

**UN-REDD**  
PROGRAMME



**National Programme**  
**Annual Report –**  
**FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF**  
**NIGERIA**

---

UN-REDD Programme

---

2014

FINAL DRAFT

In accordance with the decision of the Policy Board, hard copies of this document will not be printed to minimize the environmental impact of the UN-REDD Programme processes and contribute to climate neutrality. The UN-REDD Programme's meeting documents are available on the internet at: [www.unredd.net](http://www.unredd.net) or [www.un-redd.org](http://www.un-redd.org).

## Table of Contents

i.	Annual Report for the UN-REDD National Programmes .....	2
1.	National Programme Identification .....	3
2.	Results Based Reporting .....	4
2.1	Summary of National Programme Progress.....	4
2.2	Government and Non-Government Comments .....	4
2.3	Results Framework.....	5
3.	Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and Associated UNFCCC Decisions .....	12
3.1	Progress against Warsaw Framework .....	12
3.2	Measures to Ensure Sustainability of National Programme Results .....	15
4.	Financial Information .....	17
4.1	Financial Delivery .....	17
4.2	National Programme and/or R-PP Co-Financing Information .....	18
5.	Risks/Issues Identification & Management .....	19
5.1	Risks/Issues .....	19
5.2	Risk Narrative .....	20
6.	Key Lessons .....	20
7.	Inter-Agency Coordination.....	20
8.	KPIs (NP by Numbers) .....	22
8.1	Governance KPIs .....	22
8.2	Capacity KPIs .....	22
8.3	Technical KPIs.....	23
9.	Annex – UNDG Guidelines: Definitions .....	24

## **i. Annual Report for the UN-REDD National Programmes**

As the cohort of National Programmes increases and individual National Programmes become increasingly mature, Annual Reports aim to serve as a management tool, feeding into decisions of the National Programme Boards or Steering Committees. The Reports also aim to collect information that each country would like to highlight in terms of its progress and actions, processes and lessons to share with other countries. The content and issues included in the Annual Report respond to (i) United Nations Development Group guidelines on results-based reporting; (ii) Policy Board requests for information, indicators and issues they would like to be informed of through the Annual Report process.

The *Annual Report* for the National Programmes, covers a twelve month period ending 31 December (1 January-31 December).

The National Programme Annual Report draws information from standard management tools (financial and technical) at the Programme and national level to minimize the workload for Programme teams. The report is divided into eight sections: 1) National Programme Identification; 2) Results Based Reporting; 3) Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and Associated UNFCCC Decisions; 4) Financial Information; 5) Risk/Issues Identification & Management; 6) Key Lessons; 7) Inter-Agency Coordination; and 8) Key Programme Indicators. Please refer to the annex for UNDG definitions and guidelines.

The lead agency for each National Programme is responsible for coordinating inputs to the Annual Reports, and for ensuring all agency and counterpart perspectives have been collected - in particular government and civil society organizations. The reports are reviewed and vetted by the agency teams, who provide quality assurance and recommendations to the national teams on articulating results and on adjustments to be made. It therefore follows an iterative process which serves to enhance the quality of the reports and enable a meaningful assessment of progress and identification of key lessons regarding knowledge exchange.

Timeline for submission of Annual Reports to ([un-redd@un-redd.org](mailto:un-redd@un-redd.org)) by the lead agency National Programme focal point at Headquarter level:

**16 February 2015:** Submission of Annual Report summary form.

**27 February 2015:** Submission of first draft Annual Report.

**16 March 2015:** Submission of signed Annual Report.

## 1. National Programme Identification

Please identify the National Programme (NP) by completing the information requested below. The Government Counterpart and designated National Programme focal points of the Participating UN Organisations will also provide their electronic signature below, prior to submission to the UN-REDD Secretariat.

Country:	Federal Republic of NIGERIA
National Programme Title:	Nigeria REDD+ Readiness Programme
Implementing Partners <sup>1</sup> :	Federal Ministry of Environment (Abuja) Forestry Commission of Cross River State (Calabar)

Project Timeline			
Expression of Interest <sup>2</sup>	2010	First Funds Transfer <sup>3</sup>	01.09.2012
R-PP Approval (by FCPF or PB)	2014	NP End Date <sup>4</sup> :	01.02.2015
NP Validation Meeting	21.02.2011	No-Cost Extension:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
NP Approval by Policy Board	2012	If YES -	01.02.2015
NP Signature date	06.09.2012	Extension End Date:	
Start Date as outlined in inception workshop:	01.12.2012	Extension Duration:	18 to 22 months (as planned in late 2014).

Financial Summary (USD) <sup>5</sup>			
UN Agency	Approved Programme Budget <sup>6</sup>	Amount Transferred <sup>7</sup>	Cumulative Expenditures up to 31 December 2014 <sup>8</sup>
FAO	1,057,000	1,057,000	483,010
UNDP	2,243,318	2,243,318	747,784
UNEP	438,000	438,000	0
Indirect Support Cost (7%)	261,682	261,682	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,000,000</b>	<b>4,000,000</b>	<b>1,230,794</b>

Electronic signatures from the designated UN organizations <sup>9</sup>			Electronic signature by the Government Counterpart
FAO	UNDP	UNEP	
Date and Name of Signatories in Full:			
Click here to enter a date.	Click here to enter a date.	Click here to enter a date.	Click here to enter a date.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Mr. Salisu Dahiru (National Coordinator REDD+)

<sup>1</sup> Those organizations either sub-contracted by the Project Management Unit or those organizations officially identified in the National Programme Document (NPD) as responsible for implementing a defined aspect of the project..

<sup>2</sup> If expression of interest information available - If information not available please insert N/A.

<sup>3</sup> As reflected on the MPTF Office Gateway <http://mptf.undp.org>

<sup>4</sup> Original end date stated in NPD

<sup>5</sup> The financial information reported should include indirect costs, M&E and other associated costs. The information on expenditure is *unofficial*. Official certified financial information is provided by the HQ of the Participating UN Organizations by 30 April and can be accessed on the MPTF Office GATEWAY (<http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/CCF00>).

