

# Development of R-Package and Assessment of REDD+ Readiness in Nepal

Final sharing workshop

July 14, 2015

Brian Peniston (team leader)

***arbonaut***



Government of Nepal  
Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation  
**REDD Implementation Center**  
Bhatar Mahal, Kathmandu

# What is an “R-Package”

- Readiness Assessment Package provides a common Framework on core readiness activities,
- It is a thorough self examination by REDD+ Country stakeholders,
- Takes stock progress on REDD+ Readiness preparation phase and
- Assesses progress on REDD+ Readiness

# R-Package

- Includes:
  - country's progress, captures lessons learned,
  - assesses remaining gaps, and
  - identifies activities for the way forward to transitioning to the implementation of performance-based activities.
- Helps countries:
  - To identify remaining gaps and further needs and generates feedback and guidance to countries from multiple stakeholders and the FCPF Participants Committee.

# **R-Package objectives**

To Conduct a thorough Assessment of Nepal's Progress on REDD+ Readiness, using the R-Package Assessment Framework

# R-Package Methodology

- Multi-stakeholder Inception Workshop (Feb, 2015)
- District, regional and focused groups consultations (March-June, 2015)
- Review of reports, documents and results related to REDD+ Readiness (Feb-July, 2015)
- Multi-stakeholder final sharing workshop (July, 2015)
- Other source of information are: I/NGO experience; Global R-Package comparison (e.g. DRC, Guyana)

# R-Package overall results (draft)

No.	Assessment Criteria	Justification	Assessment
	<b>Component 1: Readiness Organisation and Consultation</b>		
	<b>Subcomponent 1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements</b>		
1	Accountability and transparency	Institutions	
2	Operating mandate and budget	Funds managed	
3	Multi-sector coordination mechanisms and cross-sector collaboration	Mechanism good, Function weak	
4	Technical supervision capacity	Project based	
5	Funds management capacity	Project based	
6	Feedback and grievance redress mechanism	Study only	
	<b>Subcomponent 1b. Consultation, Participation and Outreach</b>		
7	Participation and engagement of key stakeholders	National level	
8	Consultation processes	CSO IPO	
9	Information sharing and accessibility of information	Website not known	
10	Implementation and public disclosure of consultation outcomes	Outreach weak	
	<b>Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation</b>		
	<b>Subcomponent 2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land-Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance</b>		
11	Assessment and analysis	Docs Good	
12	Prioritization of direct and indirect drivers/barriers to forest carbon stock enhancement	Strong study, issues identified	
13	Links between drivers/barriers and REDD+ activities	Links good	
14	Action plans to address natural resource rights, land tenure, governance	Complex Issues remaining	
15	Implications for forest law and policy	Identified but not acted on	
	<b>Subcomponent 2b. REDD+ Strategy Options</b>		
16	Selection and prioritization of REDD+ strategy options	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
17	Feasibility assessment	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
18	Implications of strategy options on existing sectoral policies	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
19	Adoption and implementation of legislation/regulations	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
	<b>Subcomponent 2c. Implementation Framework</b>		
20	Guidelines for implementation	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
21	Benefit-sharing mechanism	Policies good, no mechanism	
22	National REDD+ registry and monitoring system	Not in place	
	<b>Subcomponent 2d. Social and Environmental Impacts</b>		
23	Analysis of social and environmental safeguard issues	Analysis strong	
24	REDD+ strategy design with respect to impacts	Good but need to improve	
25	<b>Environmental and social management framework</b>	<b>SESA Strong policies</b>	

