-PIF, Min Env. ; Jean Bosco KITUNGWA, esponsable suivi évaluation, UC-PIF, Min Env ; Alex BOMBA YENGE, chargé des sauvegardes environnementales, UC-PIF, Min Env
- Ghana: Musah Abu Juam, Project Coordinator/Technical Director; Tabi Agyarko, Project Manager/Chief Planning Officer
- Lao PDR: Bounpone Sengthong, DOF Deputy Director-General; Khamsene Ounekham, Deputy Director National REDD+ Office, DOF; Outhai Vongsa, Deputy Director, BCC Project; Venevong Phet, BCC project manager; Esa Puustajarvi, Chief Technical Adviser, SUFORD-SU; Paula J. Williams, Chief Technical Adviser, REDD+ Readiness project (FCPF).

The MDB representatives participating in the interviews were:

- World Bank: Gerhard Dieterle and Meerim Shakirova, FIP focal point
- Inter-American Development Bank: Gloria Visconti, FIP focal point
- African Development Bank: Gareth Phillips, FIP focal point

Input from the Asian Development Bank (Mr. Srinivasan) was collected via email.

All donor countries were invited to the FIP M&R stocktaking interviews. The donor country representatives participating in the interviews were:

- UK: Gaia Alison
- USA: Katie Berg

Input from donor country Norway: Elisabeth Forseth was sent via email.

Annex 4 Interview questionnaires for FIP country representatives, MDBs and donors



FIP Monitoring and Reporting Stocktaking Exercise

Questionnaire for Country Representatives

2017



INTRODUCTION

Thank you for your participation in the CIF Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) stocktaking interview. This stocktaking review is devised to review the effectiveness, relevance, and learning aspects of the CIF's monitoring and reporting systems for FIP.

We encourage you to respond openly and freely about your experiences with these M&R systems. Please note that your responses will be kept confidential by the CIF Administrative Unit Monitoring and Reporting team. All questionnaire responses will be analyzed and shared for validation during a stakeholder consultation workshop to be held this Spring.

SECTION 1: IDENTIFICATION

The FIP country focal point should be the primary contributor and respondent for this questionnaire. However, it is suggested that additional M&E personnel, officers, or consultants who are directly involved in FIP monitoring and reporting activities be invited to participate. We suggest limiting the total number of respondents to 2-3 persons (if possible).

1.1 Respondent Information

Please complete the table below with the requested information.

Country:					
Name:	Job Title and Government Unit:	Primary Role(s) for FIP:	Are you the FIP M&R focal point?	No. of Reporting Cycles Completed:	Contacts:
1.			Yes / No		
2.			Yes / No		
3.			Yes / No		
4.			Yes / No		
5.			Yes / No		

SECTION 2: M&R SYSTEMS APPRAISAL

2.1 Overall Effectiveness

How would you rate the overall effectiveness of FIP's monitoring and reporting systems?

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

2.2 Successes and Challenges of Implementation

What have been the main successes and challenges related to the implementation of the FIP M&R systems?

<p>Successes:</p> <p>Challenges:</p>

2.3 Integration of M&E Systems

How would you rate the integration of FIP's M&R systems into your country's systems? For example, is this M&R system – and its indicators – operating within existing national M&E systems – or operating more as a parallel structure? Have any of the indicators been integrated into other M&E systems, policy, or strategic documents? Is the FIP M&R system (or its indicators) used in any other context in your country? (For example, integration with national MRV system or forestry inventory)

(Completely integrated)			(Completely separate)	
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1
Please describe how this integration took place and/or justify your response:				

b. Have any of the FIP core reporting themes been integrated into _____?

	Indicators integrated?	Please specify:
National climate change M&E systems	Yes/No	
Other M&E systems	Yes/No	
Policies	Yes/No	
Strategic documents	Yes/No	
Other contexts	Yes/No	
Additional comments:		

2.4 Utilization of FIP M&R Systems

	a. Has your country utilized the FIP M&R systems for the following purposes?	b. Please explain your answer:
Learning	Yes/No	
Knowledge generation	Yes/No	
Capacity-building	Yes/No	
Decision-making processes	Yes/No	
Accountability purposes	Yes/No	
Other	Yes/No	

Additional comments (if needed):

SECTION 3: M&R PROCESSES

3.1 Data Collection

Please use the table below to answer 3.1 a – e.