<sup>6</sup> The total budget for the entire duration of the Programme, as specified in the signed Submission Form and NPD.

<sup>7</sup> Amount transferred to the participating UN Organization from the UN-REDD Multi-Partner Trust Fund.

<sup>8</sup> The sum of commitments and disbursement

<sup>9</sup> Each UN organisation is to nominate one or more focal points to sign the report. Please refer to the *UN-REDD Programme Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Framework* document for further guidance.

## 2. Results Based Reporting

This section aims to summarise the progress of the National Programme during the reporting period, summarise government and non-government comments and assessments and report on the delivery of the National Programme against the annual targets and indicators for the specific outcomes and outputs.

### 2.1 Summary of National Programme Progress

Please provide a brief overall assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs, observed during the current reporting period versus the previous.

#### Summary of National Programme Progress (500 words):

The National Programme experienced a notable delay in implementation in 2013-2014, and progress is unequal: implementation of some outputs progresses well, while others lag behind. Substantive advancement has been achieved in the overall REDD+ readiness planning of Nigeria (output 2.3), as well as in building capacities and stakeholder dialogue at the level of Cross River State (outputs 3.1 & 3.2). National capacities on forest monitoring and MRV were substantially enhanced along 2014 (outputs 2.2 & 3.4). A new Nigeria REDD+ & Climate Diplomacy Initiative has been crafted and is ready to initiate (it will blend outputs 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4), easing synergies and helping reach impact in an efficient and timely manner in relation to outcome 1. However delays in national institutional and technical capacity building (outcome 1) as well as in advancing REDD+ policy in Cross River State (output 3.3 and outcome 4) are suffered. The Participatory Governance Assessment was completed, and will be widely disseminated (in country and abroad) in early 2015 – Nigeria is one of the few world pilots. A draft Community Based REDD+ Country Plan was produced for validation with a final plan to be completed in early 2015. A non-cost extension is anticipated and was deliberated during a programme steering committee in early 2015.

### 2.2 Government and Non-Government Comments

The aim of this section is to allow government and non-government stakeholders to provide their assessment, comments and to provide additional and complementary information.

#### Government counterpart to provide their assessment and additional complementary information not included by the participating UN organizations: (250 words)

Government agrees with the Implementing Partner's assessment regarding the delays at the early stages of the programme as well as the measures taken to address them. However, there is need for increased backstopping and monitoring by implementing partners, robust and very active line of communication and improved response time. Measures must also be put in place for enhanced consultation through periodic meetings with implementing partners outside the statutory meetings.

#### Non-government stakeholders to provide their assessment and additional complementary information (Please request a summary from existing stakeholder committees or platforms): (250 words)

The civil-society constituency involved in REDD+ considers that Nigeria, in terms of implementing REDD+, has so far recorded some level of success in specific states, especially in the pilot state of Cross Rivers, as well as in other states that wish to follow the track, particularly Ekiti and Taraba, which are cueing into the success of the pilot state and have strongly indicated interest. UN-REDD Nigeria programme has continued providing a wide range of training and policy dialogue opportunities, including REDD+ University, the participatory governance assessment on REDD+, and some capacities on M&E. However, the CSO constituency strongly believes that involvement of CSOs should go beyond their representatives, and this would be better achieved if a review of progress and a plan of action for further CSO engagement and dialogue would be conducted. There is action to further broaden CSO engagement in REDD+.

- Ms. Priscilla Achakpa & Mr. Edwin Usang, civil society representatives at the UN-REDD Nigeria Programme's Steering Committee

## 2.3 Results Framework

Outcome 1	<b>Outcome 1:</b>	<b>Improved institutional and technical capacity at the national level</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Outcome:</b>	Institutional and technical capacities are growing, albeit slower than anticipated. National REDD+ team needs technical strengthening, as well as stronger operational/administrative capacities. On the political level, there is notable traction for REDD+.		
	<b>Outcome Performance Indicators<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>Baseline<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>Expected Outcome Targets<sup>12</sup></b>	
	1. Number of high-level and federal policies and planning processes changed due to the REDD+ analytical and dialogue work.	1. The federal government of Nigeria is engaging in REDD+ as a gateway for promoting sustainable development and fostering a green economy, but few examples of a change of route exist.	At least 4 new environmental, climate, agriculture and rural energy policy processes or strategies/plans are substantially reformed thanks to inputs from the national REDD+ process.	
	Has the expected target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No			
Output 1.1	<b>Output 1.1</b>	<b>The REDD+ Secretariat is effective at coordinating REDD+ readiness nationwide</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	The REDD+ secretariat is functional, yet it needs further technical and operational strengthening. The recruitment of a national programme officer with operational experience is pending.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	Increased legal mandate & institutional recognition of REDD+ in Nigeria	No official REDD+ legal endorsement or mandate, weak REDD+ structures	Key personnel recruited and in place. Team retreat organized to ensure coordinated vision & functioning.	
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
	<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.1.</b> The realisation of this output is lagging behind. At the end of 2014, the recruitment of an international advisor was advanced, and this is meant to enable progress in this output, yet there is insufficient technical and operational capacities; conversely, the political traction at federal level is notable.			
Output 1.2	<b>Output Title</b>	<b>Stakeholder engagement and public awareness on REDD+ enhanced</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Slow, insufficient. A priority area for 2015.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	Federal multi-stakeholder REDD+ cluster (to sustain the REDD+ process at federal level)	The REDD+ constituency at federal level is relatively small, with minimal capacities and no regular stakeholder engagement structures.	Stakeholder exchange meetings; training of journalists; guidelines for stakeholder engagement	
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No			
	<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.2.</b> Federal Government led a genuine consultation process for the R-PP, which was endorsed by the FCPF board. There is however a sense that more public awareness and stakeholder dialogue on REDD+ affairs at federal level is required, in view of the public interest in REDD+ and the growing voice of no-REDD+ discourses. Federal-level stakeholders engaged in the Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ exercise, which advanced substantially in 2014. Training to journalists and media is pending.			
<b>Output</b>	<b>Output Title</b>	<b>Policy, legal and institutional arrangements for REDD+ established</b>		

