# National Programme
# Final Report
# NIGERIA

UN-REDD Programme

DATE -

# Table of Contents

### i.    Final Report Template for the UN-REDD National Programmes

The Final Report for the National Programmes should be submitted to the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat three months following operational closure of the programme. Prior to submitting the report to the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat (un-redd@un-redd.org), the report should be co-signed by the selected focal point for each participating UN Organization, as well as the Government Counterpart. For more background information, roles and responsibilities please refer to the UN-REDD Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Framework Document.

The National Programme final 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 seven sections: 1) National Programme Identification; 2) Results Based Reporting; 3) Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and Associated UNFCCC Decisions; 4) Financial Information; 5) Issues Identification & Management; 6) Inter-Agency Coordination, and 7) Key Performance Indicators.

The lead agency for each National Programme is responsible for coordinating inputs to the Final 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.

## 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: | Nigeria |
|---|---|
| National Programme Title: | Nigeria REDD+ Readiness Programme |
| Implementing Partners[1]: | Department of Forestry, Federal Ministry of Environment (National); and Cross River State Forestry Commission (Sub-national) |

| Project Timeline | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Expression of Interest[2] | 03.03.2010 | NP End Date[3]: | 28.02.2015 |
| R-PP Approval (by FCPF or PB) | --.--.---- | No-Cost Extension: | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| NP Validation Meeting | --.--.---- | If YES - Extension End Date: | 31.12.2016 |
| NP Approval by Policy Board | --.--.---- | Extension Duration | 22 months |
| NP Signature date | --.--.---- | | |
| Start Date as outlined in inception workshop: | --.--.---- | Mid Term Review | ☒ Yes ☐ No |
| First Funds Transfer[4] | --.--.---- | If YES - Mid Term Review Date: | May, 2015 |

| Financial Summary (USD)[5] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| UN Agency | Approved Programme Budget[6] | Amount Transferred[7] | Cumulative Expenditures up to 31 December 2014[8] |
| *FAO* | 1,130,990 | | |
| *UNDP* | 2,400,350 | | |
| *UNEP* | 468,660 | | |
| *Indirect Support Cost (7%)* | | | |
| *Total* | 4,000,000 | | Click here to enter text. |

| Electronic signatures from the designated UN organizations[9] | | | 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. | Click here to enter text. |

---

[1] 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..

[2] If expression of interest information available - If information not available please insert N/A.

[3] Original end date stated in NPD

[4] As reflected on the MPTF Office Gateway http://mptf.undp.org

[5] 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).

[6] The total budget for the entire duration of the Programme, as specified in the signed Submission Form and NPD.

[7] Amount transferred to the participating UN Organization from the UN-REDD Multi-Partner Trust Fund.

[8] The sum of commitments and disbursement

[9] 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 overall progress of the National Programme, summarise government and non-government comments and assessments and report on the delivery of the National Programme against the targets and indicators for the specific outcomes and outputs.

### 2.1  Overall progress of the National Programme

Please provide a brief overall assessment of the extent to which the National has reached the expected outcomes and outputs. Please provide examples if relevant.

---

Overall progress of the National Programme (600 words):

The Programme adopted a two-pronged approach – National and sub-national, and was structured in four outcomes, two at the Federal (national) level and two focusing on Cross River State (sub-national), with a total of 14 outputs. During a mid-term review, the outputs were re-structured and re-organized to 10 outputs whilst still maintaining the same outcomes. The outputs were aligned to the four Warsaw Framework elements. In a nutshell, the programme has nearly met all the outcomes and outputs.

Notably, Nigeria developed a National Framework Strategy for REDD+ and a CRS REDD+ Strategy, both anchored on widespread stakeholder consultations, communication and knowledge management at national and sub-national (CRS) levels. The national REDD+ framework strategy provides guidance to states intending to engage in REDD+ development by outlining the steps and considerations they will need to make. As a pilot, CRS's REDD+ Strategy is intended to inform the national strategy and serve as a model for other states – a platform for learning and structural planning for REDD+ implementation in other parts of Nigeria. To underpin the Strategy, analytical studies and assessment were conducted and developed through an iterative participatory process involving all key stakeholders. The draft strategy was presented to high level of Government officials, including the Federal Minister of Environment.

In addition, Nigeria's NFMS Action Plan with institutional arrangements at the National and CRS levels were clearly defined and developed with a roadmap to facilitate enabling legislations and laws for NFMS implementation to ensure the sustainability and transparency. In CRS, a robust forest monitoring system has been established with a functional GIS laboratory and facilities. These facilities have contributed to the capacity building of stakeholders in the application of remote sensing and GIS capabilities to monitor forest changes, to generate, interpret Activity Data and to perform multiple benefits mapping. Also, 80 sample plots were established in about 62 local communities to estimate carbon stocks and Emission Factors, updated MRV database for CRS, including historic & real-time remote-sensing put in place. Forest Carbon Inventory (FCI) Standard Operation Manual was prepared, produced and printed.

The construction of the FREL/FRL was initiated in 2016. Several consultations were held to discuss what the FREL will consist of including the scale and scope, as well as the estimation of historical emissions. In terms of scale, Nigeria opted for a nested REDD+ programme in which CRS was selected as pilot State. FREL is developed at CRS level as an interim measure. The scope is based on activities, pools and gases included. For activities, only deforestation has been included in the present FREL/FRL. In the pools, the above-ground biomass which constitutes the main component/largest pool is included in the FREL/FRL considering their magnitude and cost-effectiveness to monitor the pools. Finally, for the gasses, only $CO_2$ emissions are included in the present FREL/FRL. Also, an acceptable national definition of forest is established.

Furthermore, four elements were implemented as part of the country's approach to safeguards. First, a participatory analysis of the risks and benefits of a set of proposed PaMs were considered by

the National Safeguards Working Group. Second, existing national and state policies, laws and regulations, in relation to the proposed PaMs were assessed as well as the status of their implementation. This was followed by consultations on the status of PLRs implementation and safeguard compliance in PLRs implementation, with relevant stakeholders. The third element was the development of principles and criteria that interpret the Cancun safeguards in accordance with CRS's specific circumstances; and the fourth was the application of the principles and criteria to the CRS REDD+ Strategy during REDD+ implementation through PLRs reforms (improvements/opportunities) at both State and National level. A draft SIS framework document, setting out steps to develop the SIS, was also prepared.

In addition, the CBR+ programme approved and disbursed grants to 12 civil society organizations for 12 community-based projects in Cross River State. Several trainings were conducted to enable CSOs, including NGOs and CBOs design and implement projects linked to the REDD+ readiness process and also build the capacity of forest dependent communities to address drivers and participate in the REDD+ process. Thus, the design of the various CBR+ projects provided a platform for community engagement and empowerment for active participation in the national REDD+ processes, particularly, in developing the REDD+ strategy for CRS. Together, the projects cover a range of issues, including i) Sustainable Forest Management/Biodiversity conservation; ii) Capacity Development to engage in climate change mitigation processes, including REDD+; iii) Sustainable Livelihoods to combat poverty; and iv) energy.

It is worth mentioning that, Nigeria's REDD+ readiness process has triggered interest for inter-agency collaboration and policy harmonisation at national and sub-national levels. The process has strengthened the views on community forestry and calls for reforms that will address tenure issues and enhance participation and benefit sharing. The programme is establishing unprecedented partnerships in-country and exploring opportunities for the government to adopt and integrate REDD+ principles and activities in planning and budgeting. There are other existing and emerging opportunities for REDD+ implementation in Nigeria particularly from the Wold Bank FCPF, GCF, and the GEF-SGP.

## 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) |
| --- |
| From the Cross River State perspective, being the pilot/demonstration State, in addition to the overall progress above, the REDD+ program continue to serve as a viable platform for the strengthening synergy between relevant government and non-governmental organizations towards emission reduction in the State and beyond in terms of policy reform and implementation. In the aspect of linking States to nationally determined contribution (NDC), through the REDD+ Programme, the required process is in place for the incorporation of contribution from the forest sector into the NDC. |

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

## 2.3 Lessons Learned

This section aims to capture the most significant lessons 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. The sections below should be completed only as applicable and in case lessons learned have been identified.

| Significant lessons learned in the context of the National Programme |
|---|
| Considerable lessons have been learned in the Nigeria REDD+ readiness process. The first is the planning processes around the start-up of the programme. It is important to allocate time for the setting up of structures and for facilitating recruitment processes for technical staff in the REDD+ Secretariats. In addition, programme planning should take into consideration the substantial time required for stakeholder consultations. The building and strengthening of stakeholder platforms essential for successful REDD+ implementation e.g. stakeholder forum and networks of communities of practice can take longer. Furthermore, community based projects like CBR+ strengthened community and NGOs participation particularly in developing the strategy; it is possible that if commenced earlier, CBR+ has the potential to trigger more widespread participation and generate data for early results in the REDD+ readiness process.<br><br>Furthermore, the over-ambitious programme set forth in R-PP likely contributed to a lack of focus on key elements required to achieve readiness. As a result, stakeholder engagement was much more diffuse in clarifying the way forward and analyses did not contribute as cogently as needed to the definition of strategic issues at the commencement of programme implementation. However, a joint mission in 2015 revised the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB 2015) to concentrate on the Warsaw Framework's (WF) four pillars of REDD+ readiness, with a focus on the Cross River State (CRS) pilot, reducing the 14 outputs to 10 through clustering and/or reorientation while maintaining the original programme's four outcomes: two for improved institutional and technical capacity (Outcome 1 at national level and Outcome 3 in CRS), a framework for the expansion of REDD+ across Nigeria (Outcome 2), and REDD+ readiness demonstrated in CRS (Outcome 4). In addition, the mission held targeted capacity building meetings aimed at supporting the Nigeria team to re-orient the implementation of the NP around the four Warsaw Framework element.<br><br>Finally, there needs to be clarity on institutional arrangements for REDD+ readiness implementation from the outset. For example, the composition of the REDD+ coordination units and how it functions within the structures of an institution needs to be clearly defined. Also, in a Federal State where a two-pronged approach for REDD+ implementation is employed, clear communication and reporting lines between the Federal and State is an imperative. |