# R-Package overall results (draft)

No.	Assessment Criteria	Justification	Assessment
	<b>Component 3: Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels</b>		
26	Demonstration of methodology	Sub National good	
27	Use of historical data and adjustment for national circumstances	Sub National good, national draft	
28	Technical feasibility of the methodological approach, and consistency with UNFCCC/IPCC guidance and guidelines	Sub National good and consistence with UNFCCC/IPCC, national to be tested	
29	Documentation of monitoring approach	Sub National	
	<b>Component 4: Monitoring System for Forests, and Safeguards</b>		
	<b>Subcomponent 4a: National Forest Monitoring System</b>		
30	Demonstration of early system implementation	Sub National	
31	Institutional arrangements and capacities	Identified	
	<b>Subcomponent 4b: Information System on Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards</b>		
32	Identification of relevant non-carbon aspects, and social and environmental issues	Identified but not resolved	
33	Monitoring, reporting and information sharing	Identified, not implemented	
34	<b>Institutional arrangements and capacities</b>	<b>Need to strengthen</b>	

# R-Package specific results

## Component 1: Readiness Organisation and Consultation

### Subcomponent 1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
1	Accountability and transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Apex, RWG and REDD IC</li> <li>- REDD MS Forum, National CSO-IPO alliance</li> <li>- REDD-IC web page</li> <li>- Meeting Agenda and decisions circulated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infrequent meetings</li> <li>- Low NGO numbers</li> <li>- Frequent transfers</li> </ul>
2	Operating mandate and budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- REDD-IC</li> <li>- FCPF, GoN and donor (project) Funds</li> <li>- REDD Piloting in 3 districts</li> <li>- Sub National Program (12 Districts)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Disbursements less than committed</li> <li>- Low GoN budget</li> <li>- Weak coordination</li> </ul>
3	Multisector coordination mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Apex Body and MS coordination bodies established</li> <li>- Multi-Stakeholder participation in plans, etc</li> <li>- Active REDD+ multi-stakeholder forums, REDD+ CSOs &amp; IPOs Alliance and REDD experts WG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficult to engage field and Central level staff</li> <li>- Apex Body not meeting</li> <li>- No anticipation of issues</li> </ul>
4	Technical supervision capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong REDD-IC team at Center</li> <li>- Qualified REED-IC</li> <li>- Many Documents</li> <li>- Learning by doing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequent transfers</li> <li>- Few Trained Staff</li> <li>- Limited Regional and District level staff capacities</li> </ul>
5	Funds management capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrated Fund Mgmt REDD-IC and CSOs</li> <li>- Accounting and auditing systems</li> <li>- Managing multiple funding sources</li> <li>- I/NGO managing multi donor funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FCPF, project based and limited GON Funds</li> <li>- FCPF funded NGOs not always experienced professionals</li> </ul>
6	Feedback and grievance redress mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Final draft submitted</li> <li>- Complaint mechanisms exist: Purjis, etc</li> <li>- RTI, Hello Sarkar, complain box, citizen board and CIAA mechanisms</li> <li>- Informal Conflict Management systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited guidelines + procedures</li> <li>- Weak Report and Recommendations</li> <li>- No 3rd party arbitration mechanism</li> </ul>



# R-Package results

## Component 1: Readiness Organisation and Consultation

### Subcomponent 1b. Consultation, Participation, and Outreach

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
7	Participation and key Stake Holder engagement	Active participation all levels, esp. central and project districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-No elected Local government</li> <li>-Representation issues</li> <li>-Limited Marginalized, vulnerable and Dalits</li> <li>-Many districts w/ no REDD+</li> </ul>
8	Consultation processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More than 30,000 people consulted</li> <li>- LFGs/CFUGs, IPOs regularly consulted</li> <li>- District REDD+ desk</li> <li>- Participatory Documents prep</li> <li>- Readiness 43 districts</li> <li>- Local language extension and radio</li> <li>- 450 LRPs on REDD+</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Little mass media</li> <li>- 43 districts after assessment</li> </ul>
9	Information sharing and accessibility of information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dynamic REDD-IC webpage</li> <li>- Many documents, brochures, leaflets</li> <li>- I/NGOs and CSOs engagement</li> <li>- Local language/ FM sharing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Low literacy (65.9%)</li> <li>- Vulnerable = limited net</li> <li>- No standardized partner info sharing</li> <li>- Limited local language extension</li> </ul>
10	Implementation and public disclosure of consultation outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High inclusion in docs</li> <li>- Compulsory public consultations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcomes not shared with locals</li> </ul>