<sup>10</sup> Qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment

<sup>11</sup> Information gathered at the beginning of a project or programme from which variations found in the project or programme are measured

<sup>12</sup> Specifies a particular value for an indicator to be accomplished by a specific date in the future E.g. Total literacy rate to reach 85% among groups X and Y by the year 2010

1.3	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Notable advancement, at least in terms of internal planning.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	1. Policy and legal context for a REDD+ mechanism	No policy or legal framework for text exists or has been assessed	Policy Note for REDD+ adopted.	
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No			
	<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.3.</b> The Policy Note for REDD+ was drafted (it required technical review and final stakeholder inputs).			
Output 1.4	<b>Output Title</b>	Nigeria's international engagement on REDD+ enhanced.		
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Some advancement, notably in terms of planning.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	Task force for REDD+ negotiations.	No task force for REDD+ negotiations; country has a limited number of officials that understand and follow REDD+ negotiations	Undertake exploratory phase of an ECOWAS REDD+ Initiative. Support training & capacity building on climate negotiations (Nigerian task-force for UNFCCC)	
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No			
<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.4.</b> The REDD+ & climate diplomacy initiative was designed, with the planning of steps, no launching yet. No ECOWAS dialogue triggered.				

Outcome 2	<b>Outcome 2:</b>	<b>Framework for REDD+ expansion across Nigeria prepared</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Outcome:</b>	Some progress, in terms of defining key national criteria for the expansion of REDD+		
	<b>Outcome Performance Indicators</b> <sup>13</sup>	<b>Baseline</b> <sup>14</sup>	<b>Expected Outcome Targets</b> <sup>15</sup>	
	Endorsement of a preliminary national strategy on REDD+ across Nigeria's states	No strategy for REDD+ expansion in Nigeria available; no analysis of the options and viability of REDD+ across the different states.	A first national strategy on REDD+ adopted by the federal government and stakeholders, providing specific analysis and guidance for new states to join REDD+.	
	Has the expected target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No			

Output 2.1	<b>Output Title</b>	National REDD+ challenges & potentials assessed		
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Ongoing, yet only at the first analytical stage.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	National assessment of the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation	In-depth understanding of deforestation drivers across Nigeria is weak (some studies exist, but	Undertake a non-spatial assessment of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.	

<sup>13</sup> Qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment

<sup>14</sup> Information gathered at the beginning of a project or programme from which variations found in the project or programme are measured

<sup>15</sup> Specifies a particular value for an indicator to be accomplished by a specific date in the future E.g. Total literacy rate to reach 85% among groups X and Y by the year 2010

		there is insufficient depth as required for REDD+)	
	Has the annual target been met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.2.</b> The non-spatial assessment of deforestation was conducted, yet it awaits technical review and stakeholder appropriation.		
Output 2.2	<b>Output Title</b>	<b>National MRV framework designed</b>	
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	National capacities on forest monitoring and MRV were substantially enhanced in 2014: a group of 49 experts were trained, plus another successful training stream took place on national forest carbon inventory and allometric equations, with 25 active participants. Further trainings are needed on Remote Sensing/GIS and GHG Inventories to increase knowledge and improve GHG reporting in national communications.	
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>
	GHG reporting to UNFCCC	GHG not reported with quality; weak national capacities on GHG reporting	Ongoing support and training by national MRV expert, and FAO UN-REDD team
	Has the annual target been met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.2.</b> Training workshop on forest monitoring and MRV (Jan. 2014) enhanced/increased the knowledge and understanding; and practical capabilities of 49 technical staff (also drawn from CRSFC, Federal Ministry of Environment, Academia, NGO's and CSO's) of the IPCC good practices (GPG documents), the different pillars of MRV, understanding of different sampling techniques for forest carbon inventories, and the different techniques of image analysis. Practical classroom sessions on use of open source GIS (Quantum GIS) increased their capacities on image analysis of spatial (RS) data; while a field practical session increased their skills in undertaking plot establishment and data collection for carbon assessment from various carbon pools. Eventual analysis of the data, linked with the use of allometric equations increased their capacity on the estimation of emission factors. A technical training workshop on national forest carbon inventory and allometric equations (December 2014) increased knowledge and practical skills/capacity of 25 technical staff (drawn from CRSFC, Federal Ministry of Environment, Academia, NGO's and CSO's) to undertake forest carbon sampling for different carbon pools; to undertake tree (destructive) sampling for data collection to develop allometric equations and on the use of open source statistical package (R-Software) for data analysis and development of allometric equations. Participants also enhanced their knowledge on the various stages of the design and execution of a forest carbon inventory, and on how to determine/decide on key carbon pools to sample		
Output 2.3	<b>Output Title</b>	<b>A Preliminary National Strategy for expanding REDD+ across Nigeria's states built</b>	
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Some of the basic building blocs for the national strategy for expanding REDD+ have been built.	
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>
	Understanding of differential conditions, options & challenges for REDD+ among different states	<b>No systematic analysis exists for REDD+ across Nigeria</b>	Support to drafting of R-PP. Definition of criteria for engaging in a REDD+ process. Design of a "package" of financing options for REDD.
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.2.</b> Nigeria engaged well with the FCPF and secured financing from the FCPF (confirmed at the FCPF's administrative board in July 2014) – this will allow to expand REDD+ across new states in Nigeria. The Federal Government defined the key criteria to expand REDD+ across new states; this exercise was conducted by an independent technical panel.		

