

UN-REDD
PROGRAMME



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.



National Programme Semi-Annual Report

NIGERIA

UN-REDD Programme

January to June 2015

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

Semi-Annual Report for the UN-REDD National Programmes

1. Progress Reporting

1.1 Summary of National Programme Progress

Summary of National Programme Progress:

The delay in National Programme implementation in 2013-2014 continued into much of the first half of 2015. In mid-February, the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) approved a no-cost extension, from the original end date of February 28, 2015 to December 31, 2016, with the proviso that a joint (UNDP, UNEP, and FAO) mission review the programme and make needed adjustments.

A new national MRV Specialist joined in January. The Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) arrived on February 27. On May 4 to 6, the joint mission of UNEP, UNDP, and FAO Regional Technical Advisors (RTAs) met with National and State Coordinators, the MRV Specialist, and CTA to carry out the programme review. They revised the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) to focus on establishing the Warsaw Framework's (WF) four elements of REDD readiness in Cross River State (CRS) as key elements that feed into national level readiness. The revised AWPB provides the framework for the implementation of key activities for the remaining period of the NP.

As part of efforts to move forward with the WF elements, Terms of Reference for analytical work to support REDD+ Strategy development were completed and recruitment is ready to begin. Selected stakeholder engagement included a stakeholder forum, a safeguards workshop, and training in interpretation of remotely-sensed imagery. The PGA report is near completion. Consultations with FCPF have begun, to ensure synergies between UN-REDD- and FCPF-supported activities and to delineate roles and responsibilities clearly.

At a "handover" meeting in CRS at end of May, the out-going and in-coming Governors conveyed mixed messages regarding serious commitment for the REDD+ Programme. Before the inauguration, all Commissioners were dismissed, including the Forestry Commission Chairman as State Coordinator. To date, a new State Coordinator has not been designated. Following ambiguous indications of commitment, the National Coordinator, UNEP RTA, and CTA met with CRS Deputy Governor on June 12 to explore ways forward. In early July, in response to efforts to re-engage, the Governor affirmed his commitment to getting CRS REDD ready. On July 15 he discussed next steps with the UNDP RTA and Country Representative.

1.2 Government and Non-Government Comments

Government counterparts to provide their perspective and additional complementary information not included in the overall progress assessment (250 words):

[input text]

Civil society stakeholders to provide their perspective and additional complementary information (Please request a summary from existing stakeholder committees or platforms) (250 words):

[input text]

2. Results Framework

The joint review’s revision of the AWPB (see above summary) maintained the four-outcome framework for programme implementation but reduced the number of outputs and activities for the remaining 18 months (July 2015 through December 2016) of the programme. The final (June 26) version of the revised work plan and budget did not adjust indicators, baselines, or targets. The below framework includes a few adjustments in targets, but further adjustments are expected in the second half of 2015 and will also build on the results of the planned analyses.

Outcome 1: Improved institutional and technical capacity at the national level		
<input type="checkbox"/> On track to achieving this outcome;	<input type="checkbox"/> Expected minor delays, corrective measures in place;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expected significant delays

Output 1.1: The REDD+ Secretariat is effective at coordinating REDD+ readiness nationwide	
Progress towards output: The REDD+ secretariat continues to function as a small group of committed persons in the Federal Ministry of Environment (FME), who participate regularly in pilot activities in Cross River State, which serve to strengthen technical skills and supporting operations. Following the joint review mission, it was decided not to recruit a national programme officer.	
Indicators:	Increased legal mandate & institutional recognition of REDD+ in Nigeria
Baseline:	No official REDD+ legal endorsement or mandate, weak REDD+ structures
Expected Annual Target:	REDD+ integrated into Federal level institutional structures and policy processes. National REDD+ coordination unit functioning.
Achievement of Annual Target:	The joint review mission in early May 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 in 2015 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 strategies policies and measure(s)). “Catching up” on pilot-state readiness is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for national-level REDD-readiness. The drafting of a state strategy in 2015 and the start-up of complementary FCPF support will enable good progress in 2016.
Output 1.2: Stakeholder engagement, international engagement, and public awareness on REDD+	
Progress towards output: Stakeholder engagement will continue to be a priority area, but will now be guided by the sharper focus on the four WF foundations.	
Indicators:	Federal multi-stakeholder REDD+ cluster (to sustain the REDD+ process at federal level).
Baseline:	The REDD+ constituency at federal level is relatively small, with minimal capacities and no regular stakeholder engagement structures.