| Lessons on inter-sectoral coordination |
|---|
| Please provide a narrative of the most significant lessons learned relating to inter-sectoral coordination during implementation of the national programme: (150 words)<br><br>One of the first products to guide the REDD+ readiness process is a stakeholder engagement plan premised on an appropriate stakeholder mapping process. This will enable the programme to identify and engage effectively key sectors from the outset. Also, developing the right messages, how they are communicated, and how they link with the priorities of the key sectors will strengthen coordination and efforts at including REDD+ in the national development agenda. Furthermore, understanding relationship of key sectors with key drivers will assist in shaping collaboration, coordination, and policy actions. Opportunities for policy and funding support could also facilitate coordination; and for sustaining institutional history and capacity relevant for programme implementation, staff retention and expanded staff training in key institutions of key sectors should be encouraged. |

| Lessons learned regarding the technical dimensions of the National Programme |
|---|
| Please provide a narrative of the most significant lessons learned relating the technical dimensions of the national programme during implementation: (150 words) |

At the outset, programme implementation needs to be coupled with capacity building and hands-on/practical support to implement aspects of the REDD+ Programme relating to MRV, FREL/FRL, SIS, and NFMS. This is useful to demystify their seemingly complex/technical methodologies. These technical aspects should combine simple and relevant social development tools to relate the processes and expected outputs and outcomes to the experiences of the people. The process should recognise that REDD+ is about supporting people to respond to climate change issues, and so the process itself must target well to enable people to understand and participate.

In addition, there is the need to properly link the proposed activities in the NP to the Warsaw Framework elements. This rather simplifies and helps to organize the technical work to be implemented.

### Lessons on the REDD+ readiness process

Please provide a narrative of the most significant lessons learned relating to the readiness process during implementation of the national programme: (150 words)

The country-driven programme approach combined with technical hands-on support from the participating United Nations Agencies became crucial at several points in the programme to sustain the process and keep it relevant to national realities and international standards. The constant exchanges involving skills, experiences, information and lessons helped to model a globally acceptable National programme that is peculiar to Nigeria's experience. This process has informed the development of a strategy at the sub-national level, and a national framework strategy informed by robust analytic studies in relevant areas. The inclusive and evidence-based approach towards the strategy development was applauded during stakeholder validation of the strategy, and provides benchmark information for several of government and civil society citations in ongoing development agenda in the Cross River State and Nigeria. Similarly, the establishment of a Safeguards and MRV Working Groups, has provided a space for regular, cross-sector interactions, and thereby, enhancing participatory processes around the implementation of the Warsaw Framework elements.

Inter-agency coordination is key to ensure consistency and a coordinated support to Government. Several joint missions to Nigeria, helped in expediting programme implementation. There is also the need for alignment on how various agencies recruit staff to support programme implementation. Differences in contractual terms for staff recruited by different agencies to work within the REDD+ Coordination Unit should be re-considered in future.

### Lessons on anchoring REDD+ in the national development process

Please provide a narrative of the most significant lessons learned relating to anchoring the REDD+ in the national development process: (150 words)

Mainstreaming REDD+ into relevant national programmes, policies and legislations will be relevant for the programme implementation in Nigeria. This can be supported through making the decision making and technical support group for REDD+ implementation robust and effective. The stakeholder engagement plan, regularly reviewed and updated will provide information and guidance on consultations that will ensure REDD+ is anchored in national development process. Also, data from relevant REDD+ activities will need to be managed and applied to support evidence-based advocacy to justify the programme's position in national development agenda.

### Lessons on implementation and sequencing of the National Programme support

Please provide a narrative of the most significant lessons learned relating to anchoring the national programme in the national development process: (150 words)

A core component of programme implementation is the sequencing of activities to establish backwards and forward linkages. In Nigeria, this took place very late in the programme implementation processes, an occurrence, which should be avoided in future. This is in part due to the late arrival of the Chief Technical Advisor. Also, there is the need to have joint planning meetings and work plans with clear roadmap on how various work streams will feed into each other.

---

**Other Lessons Learned**

Please provide a narrative of any other lessons learned during implementation of the national programme: (150 words)

a. Government ownership and leadership in Readiness process with stakeholder participation is key in delivering a performance based REDD+;

b. There is need to manage high expectation on the benefits of REDD+ but focus on practical solutions that it brings through integrated and participatory approaches;

c. Build on strategic partnerships at all levels in order to optimize and aggregate the full potential of opportunities for REDD+. Need for Government leadership in continuously strengthening coordination between UN-REDD and FCPF to maximise the full potential of the two programmes for REDD+ implementation.

## 2.4 Unforeseen Benefits or Unintended Consequences

Please provide a summary of any ancillary/unforeseen benefits or unintended consequences that may have become evident during implementation or closure of the national programme. (150 words)

Unforeseen Benefits (250 Words)

a. Strengthened organised community groups that were hitherto no longer operational especially regarding participation in forest governance as the result of a moratorium on logging introduced by CRS Government before the REDD+ readiness process and which is still ongoing.

b. Enabled stakeholder participation in forest governance and other REDD+ related actions at unprecedented scale, thereby encouraging experience sharing and lessons learning across landscapes throughout the process.

c. The REDD+ programme was the only platform in CRS that enabled dialogue among stakeholders on forest governance; and awakened evidence-based advocacy to review the moratorium on logging by the CRS Government, which excluded participation and was limited in scope, failing to address other major drivers.

d. Increased awareness of forest value and coordination among and between civil society and forest dependent communities to demand accountability and transparency from government for the building of infrastructures.

Unintended Consequences (250 Words)

## 2.5 Revisions to the National Programme Document

Was the results framework revised following the inception meeting or mid-term review?

☐Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable

IF yes, please provide short narrative outlining the changes: (100 words)

The National programme document results framework was not revised per se, however, the adaptive management was applied to the implementation of the NP subsequently. As mentioned earlier, the Programme outputs were reduced from the 14 outputs to 10 through clustering and/or reorientation while maintaining the original programme's four outcomes.

Were any changes made to the national programme results framework indicators following the inception

| meeting or mid-term review? |
| --- |
| ☐Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable |
| IF yes, please provide narrative outlining the changes: (100 words) |

 N/A

| Were any changes made to the national programme outcomes or outputs following the inception meeting or mid-term review? |
| --- |
| ☒Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable |
| IF yes, please provide narrative outlining the changes: (100 words)<br>The Programme's Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) was revised in May and June, 2015. The revision maintained the four outcomes for programme implementation but reduced the number of outputs and activities for the remaining period of the programme.  The revision did not adjust indicators, baselines, or targets.  Specifically, it reduced the programme outputs from 14 to 10, and the activities carefully tailored towards the Warsaw Framework elements. |

| Were any changes made to the key implementing partners following the inception meeting or mid-term review? |
| --- |
| ☒Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable |
| IF yes, please provide narrative outlining the changes: (100 words)<br><br> Following the National and State level general elections in 2015, a new democratic government emerged. In Cross River State, the widespread institutional structures that emerged saw the emergence of a new Ministry of Climate Change and Forestry with a Commissioner as head. The Board of the Forestry Commission, whose Chairman served as the Programme's State Coordinator, was disbanded following the expiration of tenure of the government and a new board was reconstituted. A new State Coordinator was appointed, after a selection process, who coordinates the REDD+ Programme at the State level in close collaboration with staff of the Forestry Commission and the Ministry. |

| Were any changes made to the duration of the national programme following the inception meeting or mid-term review? |
| --- |
| ☒Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable |
| IF yes, please provide narrative outlining the changes: (100 words)<br><br> When the programme was ending in February 2015, it received approval for a no-cost-extension for up to December 2016. This followed a strategic review of the programme's progress and focus, and recognition of issues that had led to delays. In addition, the ambitious design of the programme and dearth of data required clearer direction and more technical input. With a new direction, improved coordination and increased technical support, the no-cost-extension enabled Nigeria to implement the Programme activities towards attaining the four Warsaw Elements and developing Action Plans to demonstrate readiness and transition towards implementation in the country. |

## 2.6 Results Framework

The results framework aims to measure overall progress of the National Programme against the outcome targets and output targets identified in the National Programme document log frame following the inception meeting or mid-term review. In cases where there are no achievements or shortfalls in achieving targets, a thorough justification is required. Requirements for the sections include:

- For each outcome, please provide the outcome title and a summary of the overall progress towards reaching the outcome. Please list each performance indicator, the associated baseline and expected target for the National Programme. Please indicate if the overall targets have been met by ticking the relevant box.
- For each output, please provide the output title and a summary of the progress towards achieving the specific output. Please list each performance indicator, the associated baseline and expected overall target for the output. Please indicate if the overall output targets have been met by ticking the appropriate box. Lastly, please provide a narrative of the achievement of the overall target for the specific output. Please repeat this for each target for the output and all outputs for the outcomes.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Outcome Title:** | **Outcome 1:** Improved institutional and technical capacity at the national level | |
| **Progress Towards Outcome:** | Results under this Outcome strengthened national capacity to set up and to manage REDD+ through the federal institutions and stakeholders. This has provided the foundations for more in-depth work in Cross River State under this Programme, and for future REDD+ readiness work in other Nigerian states. Results included the establishment of an effective coordination mechanism to ensure all stakeholders participate in REDD+, and the mainstreaming of REDD+ across policies and development interventions in Nigeria. Through the coordination of the national secretariat, the Programme created a critical mass of specialists on REDD+ matters, strengthened institutions to govern REDD+, and raising awareness and support for REDD+ from decision makers and the public. This was achieved through trainings, participation in national and international workshops, and practical field events. One REDD University and a REDD+ Academy were conducted to contribute to building the capacity of nationals in REDD+ while providing similar opportunity for other African countries. Through the various national institutional arrangements for REDD+ implementation in Nigeria, the programme widened consultations with relevant agencies to strengthen the policy and regulatory framework in Nigeria for REDD+ and related affairs. This outcome also improved the knowledge of forest cover, land-use changes and carbon flows across Nigeria, as a precursor to up scaling REDD+ activities across the country. Finally, this outcome also included tangible efforts for a regional alliance for REDD+, through ECOWAS, likely making Nigeria a leader for REDD+ in the region, exchanging lessons and better influencing international negotiations around the UNFCCC and REDD+ matters. | |
| **Outcome Performance Indicators**[10] | **Baseline**[11] | **Expected Outcome Targets**[12] |
| | 1. | 1. |
| Has the expected target been met:    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| 2. | 2. | 2. |
| Has the expected target been met:    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |

---

[10] Qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment
[11] Information gathered at the beginning of a project or programme from which variations found in the project or programme are measured
[12] 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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 3. | | |
| | Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Output 1.1** | **Output Title** | The REDD+ Secretariat is effective at coordinating REDD+ readiness nationwide | |
| | **Progress Towards Output:** | The National REDD+ Secretariat was established in the Federal Department of Forestry to work closely with the Federal Department of Climate Change, both of them under the Federal Ministry of Environment. The setting up of the National REDD+ Secretariat enabled the coordination of REDD+ readiness activities at the national level and provided oversight function in Cross River State. It ensured the coordination of the various working groups and networking with and between relevant ministries, departments and agencies at the National level. The National Secretariat facilitated integration of REDD+ issues in National climate change agenda. In close collaboration with the Department of Climate Change, a new initiative (Nigeria REDD+ and Climate Diplomacy Initiative) was crafted jointly, and FCPF funding was secured. | |
| | **Output Performance Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Expected Annual Targets** |
| | Increased legal mandate and institutional recognition of REDD+ in Nigeria | No official REDD+ legal endorsement or mandate, weak REDD+ structures | 1. i) Key personnel recruited and in place. A team retreat organized to ensure a coordinated vision and functioning. Ii) REDD+ integrated into Federal level institutional structures and policy processes.  Iii) National REDD+ coordination unit functioning |
| | Has the annual target been met:     ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | **Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.1.**<br>National institutional framework for REDD+ constituted (including National REDD+ Coordination Unit) and strengthened by 2014. Now national staff (7 attached officials) has been officially assigned to the implementation of the UN-REDD Programme.<br>A joint review mission in early May 2015 brought the members of the national REDD+ Secretariat together for a two-day retreat that re-focused the AWPB on achieving the four Warsaw Framework elements, with a focus on the Cross River State pilot to feed into national-level REDD+ readiness and to "model" key elements for other states (strategy, interim state-level FMS, interim FRL, and initial safeguards for the strategy's policies and measure(s). Coordination from the national secretariat ensured Nigeria achieved REDD+ readiness at the end of 2016, and the start-up of complementary FCPF support dove-tailing into the process. | | |
| | 2. | 2. | 2. |
| | Has the expected target been met:     ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 1.1.** | | |
| | 3. | 3. | 3. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Has the expected target been met: ⊠Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | |
| | **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output 1.1.** | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Output 1.2** | **Output Title** | **Stakeholder engagement, international engagement, and public awareness of REDD+** |
| | **Progress Towards Output:** | Federal multi-stakeholder REDD+ cluster meetings (to sustain the REDD+ process at federal level) held severally especially after May 2015 programme review. The national secretariat organised national stakeholder fora, a safeguards workshop, training in interpretation of remotely-sensed imagery and other relevant REDD+ components to create awareness and build capacity for enhanced participation in the REDD+ process.  In addition, the National and State Coordinators, the CTA, and a member of the State House of Assembly attended workshops to help Nigeria prepare for participation in the COP in Paris in December 2015 through development of Nigeria's INDCs. The public awareness and participation platform thus established helped to mobilise a robust participation in the strategy process and validation in 2016.

A Policy Note for REDD+ drafted earlier in 2014. In addition, a number of the studies that were commissioned had related policy briefs prepared or key policy messages to high-level decision makers to support the implementation of REDD+. Notably, a study on the Assessment of Policy, Legal and Regulatory (PLR) Enabling Environment was commissioned, which provides key recommendations on Policy, legal and institutional issues that needs to be addressed to position REDD+ in Nigeria.

In addition, the strategy development provided more in-depth information that, informed a policy note for top government level officials at the Federal Ministry of Environment. A high-level meeting, planned for 2017, would discuss policy, legal and institutional issues targeting high level government officials in the Federal Executive and Legislative arms of government in Nigeria. |

| **Output Performance Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Expected Annual Targets** |
|---|---|---|
| 1. 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 in place. | 1. i) Stakeholder exchange meetings; training of journalists; guidelines for stakeholder engagement. Ii) Engagement of stakeholders at the national level focused on selected opportunities that have clear links to the pilot in Cross River State.  A stakeholder engagement plan, covering both federal and state levels, and a communication plan was developed jointly. The communication plan will identify specific "messages" for selected specific stakeholder groups. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Has the annual target been met: ⊠Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | |

**Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 1.2.**
A specific national level multi-stakeholder dialogue for the R-PP was completed in May 2014, following which the FCPF Board approved the R-PP for funding. Federal-level stakeholders also engaged in the Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+, which advanced substantially in 2014. In 2015

| | |
|---|---|
| and 2016 more public awareness and stakeholder dialogue on REDD+ at federal level increased through trainings and consultations towards developing the action plans for REDD+ readiness and implementation in Nigeria. | |

| 2. | 2. | 2. |
|---|---|---|
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 1.1.** | | |

| 3. | 3. | 3. |
|---|---|---|
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output 1.1.** | | |

| **Outcome Title:** | **Outcome 2:** Framework for REDD+ expansion across Nigeria prepared |
|---|---|
| **Progress Towards Outcome:** | This outcome paved the way for expanding and up-scaling REDD+ across Nigeria, from the federal institutions to other interested states and forest areas. This is in line with the Memorandum on REDD+ by the National Council on Environment, in September 2011, which called on all states in Nigeria to participate in REDD+. Under this outcome, a series of national assessments and scoping missions were undertaken to design the optimal approach to REDD+ in Nigeria, such as determining the most promising States for REDD+, the eligible forest types, the eligible REDD+ activities, the likely financial partners, the likely carbon trading and financing schemes, the methodologies for setting reference levels, and the main elements of a national MRV system. Then, drawing on the capacity built (Outcome 1), and on the operational experience (Outcomes 2 and 3), and on a broad consultation process, the programme developed and validated a national framework strategy as the template for expanding REDD+ across Nigeria. |

| **Outcome Performance Indicators[13]** | **Baseline[14]** | **Expected Outcome Targets[15]** |
|---|---|---|
| 1.Analytic studies are conducted on relevant REDD+ areas including drivers, policies, NRM, benefit sharing, REDD+ funding and knowledge management. Framework strategy for REDD+ expansion across | 1. Inadequate baseline information exists to develop a REDD+ strategy. 2. No existing policy for REDD+ expansion in Nigeria. | 1. Conduct analytic studies for REDD+ strategy; 2) Develop national framework strategy for REDD+ expansion across Nigeria. |

---
[13] Qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment
[14] Information gathered at the beginning of a project or programme from which variations found in the project or programme are measured
[15] 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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Nigeria produced. | | |
| | Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | 2. | 2. | 2. |
| | Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | | |
| | Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | | |
| | Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Output 2.1** | **Output Title** | National REDD+ challenges & potentials assessed | |
| | **Progress Towards Output:** | Notable progress was made in the non-spatial analysis of deforestation with the use of past "wall-to-wall" land use datasets, including land use change dynamics with flux diagrams showing land use change transitions between land use types. A spatially-explicit proposal was developed for Cross-River State as follow-up to this activity, and was implemented in output 3.4 in a study that provided more information on drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in Nigeria. | |
| | **Output Performance Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Expected Annual Targets** |
| | 1. National assessment of the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation | In-depth understanding of deforestation drivers across Nigeria is weak (some studies exist, but there is insufficient depth as required for REDD+) | i) Undertake a non-spatial assessment of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.) ii) Develop specific analysis at the state level and selected analysis at the national level to inform strategy development at the State and at the National levels. |
| | Has the annual target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | **Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 2.1.**<br><br>A series of analyses has been initiated (see Output 2.3) to inform the achievement of the output and expected to inform the framing of the national REDD+ framework Strategy. A review was undertaken in 2013 on this topic, and this enabled the programme to quantify past land use change dynamics for the entire country as well as per region (High Forest Zone, Guinea Savannah Zone and Sudan and Sahel zones). Past deforestation trends were modelled based on identified "wall-to-wall" datasets, which led to further field study to update historical information. In addition, the Government secured FCPF support, which expanded support on REDD+ to Nasarawa and Ondo States. | | |
| | 2. | 2. | 2. |
| | Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 2.1.** | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. | | 3. | 3. |