Outcome 3	<b>Outcome 3:</b>	<b>Institutional and technical capacity for REDD+ in Cross River State strengthened</b>
	<b>Progress Towards Outcome:</b>	Institutional and technical capacities are being notably strengthened in Cross River State.

	<b>Outcome Performance Indicators</b> <sup>16</sup>	<b>Baseline</b> <sup>17</sup>	<b>Expected Outcome Targets</b> <sup>18</sup>
	Ability of CRS to sustain the elaboration and adoption of the CRS REDD+ Strategy	No CRS REDD+ Strategy; in fact, no institutional and technical capacities available at present to build such a strategy	The CRS REDD+ Strategy is elaborated with in-depth technical analysis and in a participatory way, adopted by both governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and recognised internationally as good practice
	Has the expected target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		

Output 3.1	<b>Output 3.1</b>	CRS REDD+ Unit fully functional and effective	
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Notably achieved, as the CRS REDD+ Unit is well staffed, with a wide range of expertise, and is active and prepared to speed up REDD+ work in 2015.	
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>
	Scope of REDD+ team in CRS	CRSFC has a REDD+ unit, but the team is reduced in size and skills	Recruitments completed and fully operational.
	Has the annual target been met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 3.1.</b> The key recruitments in CRS were successful completed in 2014; only pending was the international advisor for REDD+, who joined in early 2015.			
Output 3.2	<b>Output Title</b>	<b>CRS stakeholders, with emphasis on forest communities, trained &amp; engaged on REDD+</b>	
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Tangible progress, yet much more required. The arrival of the CBR+ initiative, sponsored by UN-REDD, has created a strong sense of ownership and engagement among grassroots stakeholders in this state.	
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>
	Stakeholder exchanges on REDD+ related issues involving community and local stakeholders	Few initiatives exist, yet they are dispersed, with no guidelines and no funding for community REDD+ projects and for REDD+ pilots.	REDD+ process' database; CRS Stakeholder Forum on REDD+ meeting; information & communication materials; progress on PGA/REDD+; mobilizing CBR+ initiative
	Has the annual target been met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.2.</b> The UN-REDD guidelines for stakeholder engagement were further disseminated. The Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ (PGA/REDD+) held critical meetings and is advancing well and timely. The CBR+ initiative was successfully mobilized in Nigeria and it is being designed.			
Output 3.3	<b>Output Title</b>	<b>CRS REDD+ Strategy is constructed</b>	
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Delayed; a priority for 2015.	
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>
	Assessments and consultations conducted for constructing a REDD+ strategy.	No assessments available (except a Preliminary Assessment prepared for the formulation); need of consultations & field surveys.	Advance assessments to prepare the basis for REDD+ strategic options in CRS.

<sup>16</sup> Qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment

<sup>17</sup> Information gathered at the beginning of a project or programme from which variations found in the project or programme are measured

<sup>18</sup> Specifies a particular value for an indicator to be accomplished by a specific date in the future E.g. Total literacy rate to reach 85% among groups X and Y by the year 2010

	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<p><b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 3.3.</b>  This output did not advance substantially, despite high interest among CRS stakeholders, due to insufficient expertise to guide it. The recruitment of the international advisor for REDD+ in early 2015 is meant to change the dynamic. Significant advancement was however conducted on the analytical foundations: a spatially-explicit study on drivers of deforestation was conducted, which led to the identification of deforestation “hotspots”, field ground-truthing and participatory social surveys, and image analysis on 3 epochs (2000, 2007 and 2014); increased the knowledge and understanding of proximate/direct drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in the CRS.</p>		
Output 3.4	<b>Output Title</b>	<b>CRS Forest monitoring system operational</b>	
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	Substantial progress has been made in this output: the new Remote Sensing/GIS Laboratory was completed, with hardware and software installation done, and is now fully operational, serving for capacity building in national forest monitoring, MRV and spatial analysis of multiple benefits. The spatially explicit study of drivers of deforestation was completed in Cross River State, and together with a preliminary study on the design of a forest carbon inventory, will serve as bases for the development of the reference level for Cross River State, and serve as a model for other states in Nigeria.	
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>
	Forest Monitoring system for CRS	No forest monitoring system in place	Procure GIS laboratory & full equipment for forest inventory and monitoring. Development of Forest Carbon Inventory sampling design, and field testing the methodology with CRSFC and community members (with GCF project)
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
<p><b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 3.4.</b>  The establishment of a functional Remote Sensing/GIS Laboratory, equipped with computer hardware and GIS software at CRSFC has greatly boosted the work/capacity of CRS MRV capacity building activities, especially on Remote Sensing image analysis with GIS; as well as their capacities to undertake spatial planning and analysis for multiple benefits. It is also going to sustain forest monitoring and MRV work through the development of spatial databases. Procurement of Forest carbon inventory equipment is on going.  A preliminary forest carbon sampling framework, elaborated jointly by CRSFC and Winrock International within the GCF (Governors Climate Facility) funding, involved training and field data collection which increased the knowledge of CRSFC staff on the various stages of sampling design, the determination of sample size to achieve a predetermined precision level; while the practical field phase enhanced their capacity in forest carbon data collection, and analysis increased their knowledge on the determination of emission factors using field data and biomass allometric equations. Further field work is expected to increase sample measurements and derive emission factors.  The non-spatial analysis of deforestation drivers allowed to understand the trends in deforestation over 14 years-period; and the estimation of “Activity Data” for various land use/land cover types in the CRS. The Activity Data, together with preliminary emission factors derived during a study (Activity 3.4...) will be used as inputs into the preliminary jurisdictional Reference Level work for CRS.</p>			