Expected Annual Target:	Engagement of stakeholders at the national level will focus 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 will be developed jointly. The communication plan will identify specific “messages” for selected specific stakeholder groups. Activities to support policy, legal, and institutional arrangements at the national level and engagement internationally have been included under this Output, through which collaboration will be explored as opportunities arise. To ensure focus on the four Warsaw Framework fundamentals, the Joint Review Mission’s revision of the AWPB eliminated separate outputs in these areas.
Achievement of Annual Target:	Selected stakeholder engagement after the May programme review included a stakeholder forum, a safeguards workshop, and training in interpretation of remotely-sensed imagery. 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 through development of Nigeria’s INDCs.

Outcome 2: Framework for the Expansion of REDD+ across Nigeria prepared		
<input type="checkbox"/> On track to achieving this outcome;	<input type="checkbox"/> Expected minor delays, corrective measures in place;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expected significant delays

Output 2.1: National REDD+ challenges & potential assessed	
Progress towards output:	A series of analyses has been initiated (see Output 2.3) to inform the achievement of the output. In addition, the Government has secured FCPF support, which will expand support on REDD+ to Nasarawa and Ondo States, which were selected following screening visits and review at the February Programme Steering Committee meeting. Nonetheless, the overall strategic framework and policy guidance on how support to the additional States will be delivered is yet to be developed. The 2014 target of a first national strategy on REDD+ adopted by the federal government and stakeholders will not be met. Rather, the 2015 target is for Nigeria, through programme support, to develop specific analysis at the state level and selected analysis at the national level to inform a draft state-level strategy and guidance that will inform, in 2016, strategy development in new states and at the national level.
Indicators:	Endorsement of a preliminary national strategy on REDD+ across Nigeria's states
Baseline:	No strategy for REDD+ expansion in Nigeria available; no analysis of the options and viability of REDD+ across the different states.
Expected Annual Target:	

Achievement of Annual Target:	UN-REDD analytic activities are expected to begin in September. The analytical work is expected to inform the framing of the national REDD+ Strategy through the development of a Policy Note. The development of the national REDD+ strategy is expected to be carried out in partnership with FCPF. FCPF is expected to establish operations in September, with analyses and related engagement to begin before the end of the year.
Output 2.2: National MRV framework designed	
Progress towards output:	No activities were planned for the first half of 2015. Arrangements have been made to begin real-time data collection at the state level through a forest carbon inventory beginning in August 2015, which will include 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 in May and is awaiting stakeholder review. A preliminary review of historic AD was made in 2014 and presented in January.
Indicators:	GHG reporting to UNFCCC
Baseline:	GHG not reported with quality; weak national capacities on GHG reporting
Expected Annual Target:	Training on forest carbon inventory data analysis through remotely-sensed imagery and training on GHG inventory.
Achievement of Annual Target:	Progress on the targets will be made in the Final 2015 report.
Output 2.3: A Framework National Strategy for REDD+ across Nigeria's states developed	
Progress towards output:	Some of the basic building blocks for the national strategy for expanding REDD+ have been developed. Specific progress towards this output includes developing the Terms of Reference for the analytical work to inform the national strategy, initiating the recruitment process for various consultancies and, through the mid-year review, identifying the key outputs that are required for a framework national strategy and how this would be linked to the FCPF support to develop Nigeria's framework national REDD+ strategy.
Indicators:	Understanding of differential conditions, options, and challenges for REDD+ among different states
Baseline:	No systematic analysis exists for REDD+ across Nigeria
Expected Annual Target:	Analyses in three key areas carried out, and informed by complementary studies in greater depth in the CRS pilot: (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