Has the expected target been met**:**   ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output 1.1.**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Output 2.2** | **Output Title** | **National MRV framework designed** |
| | **Progress Towards Output:** | The programme collected real-time data at the Cross River State level through a forest carbon inventory beginning in August 2015, which included complementary support through the Governors' Climate and Forest Task Force (GCF). Preliminary land cover change data/Activity Data (AD) for the AFOLU sector and data for the estimation of Emission Factors (EFs) was developed through a state-level study on drivers of deforestation in 2014 and presented for stakeholder review and validation. |

| **Output Performance Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Expected Annual Targets** |
|---|---|---|
| 1.    GHG reporting to UNFCCC | 1. GHG not reported with quality; weak national capacities on GHG reporting | i) Ongoing support and training by national MRV expert, and FAO UN-REDD team. Ii) Training on forest carbon inventory data analysis through remotely-sensed imagery and training on GHG inventory. |

Has the annual target been met**:**    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 2.2.**
The monitoring system applied a stepwise approach, both spatially and temporally to enable an evolutionary process towards a full, nationwide MRV system as well as a safeguard information system in Phase III, while also being useful in intermediate stages.  The work accomplished towards forest monitoring in Cross-River State included, among others, capacity building, system development, technical studies reports and stakeholder engagement and activation. The Activity Data as interpreted, validated and disseminated in the state, will allow field validation for the national level, while the state-level Forest Inventory will provide data to the national REDD+ database, the format provider for the state level.  Finally, for the GHG inventory completed with the determination of forest carbon stock change in CRS will allow the verification of the national GHG inventory. Like the MRV components, the data flow for SIS will be two-way, since the federal level will provide the format needed for the safeguards at state level.

The development of FREL/FRL in the country will follow a stepwise approach with the intention that FREL/FRL will be further developed and refined over time. It must be noted that FREL/FRL uses the same building blocks or pillars like MRV: the difference stems from the fact that historical data is used for FREL/FRL while MRV uses future data collected. UNFCCC insists that FREL/FRL be consistent with MRV, so that actual performance is assessed during monitoring.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output 2.1** |
|---|---|
| | |

| | **Output Title** | **A Framework National Strategy for REDD+ across Nigeria's states developed** |
|---|---|---|
| **Output 2.3** | **Progress Towards Output:** | The basic building blocks for the national strategy for expanding REDD+ have been developed. Specific progress towards this output included developing the Terms of Reference for the analytical work to inform the national framework strategy, initiating the recruitment process for various consultancies, and identifying the key outputs that are required for a framework national strategy and how this would be linked to the FCPF support in future. .By December 2016, all the analytical work and key outputs were completed and validated by stakeholders. The analyses and outputs informed the development and validation of a national framework strategy for REDD+ replication across interested Nigerian States. |

| **Output Performance Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Expected Annual Targets** |
|---|---|---|
| 1.      Understanding of differential conditions, options and challenges for REDD+ among different states | 1. No systematic analysis exists for REDD+ across Nigeria | 1. **i)** Support to drafting of R-PP. Definition of criteria for engaging in a REDD+ process. Design of a "package" of financing options for REDD. **ii)** Analyses in five key areas carried out, and informed by complementary studies in greater depth at both federal and CRS levels. These include: **(a)** Stocktaking of financing, incentives, benefit sharing, and related financial considerations for REDD+ strategy development; **(b)** Private sector financing, investment, and engagement opportunities for REDD+ strategy development and implementation; and **(c)** Assessment of policy, legal and regulatory instruments for REDD+ Strategy development; d) Natural Resource management study ; e) knowledge management study; and f) An Issues and Options report. |

**Has the annual target been met:**     ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 2.3.**

Nigeria engaged well with the FCPF and secured financing from the FCPF (confirmed at the FCPF's administrative board in July 2014) – has allowed the expansion of REDD+ across new states in Nigeria. Meanwhile, UN-REDD analytic activities informed the framing of the national REDD+ framework Strategy through the development of issues and options and policy notes covering PLRs, Natural Resource Management, private sector engagement and financing, and REDD+ financing and benefit sharing. The same process informed the development of the CRS REDD+ Strategy under output 3.2 - "**CRS REDD+ Strategy is developed"**.

| 2. | 2. | 2. |
|---|---|---|
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 2.3.** | | |
| 3. | 3. | 3. |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output 1.2.** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Outcome Title:** | **Outcome 3:** Institutional and technical capacity for REDD+ in Cross River State strengthened | |
| **Progress Towards Outcome:** | Results under this Outcome strengthened state-level and local capacity in Cross River State to set up and be ready to manage a full-fledged REDD+ process. The REDD+ coordination unit at the State was established at the Cross River State Forestry Commission where several of the state were trained and received support to develop detailed REDD+ components. As a result, staff of the Forestry Commission were actively involved in state-level coordination of the programme and participation in national level events. On the whole, this outcome built a cadre of trained experts and interested stakeholders on key REDD+ readiness issues such as environmental finance mechanisms, forest monitoring, REDD+ policy and investment actions, social & environmental safeguards, multiple benefits, and equitable benefit-sharing schemes, all of which became relevant in the State-level REDD+ readiness process, and will continue to apply in the investment phase. Through activities under this Outcome, the State-level policy and regulatory framework related to REDD+ was assessed, the necessary changes identified, and the process to amend/update/complement laws and regulations supported. Under this Outcome, the Programme supported the comprehensive and detailed process of developing CRS's REDD+ Strategy, which included accurate studies and assessments, many consultation rounds, policy assessment and investment planning, and designing the institutions and principles to govern REDD+. Specific activities included developing Reference Levels, designing a comprehensive forest monitoring system, conducting spatial analysis of the drivers of deforestation/degradation, identification of alternative development paths to effectively reduce emissions (including interventions in the agriculture sector, sustainable energy sources, and community livelihoods), developing the benefit-sharing distribution and carbon trading systems that would underpin REDD+ in CRS, and developing a registry and rules for REDD+ initiatives. Through a fully participatory and iterative | |

| | | process, this outcome produced the REDD+ Strategy covering CRS, thus ensuring CRS is ready to shift to REDD+ Phase 2. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| Outcome Performance Indicators[16] | Baseline[17] | Expected Outcome Targets[18] |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| • | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|

| Output 3.1 | Output Title | CRS REDD+ Unit is effective at coordinating REDD+ readiness at State Level |
|---|---|---|
| | Progress Towards Output: | In January 2014, the REDD+ Unit in Cross River State recruited technical staff as identified in the Programme Document to support Programme implementation.  At the end of February, a Chief Technical Advisor for the national programme and state pilot programme assumed his position in February 2015 (when the programme should have ended), based in the CRS REDD+ Unit and focusing most of his effort on the CRS pilot.  In April, following completion of the Participatory Governance Assessment (PGA) in 2014, the PGA's three "pilot site coordinators" were retained to ensure community-level perspective and contribution to REDD+ strategy and safeguard development, forest monitoring, and the CBR+ initiative.  Following the change in the state government, all term-limited political appointees were relieved of their appointments, included the Chairman of the Forestry Commission, who had been serving as State Coordinator since the beginning of the programme.  Following the completion of the PGA draft in May 2015, it was decided to end the position of PGA Coordinator, who then left the programme at end of June. A new State Coordinator was appointed in November 2015, a management staff of CRSFC, who continued the coordination of the Programme at the State level with strong links with the national. The CTA also left the Programme at the end of December, 2015.. A major implementation strategy was the strengthening of technical and stakeholder platforms to broaden and sustain stakeholder participation and input in the REDD+ process. Fundamental to the success of the programme in the State was the unprecedented technical support from the UN Agencies, which provided the right mentorship and direction throughout this period. |
| | Output Performance Indicators | Baseline | Expected Annual Targets |

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Scope of REDD+ team in CRS<br>2. Technical Committees and Working Groups in place.<br>3. REDD+ integrated into Climate Change Technical committee.<br>4. State and National REDD+ coordination unit functioning well together. | 1. CRSFC has a REDD+ unit that has benefited from various capacity building activities within the MRV and the Safeguard components of the REDD+ Program | 1i) Recruitments completed and fully operational; (ii) CRS state-designated members of the secretariat team actively engaged; (iii) Technical Committee on climate change holds dialogue; (iv) National REDD+ coordination unit has fully implemented the 2015-16 work plan meetings within its institutional structures on REDD+ |

Has the annual target been met**:**   ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 3.1**
The national professionals and international-level advisor were all recruited. The CRSFC received UNDP training and was familiarized with UN operations for the implementation of the programme, thus able to use national implementation modalities. The Secretariat's operations were further strengthened by the recruitment of Pilot Site Coordinators to facilitate the effective participation of Forest Dependent Communities across the 3 REDD+ Pilot Sites in CRS.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2. | 2. | 2. |

Has the expected target been met**:**   ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 3.1.**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3. | 3. | 3. |

Has the expected target been met**:**   ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output3.2.**



| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Report on institutional assessment completed | | |

Has the expected target been met**:**   ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements against annual output**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

Has the expected target been met**:**   ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements against annual output**



| Output 3.2 | **Output Title** | **CRS REDD+ Strategy is developed** |
|---|---|---|
| | **Progress Towards Output:** | This output is linked with output 2.3 above on "**A Framework National Strategy for REDD+ across Nigeria's states developed"**. Terms of reference for priority key analyses were developed. The programme engaged key stakeholders to participate in analyses and strategic planning exercises that informed the CRS REDD+ Strategy and the national framework strategy to serve as a model for |

learning and structural planning for REDD+ implementation in other parts of Nigeria. The Strategy has introduced measures to address the problem of deforestation in CRS, including, technical solutions such as the introduction of agroforestry systems, as well as policy measures including increasing community participation in forest conservation through the development of forest management plans. The strategy has made recommendations for these measures to be extended to the various types of management regimes already in place in the State, as these define and follow a set of rules and norms based on land tenure and land classification. A review of the policy, legal and regulatory framework which already provided the enabling framework for implementation but where gaps and weaknesses lie in application and enforcement informed the objectives for the strategy.