# R-Package results

## Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation

### Subcomponent 2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land-Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
11	Assessment and analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uses data, all forest mgmt, forest tenure, polices, laws and strategies</li> <li>- Nested approach + sub national</li> <li>- Hybrid funding proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work in progress – no sharing</li> <li>- Link sub national + nat'l systems</li> </ul>
12	Prioritization of direct and indirect drivers/barriers to forest carbon stock enhancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 9 Drivers and 10 underlying causes</li> <li>- 6 proximate and 6 underlying causes prioritized for mountains</li> <li>- Direct and underlying drivers cited widely in studies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited participation to define drivers (Eastern Nepal)</li> </ul>
13	Links between drivers/barriers and REDD+ activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 objectives and 13 strategies developed</li> <li>- Law and policy gaps identified</li> <li>- New cross sectorial polices developed (BDS, LUP, CC Policy, Rangeland and Ag Polices, Low carbon Develop)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities weakly linked to underlying causes, (eg poverty)</li> <li>- Gap to Implement new policies</li> <li>- Lack of timely donor \$</li> <li>- Poor Inter ministerial Coordination</li> </ul>
14	Action plans to address natural resource rights, land tenure, and governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CBFM systems recognized</li> <li>- Clear CBFM provisions of communities and GON tenure rights</li> <li>- REDD+ strategy links with SESA</li> <li>- Holistic approach</li> <li>- Land use policy</li> <li>- Legal provisions control D and D</li> <li>- Active people's participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon Tenure rights not explicit</li> <li>- Customary use rights not defined</li> <li>- Weak GRM</li> <li>- Perceived corruption, governance issues</li> <li>- Need full FRL implementation</li> <li>- No Forest Carbon Trust Fund</li> <li>- Sector specific, not multi sectorial</li> <li>- Most Contentious issues remain</li> </ul>
15	Implications for forest law and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inter-sectorial Policies on Biodiversity, Low Carbon Development, Agriculture. Climate Change Policy</li> <li>- Forest Policy-2015 with REDD + emphasis</li> <li>- REDD+ is Highest priority (P1)</li> <li>- Limited Carbon rights in Draft Constitution</li> <li>- Thorough Policy, Law Review (PLR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Laws and acts not amended, and synchronized</li> <li>- Weak Sectorial Coordination</li> <li>- Draft Carbon Rights not shared</li> <li>- Implementation weak</li> <li>- PLR issues identified, not resolved</li> </ul>

# R-Package results

## Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation

### Subcomponent 2b. REDD+ Strategy Options

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
16	Selection and prioritization of REDD+ strategy options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong Mission, vision and objectives related to carbon and NCB</li> <li>- Fair Benefits sharing mechanisms</li> <li>- Links with non carbon benefits, policy harmonization and forest management systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information on REDD+ pilot projects is not accessible</li> <li>- REDD+ pilot project experiences not leveraged</li> <li>- BSM not implemented or designed</li> </ul>
17	Feasibility assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Result of multiple studies Several studies</li> <li>- SESA and other impacts considered</li> <li>- Positive and negative risks outlined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quick assessment of strategy options</li> <li>- Studies recently completed after Strategy, not incorporated</li> <li>- Limited cost benefit analysis</li> </ul>
18	Implications of strategy options on existing sectorial policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inconsistencies identified and described</li> <li>- Support broader integrated goals</li> <li>- Good community support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Timeline not developed</li> <li>- Not widely disseminated yet</li> </ul>