Achievement of Annual Target:	UN-REDD analytic activities are expected to begin in September. The analytical work is expected to inform the framing of the national REDD+ Strategy through the development of a Policy Note. The development of the national REDD+ strategy is expected to be done in partnership with FCPF. FCPF is expected to establish operations in September, with analyses and related engagement to begin before the end of the year. The planned two new states that will receive FCPF support and will build on Cross River State's experience have been designated: Nasarawa and Ondo.
-------------------------------	---

Outcome 3: Institutional and Technical Capacity for REDD+ in Cross River State		
<input type="checkbox"/> On track to achieving this outcome;	<input type="checkbox"/> Expected minor delays, corrective measures in place;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expected significant delays

Output 3.1: CRS REDD+ Unit is effective at coordinating REDD+ readiness at State Level	
The CRS REDD+ Unit in Cross River State continues to comprise a Stakeholder Engagement Specialist and an Administrator. At the end of February, a Chief Technical Advisor for the national programme and state pilot programme assumed his position, 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 informs and contributes 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 dismissed, 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, it was decided to end the position of PGA Coordinator, who then left the programme at end of June.	
Indicators ¹ :	Technical Committees and Working Groups in place. REDD+ integrated into Climate Change Technical committee. State and National REDD+ coordination unit functioning well together.
Baseline:	CRSFC has a REDD+ unit, but the team is limited in size and skills.
Expected Annual Target:	(i) CRS state-designated members of the secretariat team actively engaged (ii) Technical Committee on climate change holds dialogue meetings within its institutional structures on REDD+ (iii) National REDD+ coordination unit has fully implemented the 2015-16 work plan

¹ Proposed revisions of August 2015

Achievement of Annual Target:	To achieve REDD-readiness before the end of the no-cost extension period, the most urgent and critical need is to designate a State Coordinator. To further help achieve REDD-readiness, and to sustain it after the UN-funded staff leave on or before the end of 2016, the programme has recommended that the State designate individual staff from the full range of collaborating MDAs and other stakeholder entities to accompany particular aspects of the REDD+ Readiness process, preferably on a full-time basis. These staff will assume increasing responsibility as capacity and experience grows, and should be able to advise the relevant interagency working groups or designated units by mid-2016. At present, only an MRV Specialist has been assigned to work with the REDD+ Unit. What about the technical committee?
-------------------------------	--

Output 3.2: CRS REDD+ Strategy is developed	
<p>Progress towards output:</p> <p>Terms of reference for priority key analyses have been developed. Key stakeholders must inform these analyses and participate in a strategic planning exercise to refocus and sequence relevant work for the REDD+ Strategy. The National Safeguards Working Group, an institutional framework leveraging stakeholders' expertise, was reorganised to enable safeguard work focused on the policies and measures to be developed under the REDD+ Strategy for the pilot state of CRS. The policy and regulatory instruments for REDD that were identified in the PGA will be prioritised and safeguards for the priority instruments will be developed by the Safeguards Working Group.</p>	
Indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Analytical studies completed, documented, reviewed by stakeholders, and applied; b. Approach to safeguards developed for Cross River State; c. Draft REDD+ Strategy for Cross River State developed
Baseline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Weak institutional framework/arrangement to develop REDD+ Strategy; b. Lack of baseline information; c. Poor documentation and lack of access to existing data/information.
Expected Annual Target:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 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; b. Conduct risk/benefit analysis of Policies and Measures (as part of developing a Nigeria REDD+ approach to safeguards and SIS); c. Complete mapping of multiple benefits d. Prepare an Issues and Options report e. Organize a meeting with senior Government officials and stakeholders on climate change and REDD+ to discuss emerging issues and options for REDD+ strategy