| Output Performance Indicators | Baseline | Expected Annual Targets |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Stakeholder exchanges on REDD+ related issues involving community and local stakeholders<br>2. Analytical studies completed, documented, reviewed by stakeholders, and applied;<br>3. Approach to safeguards developed for Cross River State;<br>4. Draft REDD+ Strategy for Cross River State developed | 1. i) Few initiatives exist, yet they are dispersed, with no guidelines and no funding for community REDD+ projects and for REDD+ pilots; ii)Weak institutional framework/arrangement to develop REDD+ Strategy; iii) Lack of baseline information; iv) Poor documentation and lack of access to existing data/information. | 1i) Develop a REDD+ process database; CRS Stakeholder Forum on REDD+ meeting; production of information and communication materials; progress on PGA/REDD+; mobilising CBR+ initiatives; ii) Finalise analytical studies (PGA; Drivers of Deforestation; Forest Valuation; Private Sector Financing; Financing, Incentives and Benefit Sharing; Assessment of policy, legal and regulatory instruments for REDD+; Technical Paper on Natural Resource Management & Sustainable Forest Management Initiatives of Relevance to REDD+ Strategy in CRS; etc.) to inform strategy development; **iii)** Conduct risk/benefit analysis of Policies and Measures (as part of developing a Nigeria REDD+ approach to safeguards and SIS); **iv)** Complete mapping of multiple benefits; **v)** Prepare an Issues and Options report; **vi)** Organize a meeting with senior Government officials and stakeholders on climate change and REDD+ to discuss emerging issues and options for REDD+ strategy. |

Has the annual target been met:    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No

**Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 3.1**

1. REDD+ process database developed.
2. CRS Stakeholder Forum on REDD+ held several meeting to input into the Strategy process, and to validate the Strategy.
3. Information and communication materials produced and disseminated.
4. Analytic studies (PGA; Drivers of Deforestation; Forest Valuation; Private Sector Financing; Financing, Incentives and Benefit Sharing; Assessment of

policy, legal and regulatory instruments for REDD+; Technical Paper on Natural Resource Management & Sustainable Forest Management Initiatives of Relevance to REDD+ Strategy in CRS) completed with reports.

5. Risk/benefit analysis of Policies and Measures (as part of developing a Nigeria REDD+ approach to safeguards and SIS) completed.
6. Mapping of multiple benefits completed and included in strategy.
7. Issues and Options report produced from analytic studies.
8. Targeted meetings held with senior Government officials and stakeholders on climate change and REDD+ to discuss emerging issues and options for REDD+ strategy. A national high level dialogue planned.
9. CRS Technical Working Group functional and contributed to of the strategic analyses and development of the REDD+ Strategy.
10. REDD+ Strategy developed and validated.
11. CBR+ initiatives started and on-going.

| 2. | 2. | 2. |
|---|---|---|
| **Has the expected target been met:** ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 3.2.** | | |
| 3. | 3. | 3. |
| **Has the expected target been met:** ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output3.2.** | | |
| | | |
| **Has the expected target been met:** ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against annual output** | | |
| | | |
| **Has the expected target been met:** ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against annual output** | | |

| | **Output Title** | **CRS Forest monitoring system operational** |
|---|---|---|
| **Output 3.3** | **Progress Towards Output:** | Progress was made towards the achievement of this target including backstopping work, training workshop on forest monitoring and MRV, the completion and furnishing of the Remote Sensing/GIS Laboratory, and the procurement of RS/GIS equipment (Hardware and Software). The Remote Sensing/GIS Laboratory has been completed, with hardware and software installation further strengthened by |

an additional computer workstation pre-loaded with Idrisi-Tersett remote sensing software.

The spatially-explicit drivers of deforestation study provided data for the AFOLU sector, including land cover change or Activity Data (AD) for years 2000, 2007, & 2014, deforestation hotspots, and satellite imagery. The State MRV committee was instituted and responsible for reviewing and integrating data and analyses, including historic data from previous studies and data from the drivers of deforestation study, which included remote sensing, GIS, and land cover change matrices. The land use/land cover data were down-scaled into lower strata such as the pilot community sites, forest reserves, and Local Government Areas. Procurement of forest inventory equipment was concluded, which enabled reliable real-time forest carbon inventory data to be gathered and fed into the database the field exercises. Additional financial support from Governors' Climate and Forest Task Force (GCF) supported complementary integrated field data collection activities and update of the CRS land cover map (2014) and the preliminary forest carbon sampling framework, elaborated jointly by CRSFC and Winrock International through GCF funding. Remote sensing software (Idrisi-Tersett) was used for a satellite information analysis and management training workshop to enable stakeholders to undertake as it were satellite data analysis for forest monitoring purposes. Institutional arrangements for forest monitoring functions, including information sharing, was agreed and reflected in the Strategy under institutional arrangements for REDD+ implementation.

| Output Performance Indicators | Baseline | Expected Annual Targets |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Forest Monitoring system for CRS | 1. No forest monitoring system in place | 1Ongoing support and training by national MRV expert, and FAO UN-REDD team. Procure GIS laboratory & full equipment for forest inventory & monitoring. Conduct a spatially explicit analysis of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation Provide capacity building on remote-sensing as well as on forest monitoring systems, in collaboration with INPE training centre in Belem, Brazil (at both federal government and CRS levels Development of Forest Carbon Inventory sampling design, and field testing the methodology with CRSFC, NCF, and community members (with GCF project. Develop working relationships among key institutions that manage information relevant to land use/cover change, including the CRS Ministries of Agriculture, Environment, and Lands, the CRS Planning Commission, and the CRS GIA). |
| Has the annual target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 3.4** | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 1. Backstopping work, training workshop on forest monitoring and MRV, the completion and furnishing of the Remote Sensing/GIS Laboratory, and the initiation of procurement RS/GIS equipment (Hardware and Software achieved.<br>2. The Remote Sensing/GIS laboratory construction completed with physical structure, equipment furniture, and electrical installations.<br>3. The procurement of RS/GIS equipment was achieved.<br>4. A spatially explicit study was implemented by NASRDA (Nigerian Space Agency). Work on image pre-processing and identification of deforestation "hotspots", field work on ground-truthing, and social survey, supervised classification and analysis achieved with final report produced and validated.<br>5. Communities, civil society, academia, state, and federal level stakeholders trained on Forest Monitoring and MRV.<br>6. Training included practical work on GIS using Open Source QuantumGIS and actual field data collection for carbon stock estimation and calculation of Emission Factors. |

| 2. | 2. | 2. |
|---|---|---|
| Has the expected target been met:    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 3.4.** | | |
| 3. | 3. | 3. |
| Has the expected target been met:    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output3.2.** | | |
| 4. Report on institutional assessment completed | | |
| Has the expected target been met:    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against annual output** | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met:    ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against annual output** | | |

| Outcome Title: | Outcome 4: REDD+ readiness demonstrated in Cross River State |
|---|---|
| **Progress Towards Outcome:** | Outcome 4 was intended to develop and initiate REDD+ activities in Cross River State, as an experimentation and learning experience, thus preparing the grounds for a transition to REDD+ phase 2 (i.e. investment phase). The assumption too was that international, national and local stakeholders were already starting up REDD+ activities in Cross River State, and so this Outcome would have enabled coherence across these activities and ensured they were brought into a single REDD+ framework for CRS. It was also to provide technical support to CRS and to the local stakeholders in the operationalization of these REDD+ activities, and provide the opportunity to test run and refine the technical components developed under Outcome 3. The reference levels, the MRV system, the registry, the approval procedure and the payment system will have been developed to ensure that these activities become part of a comprehensive lesson-learning, capacity building experience, providing lessons that fed directly into the development of REDD+ readiness in CRS and across Nigeria. To a large extent, this was achieved; and as CBR+ initiatives are still on-going, the experiences and lessons will continue to feedback into the system to ensure that priority REDD+ initiatives remain relevant to the State realities. |

| Outcome Performance Indicators[19] | Baseline[20] | Expected Outcome Targets[21] |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met:  ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met:  ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met:  ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met:  ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| Has the expected target been met:  ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |

[19] Qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment

[20] Information gathered at the beginning of a project or programme from which variations found in the project or programme are measured