Outcome 4	<b>Outcome 4:</b>	<b>REDD+ readiness demonstrated in Cross River State</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Outcome:</b>	N/A		
	<b>Outcome Performance Indicators<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Baseline<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Expected Outcome Targets<sup>21</sup></b>	
	Implementation of policies and measures to reduce deforestation	Cross River State is known for its environmental commitment, but no specific policies and measures (with associated monitoring of impacts) have been designed and implemented	A set of policies and measures to reduce deforestation are implemented, with associated (proxy) indicators for monitoring their deforestation reduction impact	
	Has the expected target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

Output 4.1	<b>Output 4.1</b>	<b>REDD+ experimental initiatives in the state well coordinated and supported</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	N/A.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	<b>Guidance for REDD+ pilots and initiatives</b>	No technical guidance for REDD+ exists	N/A.	
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 4.1.</b>				
N/A.				
Output 4.2	<b>Output 4.2</b>	<b>REDD+ investments enabled [REDD+ phase 2 triggered]</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	N/A.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	Finance mobilised for forest investments in CRS.	Minimal REDD+ finance available, forest investments hard to mobilise.	Design and commission study on the Valuation of forest ecosystem services to the CRS economy and potential to move towards a green economy	
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
<b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 4.2.</b>				
The Cross River State's Green Economy Working Group was equally established in December 2014 and will soon finalize its mandate to lead the green transformation building on the planned work on the economic valuation of the forests to the state economy and the scoping of the private sector investment.				
Output 4.3	<b>Output 4.3</b>	<b>CRS established as a centre of excellence &amp; learning on REDD+</b>		
	<b>Progress Towards Output:</b>	N/A.		
	<b>Output Performance Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected Annual Targets</b>	
	Visits of states across Nigeria to Cross River State to learn	CRS is known for its environmental commitment,	Capacity building and mapping of multiple benefits of	

<sup>19</sup> Qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment

<sup>20</sup> Information gathered at the beginning of a project or programme from which variations found in the project or programme are measured

<sup>21</sup> Specifies a particular value for an indicator to be accomplished by a specific date in the future E.g. Total literacy rate to reach 85% among groups X and Y by the year 2010

	from their REDD+ and climate policies and actions.	yet learning visits from other states have been minimal.	REDD+ in CRS
	Has the annual target been met: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Planned <input type="checkbox"/> No		
	<p><b>Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 4.3.</b>  Work on capacities to assessing multiple benefits continued. Some visits from other states were conducted to learn on forest management as well as on planning REDD+ readiness.</p>		

### 3. Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and Associated UNFCCC Decisions

#### 3.1 Progress against Warsaw Framework

This section aims to provide insight and to support a thought process into how the National Programme is helping the countries progress against the framework of the convention, namely: 1) a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plans; 2) a Forest Reference Emission Level / Forest Reference Level; 3) a National Forest Monitoring System and 4) Safeguards and Safeguards Information Systems. Not all these areas are supported by the National Programmes, however efforts can be undertaken with domestic or other resources. The checklists are indicative and not always applicable to each country. They can be supplemented by qualitative information.

National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plans	
Brief assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is supporting the country in developing a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plan. (150 words)	Does the country have a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plans: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The Federal Government has established the key criteria to assess and select priority states to expand REDD+. These criteria, which were established by a technical committee, will provide the basis for the <i>Preliminary National Strategy for expanding REDD+ across Nigeria</i> (output 2.3). Meanwhile, CRS is intending to elaborate a state strategy for REDD+, in view of the federal structure of Nigeria, and some analytical work and organisational efforts advanced in this sense, yet the country was awaiting the arrival of an international technical advisor to guide this complex work stream. A non-spatial assessment of deforestation was conducted, which will inform both the national and the CRS efforts towards REDD+ strategic policy, but it awaits technical review.	If Yes: <b>Date of Completion:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>  Please select the following that apply: 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drivers of Deforestation and Forest Degradation Established <sup>22</sup> ; 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Focal Point or National REDD+ Entity Appointed; 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular Stakeholder Meeting/Workshops held; 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) advanced; 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic REDD+ options, policies and measures, and/or REDD+ activities have been identified; 6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institutional arrangements to plan and implement REDD+ activities have been established. 7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ conducted successfully.
Forest Reference Emission Levels/ Forest Reference Level (NFREL/NFRL)	
Brief assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is supporting the country in developing a forest reference emission level and forest reference level. (150 words)	Does the country have Forest Reference Emission Levels / Forest Reference Levels: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The spatially-explicit study on drivers of deforestation in Cross-River State analysed satellite images for three epochs (2000, 2007 and 2014), and activity data (AD) was obtained for land use/land cover conditions in the entire State. Furthermore, preliminary study on the design of a forest carbon inventory has led to the estimation of emission factors (EF) for the forest conditions. The historical AD and EF data collected	If Yes: <b>Date of Completion:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>  Please select the following that apply: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> A national forest definition for REDD+ has been adopted; 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Scope of the activities of the FREL/FRL have been defined;

<sup>22</sup> The drivers of deforestation and forest degradation have been defined through national processes/analysis and consensus has been established through a multi-stakeholder approach.

