

---

## Call for public inputs REDD+ Results-Based Payments

The GCF aims to support a paradigm shift in the global response to climate change, for which it allocates ex-ante resources to low-emission and climate-resilient projects and programmes in developing countries. RBP for REDD+ implies the allocation of ex-post resources to reward emission reductions and increased removals by forest. In the context of RBP for REDD+, the REDD+ activities will be in line with the paradigm shift that the GCF aims to support.

At the fourteenth meeting, through decision [B.14/03](#), the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) requested the Secretariat to develop “a request for proposals (RFP) for REDD+ results-based payments (RBP), including guidance consistent with the Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and other REDD+ decisions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

While the UNFCCC guidance including the Warsaw Framework provides guiding pillars for REDD+, operationalization of REDD+ results-based payments at the GCF requires further analysis and discussion of elements related to technical and procedural aspects in the context of the governing instrument of the Fund and current procedures. These elements have been identified in section 4.1 of document GCF/B.14/03 and section 3 of document GCF/B.15/Inf.07. These elements have also been discussed in the GCF dialogue at the 22nd session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) and analyses undertaken to date on the existing UNFCCC guidance and current GCF policies, standards and procedures.

This call seeks inputs from REDD+ stakeholders on those identified elements through a structured template which is included below. A parallel process focused on GCF procedures and mandates requiring Board decisions and the technical modalities is being conducted for board members.

Input from the REDD+ stakeholders will be shared publically and analysed by the Secretariat for the preparation of the first draft of the RfP.

### Input requested

The GCF Secretariat is pleased to invite organizations and all entities involved and interested in REDD+ results-based payments, to provide inputs for the development of the GCF Request for Proposals for REDD+ RBP. The template enclosed below includes guiding questions provided as reference only and can be complemented with additional questions identified by the REDD+ stakeholders.

### Submission

Official submission of inputs on behalf of an organization or group of organizations preferably in MS Word format should be sent via e-mail as one document with subject line: “REDD+ RBP – call for public inputs” to [fundingproposal@gcfund.org](mailto:fundingproposal@gcfund.org) by **20<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at 23:59 Korean Standard Time**

The official submission should clearly indicate: Full Name; Title/Position; Organization/Affiliation  
Contact details including telephone and e-mail address

## Template for receiving inputs

### I. Elements related to technical modalities

#### Technical element 1: Scale of implementation

**Issue:** UNFCCC provisions request forest reference emission level and/or forest reference level (FREL/FRL) and measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) to be national with some flexibility for subnational scale as an ‘interim measure’. Guidance is required for defining the scale of implementation for countries requesting RBPs. The GCF needs to state in the RFP what scale of implementation is acceptable in proposals; while being consistent with UNFCCC guidance on FREL/FRL and MRV. The GCF should also contemplate whether and how the existing REDD+ initiatives at different scales and approaches can be considered in the RFP.

UNFCCC mandates and existing practices of key initiative funds:

- UNFCCC: Requires national FREL/FRL or, if appropriate, as an interim measure, subnational FREL/FRL, in accordance with national circumstances (Decision 1/CP.16 paragraph 71).
- Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Carbon Fund: Allows for national and subnational (jurisdictional) level. Most programs are subnational.
- REDD Early Movers Program (REM): Allows for national and subnational. So far the experience has been subnational.
- Norwegian International Climate and Forest Initiative (NICFI): Mainly national level agreements with national governments, although implementation occurs at subnational scales in some countries.

Guiding questions

1.1: What scale of implementation (national, subnational, nested) should be considered for the RFP?

[Sub-regional and regional.](#)

1.2: Should the GCF provide detailed guidance for defining the scale of eligible proposals?

[Yes, for each scale.](#)

1.3: Other questions?