[21] 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

| | Output Title | REDD+ experimental initiatives in the state well-coordinated & supported | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Output 4.1** | **Progress Towards Output:** | A country plan for CBR+ was developed and validated by stakeholders.<br><br>The REDD+ Programme worked in collaboration with UNDP and the GEF-Small Grants Programme (GEF-SGP) to initiate Community Based RDD+ (CBR+) on-the-ground in CRS. Thirty-three civil society organisations (CSOs) submitted concept notes to implement CBR+ in 30 REDD+ pilot communities. The REDD+ Secretariat in Calabar facilitated assessment of these concept notes and submitted recommendations to the SGP to invite selected CSOs to submit technical proposals, from which 12 projects (implemented across 22 communities) were approved by the SGP and had begun implementation as at December 2016.  Investment based on the planned analyses and REDD+ Strategy will further strengthen the CBR+ outcomes, even as Nigeria seeks more partnership opportunities to support related activities. | | |
| | **Output Performance Indicators** | **Baseline** | | **Expected Annual Targets** |
| | 1. Guidance for REDD+ pilots and initiatives<br>2. Country plan for CBR+ prepared and approved<br>3. At least 30 concepts notes to implement CBR+ in communities developed and submitted for review to CRS REDD+ Unit<br>4. One UNDP SGP Steering committee meeting held to approve CBR+ concept notes for further development<br>5. Capacity building initiatives to help communities develop proposals carried out | 1. **i)** No REDD+ experimental initiative on the ground; **ii)** Available opportunities to learn and apply lessons from previous projects | | • 1CBR+ initiatives implemented on the ground in REDD+ pilot communities |
| | Has the annual target been met:  ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | | |
| | **Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 4.1**<br><br>CBR+ initiative advanced for the 3 initial "pilots" in CRS, thus providing an experimental basis for REDD. Nigeria actively lobbied at the global level for the new CBR+ initiative of the UN-REDD Programme, and subsequently was successfully retained as one of the 6 world pilots for the CBR+, US$ 800,000 in grants for community and local projects for REDD+. At the end of the readiness phase, 12 projects in 22 communities in CRS pilots already commenced under the CBR+. | | | |
| | 2. | 2. | | 2. |
| | Has the expected target been met:  ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | | |
| | **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 4.1.** | | | |
| | 3. | 3. | | 3. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output 4.1.** | | |
| 4. Report on institutional assessment completed | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against annual output** | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against annual output** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Output 4.2** | **Output Title** | **CRS established as a centre of excellence & learning on REDD+** |
| | **Progress Towards Output:** | The experience and capacity of selected communities in CRS to manage forests sustainably has been documented intermittently on an ad hoc basis, but lessons learned have not been synthesized for practical or widespread application, even for extending successful model within CRS.  While some "out-scaling" to neighbouring communities has occurred, such scaling has not been well supported nor has learning generally been "up-scaled" into MDAs or across NGOs. This output has helped to address some of these gaps by developing a strategy for knowledge management, establishing MRV unit and system to support data collection and management, while ensuring also that KM is included in the policy recommendations for REDD+ process in Nigeria. This output also included capacity building for staff from CRSFC, Federal Ministry of Environment and other sectors, including civil society and community representatives, on the use of spatial analysis to support REDD+ planning that considers multiple benefits, including the preparation of spatial layers and a final report, elements of which fed into the development of the CRS REDD+ Strategy. |

| **Output Performance Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Expected Annual Targets** |
|---|---|---|
| a.  1. Two Knowledge Products available and easily accessible<br>b.  At least one other state visits CRS to begin collaboration and learn about REDD<br>c.  Pilot site coordinators organize adaptive learning review of community based initiatives<br>d.  Working groups review initiatives and outputs relevant to their respective terms of reference. | 1.  i) Minimal REDD+ finance available, forest investments hard to mobilise. Ii) Community-based Forest Management initiatives ongoing; iii) Some level of political awareness and will to support improved forest governance; iv) Poor/inadequate funding of institutions by CRS Government to be REDD-ready | • 1REDD+ data management system fully established and functional. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Has the annual target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements of Annual Target 1 for Output 4.2**<br>a. Knowledge management strategy developed<br>b. Six knowledge products developed<br>c. Policy note developed to provide overall direction for REDD+ readiness & implementation in Nigerian states<br>d. Information, Education and Communication materials produced and disseminated<br>e. MRV Unit established and functional, and data collection on-going to build accessible REDD+ knowledge base<br>**f.** Working groups develop lessons learned that capture key experiences from development process of national strategy on REDD+ | | |
| 2. Report on Assessment of financing and incentives completed | 2. no study on financing and benefit sharing | 2. report on financing and incentives |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 2 for Output 3.2.** | | |
| 3. | 3. | 3. |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against Annual Target 3 for Output3.2.** | | |
| 4. | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| **Achievements against annual output** | | |
| | | |
| Has the expected target been met: ☒Yes ☐ Partially ☐ Planned ☐ No | | |
| | | |

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

### 3.1  Progress against Warsaw Framework

This section aims to gauge how the National Programme has helped the country progress against the framework of the convention (pillars), namely: 1) a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plan; 2) a Forest Reference Emission Level/ Forest Reference Level; 3) a National Forest Monitoring System and 4) Safeguards and Safeguards Information Systems. For each pillar, please provide a narrative for each year summarizing progress made in that year. This information is aimed at generating lessons and a better understanding of how efforts against each of the pillars evolve and are sequenced.

| 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)<br><br>Nigeria developed a National Framework Strategy for REDD+, and a CRS REDD+ Strategy, both anchored on widespread stakeholder consultations, communication and knowledge management. The national REDD+ framework strategy provides guidance to states interested in REDD+, outlining the steps and considerations they will need to take into account to address the drivers while linking efforts to meeting national development objectives. Meanwhile, the CRS REDD+ Strategy will support REDD+ activities in CRS. Its **vision** is "to achieve a climate-resilient economy and improved livelihoods of the people of CRS through sustainable management of forests and reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation".  Its **Mission** is "to promote good forest governance. The strategic focus is to address the proximate drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in CRS, which are specific to the threats emanating from agriculture, forestry, energy, infrastructure development and mining. The strategy identified specific short, medium, and long term **Goals**. | Does the country have a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plans:<br>☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No<br>If Yes: Date of Completion: Click here to enter a date.<br><br>Please select the following that apply:<br>1.   ☒Drivers of Deforestation and Forest Degradation Established[22];<br>2.   ☒National Focal Point or National REDD+ Entity Appointed;<br>3.   ☒Regular Stakeholder Meeting/Workshops held;<br>4.   ☒Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) advanced;<br>5.   ☒Strategic REDD+ options, policies and measures, and/or  REDD+ activities have been identified;<br>6.   ☒Institutional arrangements to plan and implement REDD+ activities have been established.<br>7.   ☒Other: Potential multiple benefits assessed |
| **Forest Reference Emission Levels/ Forest Reference Level (FREL/FRL)** | |
| 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)<br><br>The development of FREL/FRL in Nigeria followed a stepwise approach with the intention that FREL/FRL will be further developed and refined over time to allow the country to incorporate better data, improved methodologies, and additional pools. In addition, the UNFCCC states that subnational FRELs/FRLs may be developed as an interim measure. As such, Nigeria developed its | Does the country have Forest Reference Emission Levels / Forest Reference Levels:<br>☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No<br>If Yes: Date of Completion: Click here to enter a date.<br><br>Please select the following that apply:<br>1.   ☒A national forest definition for REDD+ has been adopted;<br>2.   ☒Scope of the activities of the FREL/FRL have been defined; |

---

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

| | |
|---|---|
| building blocks for FREL/FRL using the same building blocks or pillars like MRV with focus on CRS,, the only difference being that historical data was used for FREL/FRL while MRV used future data collected. | 3. ☒The scale of the FREL/FRL (national/subnational) has been defined;<br>4. ☒FREL/FRL data has been compiled (emission factors and historical activity data);<br>5. ☒A methodology for identifying FREL/FRL has been identified;<br>6. ☒A timeline for submission to the UNFCCC has been established;<br>7. ☐Other: Click here to enter text. |

**National Forest Monitoring Systems (NFMS)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Brief assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is supporting the country in developing a National Forest Monitoring System. (150 words)<br><br>Nigeria's monitoring system intends to apply a stepwise approach, both spatially and temporally to enable a full, nationwide MRV system as well as a safeguard information system in Phase III, while also being useful in intermediate stages.  First, it enables the assessment of the results from REDD+ activities, as required for phase II, and allows Phase III reporting. Both systems are complementary in time and in space. The work already accomplished towards forest monitoring includes, among others, capacity building, system development, technical studies reports and stakeholder engagement and activation. The Activity Data as interpreted, validated and disseminated in the state, will allow field validation for the national level, while the state-level Forest Inventory will provide data to the national REDD+ database.  The GHG inventory component of the MRV system has determined forest carbon stock change in CRS and will allow the verification of the national GHG inventory. | Does the country have a National Forest Monitoring System:<br>☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No<br>If Yes: Date of Completion: Click here to enter a date.<br><br>Please select the following that apply:<br>1. ☒A Land Monitoring System in place to assess activity data;<br>2. ☒Ground-based information to determine Emission Factors is available (e.g. national forest Inventory, permanent sample plots, etc);<br>3. ☒National GHG Inventory in place[23], in particular for LULUCF sector;<br>4. ☒Information produced by the NFMS is transparent and made available to stakeholders.<br>5. ☒The NFMS is supported by institutional arrangements at national level.<br>6. ☐Other: Click here to enter text. |

**Safeguards Information System (SIS)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Brief assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is supporting the country in developing a Safeguards Information System. (150 words)<br>Nigeria adopted a country approach to REDD+ safeguards. A Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ and natural resource management in Nigeria conducted through a pilot in Cross River State's three REDD+ pilot sites provided a major baseline for the safeguards work. A National Safeguards Working Group (NSWG) was constituted in late 2013.  Between 2015 and 2016, the NSWG led consultations and technical work for the preparation of the key components of Nigeria's country approach to safeguards, following UNFCCC Decisions. The programme developed principles and criteria that interpreted the Cancun safeguards in accordance with CRS's specific circumstances, which were applied to refine the strategic objectives of the CRS REDD+ Strategy | Does the country have a Safeguards Information System (SIS):<br>☐ Yes ☒ Partially ☐ No<br>If Yes: Date of Completion: Click here to enter a date.<br><br>Please select the following that apply:<br>1. ☐ The SIS takes national circumstances into account;<br>2. ☐ The SIS provides transparent and consistent information that is accessible to all relevant stakeholders and updated on a regular basis;<br>3. ☐The SIS is flexible enough to allow for improvements over time;<br>4. ☐ The SIS is country driven; |