<p>from these studies will be used to undertake a preliminary analysis towards the development of Reference Levels in 2015.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The scale of the FREL/FRL (national/subnational) has been defined;</li> <li>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FREL/FRL data has been compiled (emission factors and historical activity data);</li> <li>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A methodology for identifying FREL/FRL has been identified;</li> <li>6. <input type="checkbox"/> A timeline for submission to the UNFCCC has been established;</li> <li>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></li> </ol>
<p><b>National Forest Monitoring Systems (NFMS)</b></p>	
<p>Brief assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is supporting the country in developing a National Forest Monitoring System. (150 words)</p>	<p>Does the country have a National Forest Monitoring System:  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> No  If Yes: <b>Date of Completion:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a></p> <p>Please select the following that apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Land Monitoring System in place to assess activity data;</li> <li>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ground-based information to determine Emission Factors is available (e.g. national forest Inventory, permanent sample plots, etc);</li> <li>3. <input type="checkbox"/> National GHG Inventory in place<sup>23</sup>, in particular for LULUCF sector;</li> <li>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Information produced by the NFMS is transparent and made available to stakeholders.</li> <li>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The NFMS is supported by institutional arrangements at national level.</li> <li>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></li> </ol>
<p>National capacity building has been undertaken on forest monitoring and MRV for 49 experts, plus another training on national forest carbon inventory and allometric equations, with 25 active participants. The spatially-explicit study on drivers of deforestation in Cross-River State analysed satellite images for three epochs (2000, 2007 and 2014), produced historic activity data (AD) for land use/land cover in Cross-River State; while the preliminary work on field-testing the forest carbon inventory design produced estimates of emission factors (EF) for the forest conditions. The 2014 land use/land cover map will be used to update the sampling plan, and set-up a forest monitoring system for CRS.</p>	<p><b>Safeguards Information System (SIS)</b></p> <p>Capacity building on REDD+ safeguards has been conducted. The exercise around the Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ (PGA/REDD+), which has been successful, has provided valuable methodological approaches on how to design a safeguards system in a way that is participatory, technically focused and adapted to the national circumstances.</p> <p>Does the country have a Safeguards Information System (SIS):  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  If Yes: <b>Date of Completion:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a></p> <p>Please select the following that apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The SIS takes national circumstances into account;</li> <li>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The SIS provides transparent and consistent information that is accessible to all relevant stakeholders and updated on a regular basis;</li> <li>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The SIS is flexible enough to allow for improvements over time;</li> </ol>

<sup>23</sup> The National Greenhouse Gas (GHG) inventory is in place and includes estimates of anthropogenic forest-related greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks, forest carbon stocks and forest area changes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The SIS is country driven;</li><li>5. <input type="checkbox"/> The SIS is implemented at national level;</li><li>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The SIS builds upon existing systems, as appropriate.</li><li>7. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></li></ul>
--	---

### 3.2 Measures to Ensure Sustainability of National Programme Results

Please provide a brief overall assessment of any measures taken to ensure the sustainability of the National Programme results during the reporting period. Please provide examples if relevant; these can include the establishment of REDD+ institutions expected to outlive the Programme and regulations, or capacities that will remain in place after the completion of the programme.

#### Measures taken to ensure the sustainability of the National Programme (150 words)

The programme has suffered an important delay in delivery of outputs and finance, due to a mix of factors, some internal and some external. A number of measures were taken in 2014 and since they were taken the implementation has been smoother. In any case, a key success factor is the recruitment of key programme staff, national and international, which has been achieved partly. However, this factor will be managed from beginning 2015 with a new international advisor taken position. Implementation is showing that the design was too ambitious, with too many outputs (14). Accordingly, as the country intends to request a no-cost extension in early 2015, a joint UN-REDD Nigeria review of progress will be conducted, with the aim at injecting a number of design, institutional and operational changes to ease implementation and ensure a successful achievement of outcomes.

The questions below seeks to gather relevant information on how the National Programme is putting into practice the principles of aid effectiveness through strong national ownership, alignment and harmonization of procedures and mutual accountability.

#### Are the national implementing partners and UN-REDD focal points involved in the planning, budgeting and delivery of the National Programme?

Programme Executive Board Established:  YES  No  
If YES – Date of Last Meeting: 01.04.2014  
Frequency of Meeting (Number of Meetings annually): 1 or 2.

#### Please explain what measures are in place to ensure national ownership: (150 words)

The Federal Government leads on the convening of the Programme Steering Committee. Further, regular meetings and joint missions between federal and CRS REDD+ teams are conducted. Government prepares concept notes for capacity building/training, participants lists and logistic requirements while implementing partners provide technical support and guidance. As for procurements, Government prepares ToRs and selection of contractors while implementing partners provide technical support and effect payments.

#### Are the UN-REDD Programme's Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement applied in the National Programme process?

Fully  Partially  No

#### Please explain, including if level of consultation varies between non-government stakeholders: (150 words)

The Nigeria REDD+ programme is open and inclusive. Governmental authorities regularly partner and discuss with non-governmental constituencies. The arrival of the CBR+ initiative has created a strong momentum for non-governmental engagement. The existence of Stakeholder Platforms at Federal and CRS which are independent of Government and Partner influence further strengthens the process.

Programme sustainability depends on the extent to which sectorial counterparts, civil society representatives, private sector relevant to the REDD+ dynamic in the country and other relevant stakeholders are involved in the Programme's activities and ownership of strategic matters. In the section below please select applicable options and provide an indication of how these different sets of stakeholders are involved in and appropriate Programme activities.

- Member of the steering committee
- Member of technical or other advisory committees
- Implementing partner for some activities of the National Programme

Please explain, including if level of consultation varies between non-government stakeholders: (150 words)

Non-governmental and civil society representatives are member of the programme steering committee. They regularly participate in technical and policy discussions, sometimes outnumbering governmental participants. The CBR+ initiative will empower non-governmental actors to implement some REDD+ activities at local level.

