

# CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

FIP/SC.10/5  
April 11, 2013

---

Meeting of the FIP Sub-Committee  
Washington D.C.  
May 1, 2013

Agenda Item 6

## **APPROACHES TO MEASURING AND REPORTING RESULTS IN ENDORSED FIP INVESTMENT PLANS**

## **PROPOSED DECISION**

The FIP Sub-Committee, having reviewed document FIP/SC.10/5, *Approaches to Measuring and Reporting Results in Endorsed FIP Investment Plans*, and taking into account the findings from the report, requests the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDBs and the pilot country governments to:

- a) simplify the current FIP results-framework to include a set of agreed project-level core indicators mapped against the elements of REDD+ (i.e. deforestation, forest degradation, sustainable forest management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks);
- b) develop core indicator guidance sheets and performance monitoring tables and scorecards to provide guidance for implementation; and
- c) propose a timeline for the preparation of pilot country work plans for monitoring and reporting against the agreed core indicators.

The CIF Administrative Unit is invited to report to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee on progress achieved.

Furthermore, the Sub-Committee requests the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDBs, to provide support to the FIP pilot countries in their efforts to measure and report on FIP results by creating opportunities to share emerging lessons and discuss challenges, and by making available necessary methodological and knowledge management tools.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Currently, there is no comprehensive and consistent approach to results monitoring and reporting across the seven FIP pilot countries that have endorsed investment plans. Some of the variation reflects the diversity in context, approach and priority-setting that each country has taken. All countries view the FIP investments as a contribution to larger programs aimed at reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, or programs aimed at improved forest and agriculture management. As such, each country focuses its efforts on a piece of the larger REDD+ challenge<sup>1</sup> that they face, and each country approaches the REDD+ challenge in its own strategic way, based on national context and other on-going efforts.
2. Even while most countries note in their investment plans their intention to use the structure of the current FIP results framework, the diversity of investment objectives on the one hand broadens the framework for monitoring and reporting and on the other hand limits possibilities for common measurements and methods across the eight FIP pilots.
3. Although there are differences between the countries in how they approach the use of FIP resources in the context of REDD+, there are also some important commonalities. All countries focus interventions on key drivers of land cover change – deforestation and degradation – and all countries take some action along the *REDD+ continuum*.
4. The diversity of approaches offers a unique opportunity for knowledge management and building a base of experience across a range of conditions and situations. FIP should create a framework that builds on these differences to inform the development and implementation process of the investments. However, this will require the development of a reporting framework that embraces the diversity but also provides some opportunity for inter-comparability between projects – both within the country IPs and across the country IPs along the REDD+ continuum.
5. However, there is potential to add some structure to this diversity and thereby bring some commonality to indicators, by reviewing where each investment plan addresses the various components of REDD+. A way to bring some cohesion and commonality to the monitoring and results framework across all countries would be by building on the specific project and program contributions to a REDD+ /AFoLU measurement schema.
6. There are seven general areas for monitoring and reporting that seem to be most suitable for assessing project-level outcomes in a coherent and consistent way across the eight pilots.

### **REDD+ Area Change and GHG Emissions/Removals**

7. The first is the measurement and reporting of REDD+ areas of forest cover changes, due to deforestation/degradation or enhancements through forest plantations or reforestation. It is associated with concomitant measures of GHG emissions or removals. This metric is quantitative and could be considered a core indicator.

---

<sup>1</sup> REDD+ - Reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation; sustainable forest management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks

## **Forest Management**

8. The second area of measurement is focused on assessing progress in forest management. Most investment plans include some aspect of forest management, either through national policies and programs or at the community level using sustainable forest management and community based forest management strategies. Access to information and transparency is a related attribute that appears in most plans. Forest management is an element of REDD+ as it is important to reducing carbon stock losses as well as enhancing carbon stocks. It is also the avenue through which livelihoods and local stewardship and land tenure opportunities arise.

## **Forest Governance**

9. Forest governance is a central piece of REDD+ and applies across scales from national to community levels. While not all FIP pilot countries address it in their investment plans, it is often noted that governance and property rights are of critical importance to achieve transformational outcomes.

## **Land Tenure and Property Rights**

10. While this topic and measure could be nested under “governance”, it is often separated to highlight its importance in REDD+. Land tenure and property rights are important salient measures, especially in the context of access to land by women and indigenous peoples.

## **Livelihoods, Poverty and Incomes**

11. Contribution of FIP to livelihoods, poverty reduction and increased incomes serves as a co-benefit indicator or measure since it is identified in the objective of the FIP. Most countries will focus on creating these co-benefits through their FIP investments.

## **Biodiversity and other Environmental Benefits**

12. Some countries list biodiversity conservation as an important co-outcome, while others suggest other natural resources such as the protection of water resources.

## **Technical and Human Capacity**

13. Technical and human capacities are a critical area of concern to further advance the REDD+ agenda. One area of technical capacity building focuses on the development of basic data, measurements and information systems. Given the importance of technical and human capacity, it is suggested that a qualitative core indicator accompanied by a scorecard should be developed.

14. Taking into account the findings from the report *Overview of Current Approaches to Measuring and Reporting Results in endorsed FIP Investment Plans* and to further advance the FIP results agenda, it is proposed that the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the

MDBs and the pilot country governments, should, at the next meeting of the FIP Sub-Committee:

- a) simplify the current FIP results-framework to include a set of agreed project-level core indicators mapped against the elements of REDD+;
- b) develop core indicator guidance sheets and performance monitoring tables and scorecards to provide guidance for implementation; and
- c) propose a timeline for the preparation of pilot country work plans for monitoring and reporting against the agreed core indicators.

15. In addition, it is proposed that the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDBs provides support to the FIP pilot countries in their efforts to measure and report on FIP results by creating opportunities to share emerging lessons and discuss challenges, and by making available necessary methodological and knowledge management tools.