# R-Package results

## Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation

### Subcomponent 2c. Implementation Framework

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
19	Adoption and implementation of legislation/regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Framework laws including registry and the approval procedure for REDD+ projects in place</li> <li>- New decree on operating rules for procedural arrangements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of unanimity on the approval decision</li> <li>- Laws not disseminated</li> <li>- Many laws not adapted to the REDD+</li> <li>- Law on land-use planning not drafted</li> <li>- Several implementing regulations not yet produced</li> </ul>
20	Guidelines for implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use existing structures</li> <li>- Involve multiple stakeholders</li> <li>- Enhance local UG representation</li> <li>- Generate data thru monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon rights not defined</li> </ul>
21	Benefit-sharing mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preliminary policy guidelines and approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No national-level mechanisms</li> <li>- Ideas not publically debated</li> </ul>
22	National REDD+ registry and system monitoring REDD+ activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good sub national progress and experience</li> <li>- Technical architecture described</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Platform not operational</li> <li>- Slow process</li> <li>- Links sub to national</li> </ul>

# R-Package results

## Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation

### Subcomponent 2d. Social and Environmental Impacts

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
23	Analysis of social and environmental safeguard issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- SESA process finalized</li><li>- Participatory design</li><li>- Comprehensive and inclusive</li><li>- CSO and IPO involved</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Weak or no implementation</li></ul>
24	REDD+ strategy design with respect to impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Qualitative Impacts</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Few quantitative targets</li></ul>
25	Environmental and Social Management Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- ESAMU designed and being tested</li><li>- Links to Region and District established</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Limited experience</li><li>- Not fully operational</li></ul>

# R-Package results

## Component 3: Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
26	Demonstration of methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subnational RL established, piloted and endorsed by the GoN and FCPF (sub national 12 Districts)</li> <li>- Recommendations developed to expand to National-level RELs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sub National strong not National RL</li> <li>- Terai specific – no mts or mid hills</li> <li>- Needs Central and community Training</li> <li>- Different Reference periods</li> <li>- Limited data sets</li> <li>- Products not shared</li> <li>- Proposed national RL need to be improved</li> <li>- Compatibility check with UNFCCC needed</li> </ul>
27	Use of historical data, and adjusted for national circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National RL prepared but not tested</li> <li>- Some community level monitoring piloted in Chitwan, Gorkha and Dolakha</li> <li>- TAL RL is compatible with UNFCCC/IPCC</li> <li>- Some Non carbon ecosystem services</li> </ul>	
28	Technical feasibility of the methodological approach, and consistency with UNFCCC/IPCC guidance and guidelines		

# R-Package results

## Component 4: Monitoring System for Forests, and Safeguards

### Subcomponent 4a: National Forest Monitoring System

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
29	Documentation of monitoring approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sub National system piloted and operational</li><li>- National system designed but not tested</li><li>- FRA data could be used for future monitoring</li><li>- DFRS Designated as Central level body</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Limited Central level Technical depth</li><li>- Few staff trained</li><li>- Synchronized systems weak</li></ul>
30	Demonstration of early system implementation		
31	Institutional arrangements and capacities		

# R-Package results

## Component 4: Monitoring System for Forests, and Safeguards

### Subcomponent 4b: Information System on Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards

S.N.	Assessment Criteria	Strengths	Weaknesses
32	Identification of relevant non-carbon aspects and social and environmental issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- SESA and national REDD+ strategy in NCBs</li><li>- FRA proposes Open Source Data system</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Lack of field tests</li><li>- Implementation lags</li><li>- Capacity Building</li></ul>
33	Monitoring, reporting and information sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sub National good</li><li>- Within TAL sharing OK</li><li>- National system yet to be designed</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Scale up to National</li><li>- Limited National sharing</li></ul>
34	Institutional arrangements and capacities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Socio environmental monitoring unit planned (?)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Irregular meetings</li><li>- Policies OK but implementation behind</li></ul>