## 4. Financial Information

### 4.1 Financial Delivery

In the table below please provide up-to-date information on activities completed based on the Results Framework included in the signed NPD; as well as financial data on planned, committed and disbursed funds. The table gathers information on the cumulative financial progress of the National Programme implementation at the end of the reporting period (including all cumulative yearly disbursements). Please add additional rows as needed.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS					
PROGRAMME OUTCOME	UN ORGANISATION	Amount Transferred by MPTF to Programme	Cumulative Expenditures up to 31 December 2013		
			Commitments <sup>24</sup> (B)	Disbursements <sup>25</sup> (C)	Total Expenditures (D) = B + C
Outcome 1:	FAO	-	-	-	-
	UNDP	645,000	0	787,775	787,775
	UNEP	80,000	0	0	0
Sub-total		725,000		787,775	787,775
Outcome 2:	FAO	395,000	0	100,944	100,944
	UNDP	90,000	0	67,486	67,486
	UNEP	-	-	-	-
Sub-total		485,000		168,430	168,430
Outcome 3:	FAO	662,000	0	271,466	271,466
	UNDP	953,318	0	178,900	178,900
	UNEP	-	-	-	-
Sub-total		1,615,318	0	450,366	450,366
Outcome 4:	FAO	-	-	-	-
	UNDP	555,000	0	48,906	48,906
	UNEP	358,000	0	0	0
Sub-total		913,000	0	48,906	48,906
Indirect Support Costs (7% GMS)	FAO	73,990	0	26,069	26,069
	UNDP	157,032	0	48,924	48,924
	UNEP	30,660	0	0	0
<b>Indirect Support Costs (Total)</b>		<b>261,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74,993</b>	<b>74,993</b>
<b>FAO (Total):</b>		<b>1,130,990</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>398,479</b>	<b>398,479</b>
<b>UNDP (Total):</b>		<b>2,400,350</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,131,991</b>	<b>1,131,991</b>
<b>UNEP (Total):</b>		<b>468,660</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Grand TOTAL:</b>		<b>4,000,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,530,470</b>	<b>1,530,470</b>

<sup>24</sup> *Commitments*: Includes all amount committed to date. Commitment is the amount for which legally binding contracts have been signed and entered into the Agencies' financial systems, including multi-year commitments which may be disbursed in future years.

<sup>25</sup> *Disbursement*: Amount paid to a vendor or entity for goods received, work completed, and/or services rendered (does not include unliquidated obligations)

## 4.2 National Programme and/or R-PP Co-Financing Information

If additional resources (direct co-financing) are provided to activities supported by the UN-REDD National Programme including new financing mobilized since start of implementation, please fill in the table below:

Sources of Co-Financing <sup>26</sup>	Name of Co-Financer	Type of Co-Financing <sup>27</sup>	Amount (US\$)	Supported Outcome in the NPD
<b>FCPF</b>	<b>FCPF / World Bank</b>	<b>Cash</b>	<b>3,800,000</b>	<b>1 &amp; 2</b>

---

<sup>26</sup> Indicate if the source of co-financing is from: Bilateral aid agency, foundation, local government, national government, civil society organizations, other multilateral agency, private sector, or others.

<sup>27</sup> Indicate if co-financing is in-kind or cash.

## 5. Risks/Issues Identification & Management

For each risk category, please identify any relevant internal and external risks affecting the implementation of the National Programme. For each identified risk, please clarify whether it is a risk or issue and provide a probability and impact rating. Please also indicate whether mitigation measures or actions are in place or planned. Please add/remove rows as required.

The following risk and issue definitions are adopted:

- A **risk** is something that *might happen*. It has a probability (or likelihood) of happening and if it does there will be a certain impact (may be positive or negative).
- An **issue** is something that *has happened* (or is happening right now). It does not have a probability but it will have an impact. If an issue identified, please indicate probability as N/A.

**NOTE** – A single risk/issue matrix is provided, blending both external and internal dimensions, as it is directly derived from the official risk matrix of the National Programme, as adopted and signed.

### 5.1 Risks/Issues

Themes		Identified Risks/Issues.	Risk / Issue	Probability 1 = Low 5 = High	Impact 1 =Low 5 =High	Mitigation Measures/Actions <input type="checkbox"/> Checkbox
External & Internal Risks	Political	Commitment of federal and/or CRS governments towards implementing REDD+ declines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Issue	1	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions in place; <input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions planned; <input type="checkbox"/> No measures/actions;
	Organisational	Government agencies do not cooperate and coordinate activities effectively	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Issue	3	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions in place; <input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions planned; <input type="checkbox"/> No measures/actions;
	Socio-cultural	REDD+ activities become unpopular with stakeholder groups in CRS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Issue	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions in place; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions planned; <input type="checkbox"/> No measures/actions;
	Operational	Programme inputs (funds, human resources, etc.) are not mobilized in a timely fashion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Issue	4	4	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions in place; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions planned; <input type="checkbox"/> No measures/actions;
	Environmental	Risk of leakage (displacement of deforestation due to CRS activities)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Issue	3	2	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions in place; <input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions planned; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No measures/actions;
	Programmatic	Potential investors are too eager to get into REDD+, carbon finance and carbon trading, creating confusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risk <input type="checkbox"/> Issue	3	2	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions in place; <input type="checkbox"/> Measures/Actions planned; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No measures/actions;

## 5.2 Risk Narrative

### Key External Risks and Responses

Please briefly summarise the key current external difficulties (not caused by the National Programme) that may delay or impede the quality of implementation. (250 words)

Some changes in Government and the pre-electoral dynamic in late 2014 did not ease implementation.

### Key Internal Risks and Responses

Please briefly summarise the key current internal difficulties (not caused by the National Programme) that may delay or impede the quality of implementation. (250 words)

The programme has suffered an important delay in delivery of outputs and finance, due to a mix of factors, some internal and some external. A number of measures were taken in 2014 and since they were taken the implementation has been smoother. In any case, a key success factor is the recruitment of key programme staff, national and international, which has been achieved partly. However, this factor will be managed from beginning 2015 with a new international advisor taken position.

Implementation is showing that the design was too ambitious, with too many outputs (14). Accordingly, as the country intends to request a no-cost extension in early 2015, a joint UN-REDD Nigeria review of progress will be conducted, with the aim at injecting a number of design, institutional and operational changes to ease implementation and ensure a successful achievement of outcomes.

### Key Issues and Responses

Please briefly explain the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or manage the issues (internal and external) referred to above. (250 words)

The programme's implementation partners (Government and the UN) show intent to meet more frequently at both management and technical levels to deal with risks and issues at the current crossroads of the National Programme. A joint review of the programme is scheduled for 2015, to precisely deal with the issues that have emerged.