Achievement of Annual Target:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Initial drafts of PGA report have been reviewed by stakeholders, who have provided feedback/inputs. These are being incorporated into a final version, which will serve as a basis for the strategic analyses. b. The safeguards working group has been reorganised and is working to prioritise REDD+ relevant policies and measures. c. Establishment of the CRS Technical Working Group will contribute to more effective review of the strategic analyses and will be essential to the development of the REDD+ Strategy.
Output 3.4: CRS forest monitoring system operational	
<p>Progress towards output: The Remote Sensing/GIS Laboratory has been completed, with hardware and software installation last year further strengthened by an additional computer workstation pre-loaded with Idrisi-Tersett remote sensing software.</p>	
Indicators:	Forest Monitoring system for CRS
Baseline:	No forest monitoring system in place
Expected Annual Target:	Procure full equipment for forest inventory and monitoring. Development of Forest Carbon Inventory sampling design, and field testing the methodology with CRSFC, NCF, and community members (with GCF project). By the end of the year, Cross River State will need to have begun developing working relationships among the 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.
Achievement of Annual Target:	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 is in place and will begin reviewing and integrating data and analyses, including historic data from previous studies and data from the drivers of deforestation study, which include remote sensing, GIS, and land cover change matrices. The land use/land cover data are being down-scaled into lower strata such as the pilot community sites, forest reserves, and Local Government Areas. Procurement of forest inventory equipment is almost concluded, which will enable reliable real-time forest carbon inventory data to be gathered and fed into the database as field exercises commence in July/August. Additional financial support from Governors' Climate and Forest Task Force (GCF) will support complementary integrated field data collection activities and update the CRS land cover map (2014) and the preliminary forest carbon sampling framework, elaborated jointly by CRSFC and Winrock International through GCF funding in August 2014. Remote sensing software (Idrisi-Tersett) will be deployed for a satellite information analysis and management training workshop in August to enable stakeholders to undertake on-going satellite data analysis for forest monitoring purposes. Institutional arrangements for forest monitoring functions, including information sharing, need better definition and formalization.

Outcome 4: REDD+ readiness demonstrated in Cross River State		
<input type="checkbox"/> On track to achieving this outcome;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expected minor delays, corrective measures in place;	<input type="checkbox"/> Expected significant delays

Output 4.1: REDD+ experimental initiatives in the state well-coordinated and supported	
Progress towards output: REDD+ is working in collaboration with the UNDP Small Grants Programme (SGP) to initiate CBR+ on-the-ground. 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. Investment based on the planned analyses and REDD+ Strategy is not likely before 2016. In addition, partnership opportunities to support implementation of REDD+ related activities on the ground are being explored with UNDP-GEF.	
Indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Country plan for CBR+ prepared and approved b. At least 30 concepts notes to implement CBR+ in communities developed and submitted for review to CRS REDD+ Unit c. One UNDP SGP Steering committee meeting held to approve CBR+ concept notes for further development d. Capacity building initiatives to help communities develop proposals carried out
Baseline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. No REDD+ experimental initiative on the ground; b. Available opportunities to learn and apply lessons from previous projects.
Expected Annual Target:	CBR+ initiatives implemented on the ground in REDD+ pilot communities
Achievement of Annual Target:	A country CBR+ has been developed and approved with the engagement of key stakeholders. It is expected that the start-up of the programmes will commence by the end of 2016.
Output 4.2: 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.	
Indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Two Knowledge Products available and easily accessible b. At least one other state visits CRS to begin collaboration and learn about REDD c. Pilot site coordinators organize adaptive learning review of community based initiatives d. Working groups review initiatives and outputs relevant to their respective terms of reference

Baseline:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Community-based Forest Management initiatives ongoing; b. Some level of political awareness and will to support improved forest governance; c. Poor/inadequate funding of institutions by CRS Government to be REDD-ready.
Expected Annual Target:	REDD+ data management system fully established and functional.
Achievement of Annual Target:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Knowledge management strategy developed b. Policy note developed to provide overall direction for REDD+ readiness & implementation in Nigerian states c. Information, Education and Communication materials produced and disseminated d. MRV Unit established and functional, and data collection on-going to build accessible REDD+ knowledge base e. Working groups develop lessons learned that capture key experiences from development process of national strategy on REDD+

3. Warsaw Framework for REDD+ and Associated UNFCCC Decisions

This section aims to provide insight and to support a thought process into how countries are progressing against the framework of the convention, namely: 1) a National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plan; 2) a National Forest Reference Emission Level/National Forest Reference Level; 3); a National Forest Monitoring System and 4) Safeguards and Safeguards Information Systems.