# R-Package overall group assessments

No.	Assessment Criteria	Justification	Assessment
	<b>Component 1: Readiness Organisation and Consultation</b>		
	<b>Subcomponent 1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements</b>		
1	Accountability and transparency	Institutions	
2	Operating mandate and budget	Funds managed	
3	Multi-sector coordination mechanisms and cross-sector collaboration	Mechanism good, Function weak	
4	Technical supervision capacity	Project based	
5	Funds management capacity	Project based	
6	Feedback and grievance redress mechanism	Study only	
	<b>Subcomponent 1b. Consultation, Participation and Outreach</b>		
7	Participation and engagement of key stakeholders	National level	
8	Consultation processes	CSO IPO	
9	Information sharing and accessibility of information	Website not known	
10	Implementation and public disclosure of consultation outcomes	Outreach weak	
	<b>Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation</b>		
	<b>Subcomponent 2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land-Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance</b>		
11	Assessment and analysis	Docs Good	
12	Prioritization of direct and indirect drivers/barriers to forest carbon stock enhancement	Strong study, issues identified	
13	Links between drivers/barriers and REDD+ activities	Links good	
14	Action plans to address natural resource rights, land tenure, governance	Complex Issues remaining	
15	Implications for forest law and policy	Identified but not acted on	
	<b>Subcomponent 2b. REDD+ Strategy Options</b>		
16	Selection and prioritization of REDD+ strategy options	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
17	Feasibility assessment	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
18	Implications of strategy options on existing sectoral policies	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
19	Adoption and implementation of legislation/regulations	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
	<b>Subcomponent 2c. Implementation Framework</b>		
20	Guidelines for implementation	Included in draft REDD+ Strategy	
21	Benefit-sharing mechanism	Policies good, no mechanism	
22	National REDD+ registry and monitoring system	Not in place	
	<b>Subcomponent 2d. Social and Environmental Impacts</b>		
23	Analysis of social and environmental safeguard issues	Analysis strong	
24	REDD+ strategy design with respect to impacts	Good but need to improve	
25	<b>Environmental and social management framework</b>	<b>SESA Strong policies</b>	

# R-Package overall group assessments

No.	Assessment Criteria	Justification	Assessment
	<b>Component 3: Reference Emissions Level/Reference Levels</b>		
26	Demonstration of methodology	Sub National good	
27	Use of historical data and adjustment for national circumstances	Sub National good, national draft	
28	Technical feasibility of the methodological approach, and consistency with UNFCCC/IPCC guidance and guidelines	Sub National good and consistence with UNFCCC/IPCC, national to be tested	
29	Documentation of monitoring approach	Sub National	
	<b>Component 4: Monitoring System for Forests, and Safeguards</b>		
	<b>Subcomponent 4a: National Forest Monitoring System</b>		
30	Demonstration of early system implementation	Sub National	
31	Institutional arrangements and capacities	Identified	
	<b>Subcomponent 4b: Information System on Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards</b>		
32	Identification of relevant non-carbon aspects, and social and environmental issues	Identified but not resolved	
33	Monitoring, reporting and information sharing	Identified, not implemented	
34	<b>Institutional arrangements and capacities</b>	<b>Need to strengthen</b>	

# R-Package way forward

- ✓ Strengthen GRM
- ✓ Design Forest Carbon Trust Fund
- ✓ Participatory design of Benefits sharing Mechanism
- ✓ Strengthen MRV linking community to sub national to national systems
- ✓ Operationalise and Strengthen Apex Body and Multi Sectorial Coordination at Centre, Regional and Districts
- ✓ Expand Engagement of Vulnerable communities, marginalised and Dalits all levels
- ✓ Expand Outreach and awareness through more local language and media materials and campaigns
- ✓ Expand forest monitoring from Terai based to include Mid hills and Mountains Forests
- ✓ Conduct active awareness and dissemination programs on carbon Rights and
- ✓ Standardize FPIC and conduct programs broadly

Thank You

Questions and Clarifications???