- a. From which sources are data collected for FIP M&R in your country?
- b. Which entities are responsible for collecting FIP M&R data in your country?
- c. For the entities identified in part b, please list the type of data collected by each.
- d. Which of the listed entities do you liaise with during data collection?
- e. Please describe the role each entity plays in the data collection process.

a. Data Sources:				
	b. Is this entity responsible for data collection?	c. If yes to (b), please list the type of data they collect:	d. Do you liaise with this entity during data collection?	e. Please describe this entity's role in data collection:
National entities (List all that apply here):	Yes/No		Yes/No	
MDBs (List all that apply here):	Yes/No		Yes/No	
PMUs	Yes/No		Yes/No	
CIF Admin Unit	Yes/No		Yes/No	
Other (List all that apply here):	Yes/No		Yes/No	
Other information (if needed):				

3.2 Scoring workshop organization and stakeholder engagement / participation
Respondents should gather this information and populate the table for 3.2 a – e.)

- a. Which stakeholder groups were invited to last year’s scoring workshop?
- b. Which stakeholder groups attended last year’s scoring workshop?
- c. How many attendees represented each stakeholder group?
- d. How many women were represented in each stakeholder group?
- e. Has any of the above changed over time (e.g. number of total participants, types of groups represented, number/role of women in process)? Please explain.

	a. List all that apply:	Invited to scoring workshop last year?	b. Attended workshop last year?	c. Number of attendees	d. Number of women participating
Relevant government agencies		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on government stakeholder attendees (if needed):					
Indigenous peoples		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on indigenous peoples attendees (if needed):					
Local communities		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on local communities attendees (if needed):					
Local NGOs/civil society		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on local NGOs/civil society attendees (if needed):					

International NGOs		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on international NGO attendees (if needed):					
Private sector		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on private sector attendees (if needed):					
Academia		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on academic attendees (if needed):					
Other (Please specify):		Yes/No	Yes/No		
Comments on other attendees (if needed):					
e. Please describe any trends in stakeholder engagement you have witnessed over time (e.g. number of total participants, types of groups represented, number/role of women in process, etc.):					

3.3 Vetting/Quality Assurance

- a. Was a cross-cutting, multi-stakeholder, national-level steering committee established for quality assurance purposes? Yes/No
- b. If YES to part (a), was a quality assurance exercise conducted by this committee last year? Yes/No/NA
- c. If YES to part (b), please provide a short explanation of how it was conducted (i.e. what went well, challenges found, etc.)

If NO to parts (a) OR (b), please describe why not. For example, was an alternative quality assurance exercise conducted? Why or why not?

3.4 M&R Support to Country

- a. What has been your country’s experience engaging with MDBs throughout the M&R process? (Please respond to sub-questions in the table below.)

Please explain the engagement of MDBs considering the following issue areas:				
i. Resources provided (i.e. financial, human)				
ii. Capacity-building				
iii. Nature/timeliness of support				
iv. Overall, how satisfied are you with the support you have received from MDBs?				
Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied
5	4	3	2	1
Comments on rating:				

- b. What has been your country’s experience with the CIF Administrative Unit throughout the M&R process? (Please respond to sub-questions in the table below.)

Please explain the engagement of CIF considering the following issues areas:				
i. Resources provided (i.e. financial, human)				
ii. Capacity-building				
iii. Nature/timeliness of support				
iv. Overall, how satisfied are you with the support you have received from the CIF Administrative Unit?				
Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied

5	4	3	2	1
Comments on CIF Admin Unit engagement rating:				
v. How would you rate the usefulness of the Community of Practice weekly emails that the CIF Administrative Unit has been sending to you?				
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor
5	4	3	2	1
Comments on Community of Practice email rating:				

3.5 Capacity Limitations

What limitations or challenges does your country face during the FIP M&R process?	Do you have any best practices or success stories to share for the FIP M&R process?
Please elaborate:	Please elaborate:

3.6 Capacity Changes

Are there examples of significant capacity changes in M&R or M&R coordination in your country through the FIP M&R process? Yes/No

If YES to above, what are the key elements to those changes?

SECTION 4: TOOLKIT AND REPORTING THEMES

4.1 Suitability of indicators to country context

a. How would you rate the overall suitability of the 6 FIP reporting themes to your country's context? (see indicators listed below)

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

Please justify your answer (For example, are there other reporting themes that would be better suited to your country's context?)
b. Are there other indicators that would be better suited to your country's climate adaptation context? Please explain as appropriate:

4.2 Utility of FIP reporting themes

a. In the table below, please rate each of the FIP Core reporting themes in terms of how useful you have found it to be for your country

b. Please also provide a short description commenting on how you have used this indicator in your country (e.g. learning, knowledge generation, capacity-building, decision-making processes, accountability purposes, alignment with country indicators, other uses).

UTILITY OF INDICATORS					
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
1.1. GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock	5	4	3	2	1
1.2 Livelihood co-benefits	5	4	3	2	1
2.1 Biodiversity and other environmental services	5	4	3	2	1
2.2 Governance	5	4	3	2	1
2.3 Tenure, rights and access	5	4	3	2	1
2.4 Capacity development	5	4	3	2	1

4.3 Problems or Challenges with the reporting themes

Have you experienced any problems or challenges on these reporting themes?