[What is the scale of intervention for executing and implementing entities, for example, for a regional project? Only regional implementing entities could be designated?](#)

[A project could be regional even if the FREL and MRV tools are at national level.](#)

[Which approach would be applied for transboundary forest ecosystems?](#)

#### Technical element 2: Forest reference emissions levels (FREL)/forest reference levels (FRL)

**Issue:** Warsaw Framework for REDD+ articulates modalities for the development and technical assessment of FRELS/FRLs, and for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) of emission reductions achieved through REDD+ activities. Under the current UNFCCC REDD+ decisions, Parties, when constructing their national (or subnational) forest reference emission level and/or forest reference level, may choose their own baseline. This flexibility results in various reference and accounting periods that vary by country. The GCF needs to consider ways to link these procedures with RBF while considering specific countries’ circumstances.

Existing practices of other funds:

- FCPF Carbon Fund: Follows UNFCCC requirements of using historical averages and adjustment but it only allows limited adjustment for “high forest low deforestation” (HFLD) countries with justified changes in deforestation trends and puts in place further requirements on the historic averages by requiring that the historic period considered is about 10 years before the end date which should be the most recent date prior to two years before the start of the draft ER Program Document assessment.
- REM: Historical average rates
- Norway-Guyana bilateral agreement: Mean value of historic average rate and developing country average, with downward adjustment option
- Norway-Brazil bilateral agreement: Historical average rates, updated every 5 years

Guiding questions:

2.1: How should the GCF take into account the different approaches used for defining FREL/FRL and translated into verified REDD+ results?

[It’s important to present the adopted methodologies, approaches and tools. Links with the guidance of the IPCC must be evident.](#)



2.2: Is there a need for additional GCF-specific criteria for FREL/FRL and MRV? If so, what type criteria should that be?

There is a need to confront results with others, gained with different tools.

2.3: How should the GCF take into account the results of the analysis of the REDD+ technical annex<sup>1</sup>? What process and review criteria, if any, in order to make funding decisions?

First of all, cost-effectiveness and impacts on ecosystems, and on populations are criteria for the decision-making process.

2.4: Should a description of how alignment of subnational FREL/REL to national-scale FREL/REL be required?

Yes, that's important.

2.5: Other questions?

What kind of measures are considered for countries which are not involved or advanced on the REDD+ and FREL/REL?

### Technical element 3: Operationalization of the 'Cancun safeguards'

**Issue:** The Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and earlier COP decisions contain seven safeguards<sup>2</sup> that are required to be addressed and respected in all phases of REDD+. The GCF needs to consider how these relate to the existing GCF policies, procedures and reporting requirements, in particular how they can be reconciled with the interim safeguards of the GCF (IFC Performance Standards). The GCF also needs to decide if additional guidance is required on REDD+ RBP-specific considerations in order to operationalize RBP. Such guidance could be warranted, for example, to address the risks of reversals of Emission Reductions achieved, or information may be required to ensure GCF's ESS, fiduciary standards, and gender policy are upheld in activities that produced ERs being rewarded.

Existing practices of other funds:

- FCPF Carbon Fund: World Bank safeguard policies and processes (Strategic Assessment and Management Framework); Benefit Sharing Plan
- REM: Cancun REDD+ Safeguards; KfW safeguards; BMZ human rights guidelines
- Norway-Guyana bilateral agreement: World Bank, IDB and UNEP safeguards
- Norway-Brazil bilateral agreement: Safeguards of the Brazilian Development Bank

Guiding questions:

3.1: How should the GCF assess the implementation of the Cancun Safeguards in addition to the IFC performance standards (interim GCF ESS)?

GCF should develop its proper safeguards based on existing documents.

3.2: Should the GCF develop additional guidance for the reporting on how the Cancun Safeguards are being respected?

Yes, the GCF should develop additional guidance for the alignment of existing safeguards, but not only for the reporting.

3.3: Other questions?

How can the GCF support developing countries in translating these safeguards measures at national level to ensure their implementation?

### Any additional issues/comments

- Links with related national policies and strategies are basic and an important issue.
- Furthermore, what is the cost of inaction, i.e. the impact if no project?

<sup>1</sup> Decision 14/CP.19

<sup>2</sup> Appendix I to UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16.