[23] 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.

| | |
|---|---|
| during REDD+ implementation through PLRs reforms. Regarding REDD+ safeguard information system, given that most of the start-up REDD+ activities took place in CRS, the state level work on safeguards will therefore provide data to develop a federal REDD+ safeguards information system (SIS). The Safeguard team have concluded a final draft design framework and roadmap for the development of the Nigeria's REDD+ Safeguard Information System. | 5. ☐ The SIS is implemented at national level; <br><br> 6. ☐ The SIS builds upon existing systems, as appropriate. <br> 7. ☐ Other: Click here to enter text. |

### 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. 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) |
| --- |
| A national-level stakeholder engagement process has been put in place, as required in REDD+ processes and in climate-change endeavors, to ensure a more open and consultative engagement across ministries, local authorities, civil society forces and community representatives.<br><br>A number of trainings and dialogue events for civil society have been supported as well as the engagement of stakeholders in various ongoing studies through the development of various TORs, participation in analysis, and validation of the studies by the REDD+ Technical Committees at Federal and CRS levels as well as multi-sector working groups such as the safeguards working group. A decentralized network of REDD+ practitioners, which was established during 2012, has been supported and provides the basis for stakeholder engagement and a decentralized dimension of REDD+.<br><br>The Government with the support of UN partners is developing a transitional plan to help mobilize partnerships, financial support and investments to transit from readiness to Implementation. As part of this, proposals and concept notes are being developed to engage with key development partners in support of REDD+ implementation.<br><br>Furthermore, REDD+ is being mainstreamed into key national policy and planning processes, including the Green Economy Strategy of CRS. |

| 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<br>If YES – Date of Last Meeting: Click here to enter a date.<br>Frequency of Meeting (Number of Meetings annually): Click here to enter text.<br><br>Please explain what measures are in place to ensure national ownership: (150 words)<br>Nigeria's REDD+ programme by design was nationally-led, with the same circumstances translating into the implementation of the readiness phase. The programme has a well-defined management and coordination arrangement with a National Advisory Council responsible for providing overall policy direction for both national and sub-national. Thereafter, there is the programme steering committee that is responsible for managing the programme, and a technical committee that provides the technical input required. The functions and roles of key government agencies are clearly defined to enable REDD+ implementation and reporting. |

| Are the UN-REDD Programme's Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement applied in the National Programme process? |
| --- |
| ☒ Fully ☐ Partially ☐ No<br>Please explain, including if level of consultation varies between non-government stakeholders: (150 words)<br>Level of consultation in the Nigeria REDD+ readiness programme varied between government and non-government stakeholders, thus recognising the diversity of stakeholders. Government provided the overall coordination in the programme; what was required was ensuring institutional linkages among key government agencies. At both state and national levels, this was facilitated by targeted consultations and dialogue, and inclusion in various operational structures e.g. technical committees for the programme. In addition, high level government officials were targeted for information sharing and advocacy to support the REDD+ process. |

The programme made special efforts to ensure the voices of forest dependent communities, and those of vulnerable groups among them were heard. First was the need to engage the communities in ways that they feel part of the programme. For each of the 3 pilot sites, each cluster identified a member to act as liaison between the programme and the cluster of communities. These persons were recruited by the programme and supported to perform their roles. This, combined with direct consistent dialogue with communities through their own existing institutions and processes built trust and acceptance for the programme.

The programme also made conscious efforts at engaging differently with the academia, private sector, the media, and very importantly civil society through their own platforms.

Overall, in addition to the targeted consultations, the programme created a platform for direct interaction among the various stakeholders. The stakeholder forum in CRS (including representatives from all the various stakeholders), provided this platform, and met bi-annually to update on the REDD+ process and take decisions on next steps. This platform was instrumental in developing and validating the Strategy. The same platform existed at the national level for the same purpose.

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)
The Programme consciously enabled a robust process for stakeholder participation. At the steering committee level, while the government continues to provide leadership, membership included representatives from other government agencies, the civil society, and the academia. The technical committee, especially in CRS, is more robust membership from all the stakeholder groups including forest dependent communities, civil society, academia, media, private sector and of course government. In spite of the technicality of some REDD+ areas, the programme ensured that representatives from CSOs and forest dependent communities were trained in every area and participated in hands-on data collection. Because of the peculiar nature of the private sector, their participation in the process was comparatively minimal.

## 4.    Financial Information (to be updated)

### 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 national programme (including all cumulative yearly disbursements). Please add additional rows as needed for each table and copy and paste tables for additional years.

Year 1 (2011)

| Financial Delivery | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Cumulative expenditure up to project end date | | |
| | | | Year 1 | | |
| Programme Outcomes | UN Organisation | Amount Transferred by MPTF to Programme | Committed C | Disbursed D | Total (Year 1) TY1 = C + D |
| Outcome 1: | FAO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNDP | 345,794 | 0 | 238,993 | 238,993 |
| | UNEP | 56,075 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Sub-total* | | *401,869* | | | *238,993* |
| Outcome 2: | FAO | 0 | | | |
| | UNDP | 112,149 | 0 | 75,545 | 75,545 |
| | UNEP | *56,075* | 0 | 0 | |
| *Sub-total* | | *168,225* | *0* | *75,545* | *75,545* |
| Outcome 3: | FAO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNDP | 163,550 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNEP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Sub-total* | | 163,550 | | *75,545* | *75,545* |
| Outcome 4: | FAO | 72151 | 28922 | 39912 | 68,834 |
| | UNDP | | | | |
| | UNEP | 56,076 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Outcome 5: | FAO | 460822 | 13,040 | 144,731 | 157,771 |
| | UNDP | 0 | | | |
| | UNEP | 0 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Outcome 6 | FAO | *304206* | *9000* | | *9000* |
| | UNDP | *0* | | | |
| | UNEP | *0* | | | |
| *Sub-total* | | | *9000* | | *9000* |
| | | | | | |
| **Indirect Support Costs** | FAO | 63013 | | 63013 | 63013 |

| | (7% GMS) | UNDP | 43503 | | 43503 | 43503 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | UNEP | 7850 | | 7850 | 7850 |
| **Indirect Support Costs (Total)** | | | **114,336** | | 114,336 | 114,336 |
| **FAO (Total):** | | | | | | |
| **UNDP (Total):** | | | | | | |
| **UNEP (Total):** | | | | | | |
| **Grand Total:** | | | **1,685,193** | **50,962** | **499,181** | **550,143** |

Year 2 (2012)

| **Financial Delivery** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Cumulative expenditure up to project end date** | | |
| | | | **Year 2** | | |
| **Programme Outcomes** | **UN Organisation** | **Amount Transferred by MPTF to Programme** | Committed C | Disbursed D | Total (Year 2) TY2 = C + D |
| Outcome 1: | FAO | 0 | | | |
| | UNDP | 724,433 | | 423,246 | 423,246 |
| | UNEP | 63,547 | | | |
| *Sub-total* | | **783,823** | | 423,246 | 423,246 |
| Outcome 2: | FAO | | | | |
| | UNDP | 427,089 | | 242,863 | 242,863 |
| | UNEP | | | | |
| *Sub-total* | | 427,089 | | 242,863 | 242,863 |
| Outcome 3: | FAO | | | | |
| | UNDP | 201,747 | | 2,579 | 2,579 |
| | UNEP | | | | |
| *Sub-total* | | 201,747 | | 2,579 | 2,579 |
| Outcome 4: | FAO | 102,000 | | 75,623 | 75,623 |
| | UNDP | 0 | | | |
| | UNEP | 56,458 | | 39,055 | 39,055 |
| *Sub-total* | | | | 114,678 | 114,678 |
| *Outcome 5:* | *FAO* | 1,278,275 | 20,549 | 767,596 | 788,145 |
| | *UNDP* | *0* | | | |
| | *UNEP* | *0* | | | |
| *Sub total* | | 1,278,275 | **20,549** | 767,596 | 788,145 |
| *Outcome 6* | *FAO* | 607,974 | *1820* | 347,720 | 349,440 |
| | *UNDP* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| | *UNEP* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| *Sub total* | | 607,974 | *1820* | 347,720 | 349,440 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indirect Support Costs** | FAO | | | | |
| **(7% GMS)** | UNDP | | | | |
| | UNEP | | | | |
| **Indirect Support Costs (Total)** | | | | | |
| **FAO (Total):** | | 1,988,247 | 22,369 | 1,190,939 | 1,213,308 |
| **UNDP (Total):** | | 1,353,269 | **0** | 668,688 | 668,688 |
| **UNEP (Total):** | | 120,005 | **0** | 39,055 | 39,055 |
| **Grand Total:** | | **3,461,521** | **22,369** | **1,898,682** | **1,921,051** |