REPORTING THEME-SPECIFIC PROBLEMS OR CHALLENGES		
	Yes / No?	If yes, please explain:
1.1. GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock	Yes / No	
1.2 Livelihood co-benefits	Yes / No	
2.1 Biodiversity and other environmental services	Yes / No	
2.2 Governance	Yes / No	
2.3 Tenure, rights and access	Yes / No	
2.4 Capacity development	Yes / No	

4.4 How were targets for themes 1.1 and 1.2 established and reported?

Targets for reporting theme 1.1 GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock:	Year of Target:
Description of target setting process for reporting theme 1.1 - Target 1: - Target 2:	Description of reporting the progress towards target for reporting theme 1.1: - Target 1: - Target 2:
Targets for reporting theme 1.2 Livelihood co-benefits:	Year of Target:
Description of target setting process for reporting theme 1.2	Description of reporting the progress towards target for reporting theme 1.2:

4.5 Effectiveness of scorecards in Category 2: Other relevant co-benefit themes

- a. How effective of an approach are the scorecards for reporting themes 2.1 to 2.4?
- b. How reliably does each approach capture your country's progress in this area over time?

EFFECTIVENESS OF SCORECARDS APPROACH						
		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
2.1 Biodiversity and other environmental services	a. Effectiveness	5	4	3	2	1
	b. Reliability over time	5	4	3	2	1
2.2 Governance	a. Effectiveness	5	4	3	2	1
	b. Reliability over time	5	4	3	2	1
2.3 Tenure, rights and access	a. Effectiveness	5	4	3	2	1
	b. Reliability over time	5	4	3	2	1
2.4 Capacity development	a. Effectiveness	5	4	3	2	1
	b. Reliability over time	5	4	3	2	1
Additional comments on effectiveness/reliability of FIP scorecards:						

4.6 For each FIP Narrative listed below, please rate its reporting effectiveness. Please then explain your response by highlighting examples of strengths, problems, challenges, or other factors associated with your perception of the narrative’s effectiveness.

Narrative 3.1: Theory of change and assumptions				
Very effective	Somewhat Effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				
Narrative 3.2: Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies (e.g. NDCs national forest programs, etc.) and uptake of FIP approaches				
Very effective	Somewhat Effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				
Narrative 3.3: Support received from other partners, including the private sector				
Very effective	Somewhat Effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				
Narrative 3.4: Link of DGM to FIP investments from government’s point of view				

Very effective	Somewhat Effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				
Narrative 3.5: Highlights and showcases (if available)				
Very effective	Somewhat Effective	Neutral	Somewhat ineffective	Very ineffective
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				

4.7 Guidance and Quality of Toolkits

How would you rate the guidance available in M&R toolkits and related documents (i.e. tables and scorecards) in terms of their (a) adequacy and (b) ease of understanding?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
Adequacy	5	4	3	2	1
Ease of Understanding	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

SECTION 5: CONCLUSION

5.1 Lessons Learned

What are the main lessons (positive or negative) that you learn from implementing the FIP monitoring and reporting system?

5.2 Value Added

a. Do you see any value added to your country from the FIP monitoring and reporting systems?	Yes/No
Please describe why or why not:	

5.3 Recommendations for Improvement

What recommendations do you have to make the FIP monitoring and reporting systems more effective?



FIP Monitoring and Reporting Stocktaking Exercise

Questionnaire for MDBs

2017



INTRODUCTION

Thank you for your participation in the CIF Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) stocktaking interview. This stocktaking review is devised to review the effectiveness, relevance, and learning aspects of the CIF's monitoring and reporting systems for FIP.

We encourage you to respond openly and freely about your experiences with these M&R systems. Please note that your responses will be kept confidential by the CIF Administrative Unit Monitoring and Reporting team. The aggregated questionnaire responses will be analyzed and shared for validation during a stakeholder consultation workshop to be held this spring.

Respondent Information

Please complete the table below with the requested information.

MDB:					
Name:	Job Title:	Primary Role(s) for FIP:	Are you the FIP focal point in your MDB?	Countries overseen:	Contacts:
1.			Yes / No		
2.			Yes / No		
3.			Yes / No		
4.			Yes / No		

1. MDB's role in FIP M&R

- a. What has been the main role of your MDB in the FIP M&R process?

2. Overall Effectiveness

How would you rate the overall effectiveness of FIP's monitoring and reporting systems?

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

3. Successes and Challenges of Implementation

What have been the main successes and challenges of the FIP M&R systems?