Only complete the sections that apply to the priorities identified for the country and mark as N/A any criteria or indicator that does not apply to the context of the country.

1. National REDD+ Strategy / Action Plans		
Supported by (tick as many as applicable) : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Programme; <input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Support; <input type="checkbox"/> Other Source (Specify) ; <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable		
Please provide a brief description of the progress being made, if possible separating overall progress from the progress being made with support of the National Programme (100 words): Terms of reference for priority strategic analyses have been developed that will provide integrated strategic inputs for a REDD+ strategy for Cross River State and for a REDD+ Policy Note that will guide the development of a national strategy in 2016. Feedback on the initial drafts of the PGA report is being incorporated into a final version, which will serve as a further basis for the strategic analyses. Establishment of the CRS Technical Working Group will be contribute to more effective review of the strategic analyses and will be essential to the development of the REDD+ Strategy.		
<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Score²</i>
Process Indicator	1.1. Does the country have a National Strategy or Action Plan to achieve REDD+?	0
	<i>0: No</i>	
	<i>1: Under design</i>	
	<i>2: Drafted, under deliberation</i>	
	<i>3: Adopted</i>	

² If indicator does not apply to country situation, mark N/A as appropriate.

		4: Link to the NS/AP provided on the UNFCCC REDD+ web platform information hub	
		5: Implementation in early stages	
		6: Full implementation of NS/AP	
Robustness Indicators	1.2. Drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and barriers to REDD and REDD+ activities (if relevant) established?	0: Drivers not established yet	1
Robustness Indicators		1: Drivers identified	
		2: In-depth analysis of drivers currently being conducted	
		3: Drivers established, with in-depth analysis and information made available.	
		4: Direct drivers established and main direct drivers quantified (GHG) or weighted against one another with a consensus, and information made available.	
	1.2.a Underlying drivers (and agents of DD and barriers if relevant) analysed in depth for each direct driver ?	0: No, just generic mention.	0
		1: To some extent.	
		2: Yes, comprehensive and detailed studies of underlying driver (i.e. economic, social, governance, political, fiscal, and technological) for each direct driver.	
	1.2.b Has this process of establishing drivers and prioritizing which drivers to address first benefited from inputs from Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples stakeholders?	0: mostly desk work, led by the Ministry/Agency in charge of the forest sector.	0
		1: To some extent: some workshops were held.	
		2: Fully: the “drivers” package received substantive contributions from civil society, including by	

		<i>integrating research led by civil-society organisations.</i>	
	1.2.c Has this process of establishing and sequencing drivers benefited from inputs from other sectors (i.e. private sector engagement)?	<i>0: No, desk work only driven by one Ministry.</i>	0
		<i>1: To some extent: a couple of meetings were held with other Ministries.</i>	
		<i>2: Fully: the “drivers” package received substantive contributions from other ministries, including by integrating other ministries-led research.</i>	
	1.3. The National REDD+ strategy is country driven?	<i>0: The NS/AP was mainly drafted by international consultants.</i>	NA
		<i>1: To some extent: a number of consultations have been held with various stakeholders.</i>	
		<i>2: To a large extent: the NS/AP is part of the policy dialogue and making process of Government.</i>	
	1.4. Inclusion of land-use planning, land-tenure policy and/or territorial rights issues in the definition of the PAMs have been taken into account?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: Yes</i>	
	1.5. A country approach to safeguards, including Safeguard Information System design, has been developed and is being implemented as an integral part of the overall NS/AP process?	<i>0: No</i>	1
		<i>1: An approach has been articulated but not yet implemented</i>	
		<i>2: The approach is being implemented but in a parallel process, somewhat in isolation from that for the NS/AP</i>	
		<i>3: An approach has been developed and has been implemented, as an integral part of the overall NS/AP process</i>	
	1.6. Forest governance issues have been taken into account (or are part of the NS).	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: Yes</i>	
	1.7. NS/AP is informed by identified social and environmental	<i>0: No</i>	0