Year 3 2013

| PROGRAMME OUTCOME | UN ORGANISATION | Amount Transferred by MPTF to Programme | Cumulative expenditure up to project end date | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Year 3** | | |
| | | | Committed C | Disbursed D | Total (Year 3) TY3 = C + D |
| | | | IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS | | |
| Outcome 1: | FAO | | 0 | | 0 |
| | UNDP | 831,776 | 0 | 770,723 | 770,723 |
| | UNEP | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Sub-total* | | **841,776** | *0* | 770,723 | 770,723 |
| Outcome 2: | FAO | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNDP | 327,103 | 0 | 398,734 | 398,734 |
| | UNEP | 94,273 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Sub-total* | | **421,376** | *0* | 398,734 | 398,734 |
| Outcome 3: | FAO | | 0 | | |
| | UNDP | 705,607 | 0 | 102,341 | 102,341 |
| | UNEP | 153,620 | 0 | | 0 |
| *Sub-total* | | **859,227** | *0* | 102,341 | 102,341 |
| Outcome 4: | FAO | 56,075 | 0 | 110,319 | 110,319 |
| | UNDP | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNEP | 36,500 | 0 | 36,500 | 36,500 |
| *Sub-total* | | **92,575** | *0* | **146,819** | **146,819** |
| *Outcome 5* | *FAO* | 1,252,336 | *0* | 1,254,493 | 1,254,493 |
| | *UNDP* | - | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| | *UNEP* | - | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| *Sub total* | | 1,252,336 | *0* | 1,254,493 | 1,254,493 |
| *Outcome 6* | *FAO* | 728,972 | *0* | 531,910 | 531,910 |
| | *UNDP* | - | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| | *UNEP* | - | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| *Sub total* | | 728,972 | *0* | 531,910 | 531,910 |
| **Indirect Support Costs** | FAO | 142,617 | 0 | 132,771 | 132,771 |
| **(7% GMS)** | UNDP | 130,514 | 0 | 89,026 | 89,026 |
| | UNEP | 20,608 | 0 | 2,555 | 2,555 |
| **Indirect Support Costs (Total)** | | 293,738 | **0** | 224,351 | 224,351 |
| **FAO (Total):** | | 2,180,000 | **0** | 2,029,493 | 2,029,493 |
| **UNDP (Total):** | | 1,995,000 | **0** | 1,360,823 | 1,360,823 |
| **UNEP (Total):** | | 315,001 | **0** | 39,055 | 39,055 |
| **Grand Total:** | | **4,490,000** | **0** | **3,429,371** | **3,429,371** |

## Cumulative Financial Delivery for all years

| IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROGRAMME OUTCOME** | **UN ORGANISATION** | **Amount Transferred by MPTF to Programme** | **Cumulative Expenditures up to 31 December 2014** | | |
| | | | **Commitments[24] (B)** | **Disbursements[25] (C )** | **Total Expenditures (D) = B + C** |
| Outcome 1: | FAO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNDP | 831,776 | 0 | 1,150,460 | 1,150,460 |
| | UNEP | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub-total | | **841,776** | | | |
| Outcome 2: | FAO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNDP | 327,103 | 0 | 448,818 | 448,818 |
| | UNEP | 94273 | 8,543 | 85,730 | 94,273 |
| Sub-total | | **421,376** | | | |
| Outcome 3: | FAO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNDP | 705,607 | | 228,233 | 228,233 |
| | UNEP | 153,620 | 30,519.79 | 122,740.21 | 153,260 |
| Sub-total | | **859,227** | | | |
| Outcome 4: | FAO | 56,075 | | 110,319 | 110,319 |
| | UNDP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNEP | 36,500 | | 36,500 | 36,500 |
| Sub-total | | 92,575 | | | |
| Outcome 5 | FAO | 1,252,336 | 9,000 | 1,270,493 | 1,279,493 |
| | UNDP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNEP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| subtotal | | 1,252,336 | | | |
| Outcome 6 | FAO | 728,972 | 55,238 | 590,665 | 645,903 |
| | UNDP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | UNEP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| subtotal | | 728,972 | | | |
| **Indirect Support Costs (7% GMS)** | FAO | 142,617 | 4,497 | 137,641 | 142,138 |
| | UNDP | 130,514 | | 0 | 0 |
| | UNEP | 20,608 | 2,734.40 | 17,147.91 | 19,882.31 |
| **Indirect Support Costs (Total)** | | 293,738 | | | |
| **FAO (Total):** | | 2,180,000 | 64238 | 1971477 | 2,035,715 |
| **UNDP (Total):** | | 1,995,000 | 167 | 1,827,511 | 1,827,511 |
| **UNEP (Total):** | | 315,001 | 39062 | 284,033 | 284,033 |

---

[24] *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.

[25] *Disbursement:* Amount paid to a vendor or entity for goods received, work completed, and/or services rendered (does not include un-liquidated obligations)

| | Grand TOTAL: | 4,490,000 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

If additional resources (direct co-financing) were 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[26] | Name of Co-Financer | Type of Co-Financing[27] | Amount (US$) | Supported Outcome in the NPD | Year Mobilized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

---

[26] 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.
[27] Indicate if co-financing is in-kind or cash.

## 5.    Issue Identification & Management (Issue Log)

For each issue category, please identify any relevant internal and external issues that have affected the National Programme during implementation. For each identified theme please indicate whether measures or actions were put in place to address the identified issues. Please add/remove rows as required.
The following issue definition is adopted:

- An **issue** is something that *has happened*. It does not have a probability but it will have an impact.

### 5.1  External Issues

| Themes | | Identified Issue | Impact 1 = Low 5 = High | Date Raised | Status | Responsible Party | Please describe actions taken to resolve the identified issues or reasons why issues status remained unresolved. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **External** | Political | Changes in government | 1 | 16.11.2014 | ☒ Resolved Date Resolved: Click here to enter a date. ☐ Unresolved | Implementing partner and implementing agencies | The changes in government did not affect the progress of the project in any way. The implementation unit stepped up efforts to sensitize the political leaders |

### 5.2  Internal Issues

| Themes | | Identified Issue | Impact 1 = Low 5 = High | Date Raised | Status | Responsible Party | Please describe actions taken to resolve the identified issues or reasons why issues status remained unresolved. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Internal** | Strategic | | | | | | |
| | Programmatic | | | | | | |
| | Operational | | | | | | |

### 5.3  Internal & External Issues

### 5.4 Risk Narrative

| Key External Risks and Responses |
|---|
| Please briefly summarise the key external risks identified throughout implementation of the national programme that may have delayed or impeded the quality of implementation and describe what adjustments were made to address these identified external risks. (250 words)<br><br>Click here to enter text. |

| Key Internal Risks and Responses |
|---|
| Please briefly summarise the key internal risks identified throughout implementation of the national programme that may have delayed or impeded the quality of implementation and describe what adjustments were made to address these identified internal risks. (250 words)<br><br>U, |

## 6. 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".

| Was the National Programme in coherence with the UN Country Programme or other donor assistance framework approved by the Government? |
|---|
| ☒ Yes ☐ No<br><br>If not, please explain  what measures were put in place to address this: (150 words) |

| Coordination mechanisms and decisions taken to ensure joint delivery |
|---|
| Please briefly summarise what types of coordination mechanism and decisions were taken to ensure joint delivery of the National Programme (150 words)<br><br>Joint work planning was undertaken by all agencies. Work planning meetings were held at the beginning of every year with all the agencies represented. In addition, consultancy and review meetings were held back to back this helped in ensuring efficiency in terms of time and funds allocated for meetings and consultancy.  The development of various aspects of the Warsaw Framework was coordinated effectively. For example, in the development of the CRS Strategy and the National Framework strategy, analytical work on safeguards and on the MRV/FREL related work was integrated into the strategy development process. |

| Was a HACT assessment been undertaken? |
|---|
| ☒ Yes ☐ No<br><br>If Yes, to what degree was the HACT being taken up and by which agency: (150 words) |

## 7.    Key Performance Indicators

This section is designed to assess and aggregate quantitative performance indicators relating to overall 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 colle

### 7.1  Governance KPI

| Indicator | Year 1 (2011) | Year 2 (2012) | Year 3 (2013) | Year 4 (2014) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of steering committee meetings held | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Number of institutes represented in steering committee | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 48 |
| Number of women members of the steering committee | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 24 |
| Number of people actively engaged in advising on the development of the national strategy | 150 | 250 | 450 | 1000 | 1850 |
| Number of civil society organizations actively engaged in different aspects of the programme (e.g. National Strategy, Defining RELs/FRELs, Steering Committee, Working Groups) | 3 | 15 | 30 | 45 | 93 |
| Number of sub-national REDD+ sensitization, awareness raising and capacity building initiatives. | 3 | 5 | 14 | 16 | 38 |
| Other: Click here to enter text. | | | | | |

## 7.2 Capacity KPI`s

| Indicator | Year 1 (2011) | Year 2 (2012) | Year 3 (2013) | Year 4 (2014) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of people trained on REDD+ and climate change | Men:<br><br>Women: | Men:<br><br>Women: | Men:<br><br>Women: | Men:<br><br>Women: | Men:<br><br>Women: |
| Number of CSOs trained | 13 | 25 | 45 | 60 | 143 |
| Number of REDD+ University events | | | | | |
| Number of national consultation workshops held | 3 | 5 | 14 | 16 | 38 |
| Number of information notes produced | 3 | 5 | 18 | 25 | 51 |
| Number of information gathering events | 3 | 5 | 18 | 26 | 52 |
| Number of stakeholders registered in the REDD+ database | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other: Click here to enter text. | | | | | |

## 7.3 Technical KPI`s

| Indicator | Year 1 (2011) | Year 2 (2012) | Year 3 (2013) | Year 4 (2014) | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total area potentially supported towards emission reduction (km$^2$) | | | | | |
| Total forest area | | | | | |
| Number of land use plots assessed through remote sensing | 0 | 0 | 2100 | 2100 | 4200 |
| Number of MRV training events | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 11 |
| Number of people trained on forest monitoring and MRV | 25 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 205 |
| Number of CSOs trained on technical matters | 5 | 15 | 30 | 35 | 85 |
| Number of people trained in NFMS for REDD+ | 25 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 205 |
| Number of MRV training participants from CSOs | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 35 |
| Other: Click here to enter text. | | | | | |

## 8. 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 behavior 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.