<p>Successes:</p> <p>Challenges:</p>

4. Scoring workshop

- a. Which FIP pilot countries' scoring workshops have you attended and in which years?

Please describe your role during the scoring workshop:

- b. How would you rate the utility (i.e. usefulness) of the FIP scoring workshop?

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

Please justify your score and describe how the scoring workshop has been used:

5. Vetting/quality assurance

- a. Is your MDB engaged in data vetting or any other quality assurance of the FIP M&R system? Yes/No

Please describe how your MDB has been engaged in the data vetting or quality assurance process:

6. How well do you think the FIP core reporting themes are integrated with your MDB’s project indicators?

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

Please provide additional comments:

7. Which alternative indicators would you suggest using for FIP M&R in the future?

Please describe:

8. How do you think that the future design of the FIP M&R system should approach the gap of interim results? Do you think that the system should include more M&R information sharing between MDBs and the CIF Administrative Unit? For example through relevant project progress reports or updated project results frameworks? Please explain which advantages/disadvantages you think this would entail.

Please describe:

9. How do you think that the new design of the FIP M&R system should approach the issue of countries using different GHG calculations / methodologies (i.e. aggregation problems)? Would number of Ha covered under forest management plans (or similar) be a viable alternative in your view? Other suggestions of indicators that could work? Please explain which advantages/disadvantages you think these would entail.

10. Do you think the FIP M&R system captures well the specific impact that investments plans have on women? What would you recommend to improve the reporting system to better assess the gender impact?

11. Recommendations for Improvement

What recommendations do you have to make the FIP monitoring and reporting systems more effective?



FIP Monitoring and Reporting Stocktaking Exercise

Questionnaire for donors
2017



INTRODUCTION

Thank you for your participation in the CIF Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) stocktaking interview. This stocktaking review is devised to review the effectiveness, relevance, and learning aspects of the CIF's monitoring and reporting system for FIP.

We encourage you to respond openly and freely about your experiences with the FIP M&R system. The aggregated questionnaire responses will be analyzed and shared for validation during a stakeholder consultation workshop to be held this spring.

Respondent Information

Please complete the table below with the requested information.

Donor country:				
Name:	Job Title:	Primary Role(s) for FIP:	Are you the FIP focal point in your country?	Contacts:
1.			Yes / No	
2.			Yes / No	
3.			Yes / No	
4.			Yes / No	

1. Overall Effectiveness of the FIP M&R system

How would you rate the overall effectiveness of FIP's monitoring and reporting system?

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

Please provide an explanation:

2. Utility of FIP reporting themes/ indicators

In the table below, please rate each of the FIP reporting themes in terms of how useful you have found it to be

a. Core FIP reporting themes

UTILITY OF INDICATORS					
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
1.1. GHG emission reductions or avoidance/enhancement of carbon stock	5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:					
1.2 Livelihood co-benefits	5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:					
2.1 Biodiversity and other environmental services	5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:					
2.2 Governance	5	4	3	2	1

Explanation:					
2.3 Tenure, rights and access	5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:					
2.4 Capacity development	5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:					

b. FIP Narratives

Narrative 3.1: Theory of change and assumptions				
Very useful	Somewhat useful	Neutral	Somewhat unuseful	Very unuseful
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				
Narrative 3.2: Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies (e.g. NDCs national forest programs, etc.) and uptake of FIP approaches				
Very useful	Somewhat useful	Neutral	Somewhat unuseful	Very unuseful
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				

Narrative 3.3: Support received from other partners, including the private sector				
Very useful	Somewhat useful	Neutral	Somewhat unuseful	Very unuseful
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				
Narrative 3.4: Link of DGM to FIP investments from government's point of view				
Very useful	Somewhat useful	Neutral	Somewhat unuseful	Very unuseful
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				
Narrative 3.5: Highlights and showcases (if available)				
Very useful	Somewhat useful	Neutral	Somewhat unuseful	Very unuseful
5	4	3	2	1
Explanation:				

3. Recommendations for Improvement

- a. What recommendations do you have to make the FIP monitoring and reporting system more useful and effective?

- b. How do you think that the future design of the FIP M&R system should approach the gap of interim results? Do you think that the system should include more M&R information sharing between MDBs and the CIF Administrative Unit? For example through relevant project progress reports or updated project results frameworks? Please explain which advantages/disadvantages you think this would entail.

- c. How do you think that the new design of the FIP M&R system should approach the issue of countries using different GHG calculations / methodologies (i.e. aggregation problems)? Would number of Ha covered under forest management plans (or similar) be a viable alternative in your view? Other suggestions of indicators that could work? Please explain which advantages/disadvantages you think these would entail.

d. Do you think the FIP M&R system captures well the specific impact that investments plans have on women? What would you recommend to improve the reporting system to better assess the gender impact?