## 6. Key Lessons

This section aims to capture the most significant lesson learned in the context of the National Programme, as they relate to the thematic work areas on REDD+ or more generally to the practical aspects of implementation, coordination and communication.

### Significant lessons learned in the context of the National Programme

Please provide a narrative of the most significant lessons learned. Include explanations of what was learnt, why the lesson is important, and what has been done to document or share those lessons. (500 words)

Nigeria has opted for a dual REDD+ approach, advancing REDD+ in a selected state (Cross River State) that will serve as model for the rest of the countries, while federal government provides the policy and institutional framing. This model seems valuable for many countries – especially those with large surfaces or complex REDD+ challenges – and hence Nigeria will be able to offer valuable lessons on how to conduct such a dual REDD+ approach with demonstration jurisdictions taking the lead.

## 7. Inter-Agency Coordination

The aim of the questions below is to collect relevant information on how the National Programme is contributing to inter-agency work and “Delivering as One”.

Is the National Programme in coherence with the UN Country Programme or other donor assistance framework approved by the Government

Yes  No

If not, please explain and what are the measures to address this: (150 words)

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**What types of coordination mechanisms and decisions have been taken to ensure joint delivery?**

Please reflect on the questions above and add any other relevant comments and examples if you consider it necessary: (150 words)

Meetings of the Programme Steering Committee at least once, ideally twice per year. Joint missions of the Un-REDD agencies. A joint review of progress with a likely review of design is scheduled for early/mid 2015.

**Has a HACT assessment been undertaken?**

Yes  No

If Yes, to what degree is the HACT being taken up and by which agency: (150 words)

HACT has been conducted at macro level. HACT is regularly applied by UNDP. FAO has adapted its internal operational systems to resemble HACT and particularly to ensure national ownership. However UNEP is a non-resident agency and employment of HACT becomes more complicated.

## 8. KPIs (NP by Numbers)

This section is designed to assess and aggregate quantitative performance indicators relating to annual delivery of the National Programme. These relate to governance, capacity development and technical capacity, supporting the qualitative information provided in the previous sections and are intended to respond to requests from the Policy Board to better quantify and disaggregate the reach of the UN-REDD Programme. For *each* section please include the value, when data is available, for each year since NP start date up until the current reporting year. Please mark Not Available where such information has not been collected.

### 8.1 Governance KPIs

Indicator	Year 1 (2012-2013)	Year 2 (2014)	Year 3 (2015)	Year 4 (2016)	Total
Number of steering committee meetings held	2	1			3
Number of institutes represented in steering committee	8	8			8
Number of women members of the steering committee	3	2			2-3
Number of people actively engaged in advising on the development of the national strategy	N/A	12			12
Number of civil society organizations actively engaged in different aspects of the programme (e.g. National Strategy, Defining RELs/FREs, Steering Committee, Working Groups)	12	15			>15
Number of sub-national REDD+ sensitization, awareness raising and capacity building initiatives.	N/A	16			>20
Other: Click here to enter text.					

### 8.2 Capacity KPIs

Indicator	Year 1 (2012-2013)	Year 2 (2014)	Year 3 (2015)	Year 4 (2016)	Total
Number of people trained on REDD+ and climate change	Men: 120 Women: 70	Men: 68 Women: 30	Men: Women:	Men: Women:	Men: Women:
Number of CSOs trained		30			
Number of REDD+ University events	1	0			
Number of national consultation workshops held	5	3			

Number of information notes produced		18			
Number of information gathering events		5			
Number of stakeholders registered in the REDD+ database		hundreds ( <sup>28</sup> )			
Other: Click here to enter text.					

### 8.3 Technical KPIs

Indicator	Year 1 (2012-2013)	Year 2 (2014)	Year 3 (2015)	Year 4 (2016)	Total
Total area potentially supported towards emission reduction (km <sup>2</sup> )					
Total forest area					
Number of land use plots assessed through remote sensing					
Number of MRV training events		2			
Number of people trained on forest monitoring and MRV		74			
Number of CSOs trained on technical matters		3			
Number of people trained in NFMS for REDD+		74			
Number of MRV training participants from CSOs		3			
Other: Click here to enter text.					

<sup>28</sup> 6 broad stakeholder groups registered in REDD+ data base in CRS including forest dependent communities (70 communities total), government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (21 institutions total), CSOs (30 organisations total), Media (35 individuals total), Private Sector (15 total) and Academia (30 individuals total from 2 institutions).

## 9. Annex – UNDG Guidelines: Definitions

The following definitions for results based reporting from the UNDP Guidelines are to be used for the annual report:

- **Results:** A result is a describable or measurable change that is derived from a cause-and-effect relationship. There are three types of such changes – outputs, outcomes and impact – which can be set in motion by a development intervention.
- **Results Based Reporting:** Seeks to shift attention away from activities to communicating important results that the programme has achieved at output and outcome levels. An effective results-based report communicates and demonstrates the effectiveness of the intervention. It makes the case to stakeholders and donors for continued support and resources.
- **Results Matrix:** An important aid in results-based reporting is the results matrix, which clearly articulates the results at output and outcome level and the indicators, baselines and targets. These items, along the review of indicators, assumptions and risks, should serve as guides for reporting on results.
  - **Outcomes:** Outcomes describe the intended changes in development conditions resulting from UNCT cooperation. Outcomes relate to changes in institutional performance or behaviour among individuals or groups as viewed through a human rights-based approach lens.
  - **Outputs:** Outputs are changes in skills or abilities, or the availability of new products and services that are achieved with the resources provided within the time period specified. Outputs are the level of result in which the clear comparative advantages of individual agencies emerge and accountability is clearest. Outputs are linked to those accountable from them giving the results chain a much stronger internal logic.
  - **Indicators:** Indicators help measure outcomes and outputs, adding greater precision. Indicators ensure that decision-making is informed by relevant data.