	benefits and risks of planned REDD+ PAM?	<i>1: Social and environmental priority benefits and/or risks identified in an ad hoc manner and expressed in NS/AP</i>	
		<i>2: Social and environmental benefits and risks systematically identified for each and every candidate REDD+ PAM, and mapped as feasible. REDD+ PAMs refined in their selection, design, methodology and/or location to enhance benefits and reduce risks</i>	
		<i>3: Social and environmental benefits and risks systematically identified for each and every candidate REDD+ PAM, which have been refined in their selection, design, methodology and/or location to enhance benefits and reduce risks; plans are made to manage any residual risk and ensure benefits are optimised</i>	
	1.8. Gender considerations have been taken into account?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: Somewhat, In a parallel, separate process.</i>	
		<i>2: Yes, for each possible policy or measure or strategic orientation, gender perspectives have been analysed.</i>	
	1.9. National Focal Point or National REDD+ Entity appointed?	<i>0: No</i>	1
		<i>1: Yes, at a sectoral ministry/agency, such as environment, forestry, natural resources or the like.</i>	
		<i>2: Yes, at a high-level or cross-sectoral ministry/agency, such as Finance, Prime Minister's office, Planning or land-use.</i>	
	1.10. Regular multi-stakeholder meetings/workshops held?	<i>0: No stakeholder meetings/workshops held yet.</i>	1
		<i>1: Regular meetings are being held, with a platform for consultation established and meeting at a</i>	

		<i>frequency agreed upon by stakeholders.</i>	
		<i>2: Private sector actors have been mobilized through meetings/ workshops and are engaged.</i>	
	1.11. Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) advanced?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: Yes</i>	
	OPTION 1 1.12. Strategic REDD+ options and/or REDD+ activities have been identified?	<i>0: No</i>	
		<i>1: Yes – REDD+ strategic options and/or REDD+ activities have been established (please indicate which one OF these two features has been established)</i>	
		<i>2: Yes – REDD+ strategic options and REDD+ activities have been established</i>	
	OPTION 2 - PAMs 1.12. Policies and measures (PAMs) have been clearly identified, and address the priority direct & related underlying drivers?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: PAMs clearly identified.</i>	
		<i>2: PAMs clearly identified and addressing the direct and related underlying drivers.</i>	
		<i>3: PAMs clearly identified and addressing the direct and related underlying drivers, and an explicit link to the scope of REDD+ is made for at least part of the PAMS.</i>	
		<i>4: Yes, and endorsed by official decree or national development plan.</i>	
	1.12.a Quality of the process for identifying REDD+ options, policies and measures	<i>0: Few other stakeholders than lead Ministry have had inputs.</i>	NA
		<i>1: Relevant stakeholders have had inputs.</i>	
		<i>2: Relevant stakeholders have defined specific options, policies and measures.</i>	
	1.13. Institutional arrangements to plan and implement REDD+ activities established?	<i>0: Institutional arrangements not established yet</i>	1
		<i>1: Institutional arrangements are being developed</i>	

		<i>2: Institutional arrangements established and operational</i>	
	1.14. REDD+ investment options and resource-mobilization strategies developed?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: REDD+ investment opportunities and challenges identified (including quantitative and qualitative analyses of investment potential)</i>	
		<i>2: REDD+ investment opportunities identified and resource-mobilization strategies developed including domestic and international finance, fiscal instruments, and private investments</i>	
	1.15. A robust and transparent financial mechanism for REDD+ implementation (including RBPs) is in place?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: Under Elaboration</i>	
		<i>2: Designed</i>	
		<i>3: Functional</i>	
	1.16. The complementary roles of the various levels of government (National, Subnational, Local) and related PAMs have been defined, regardless of decision on scale?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: Yes</i>	
	1.17. A robust Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of REDD+ implementation is functional	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: M&E of PAMs</i>	
		<i>2: M&E of PAMs & Drivers</i>	

2. Forest Reference Emission Levels (FREL) / Forest Reference Levels (FRL)
Supported by (tick as many as applicable) : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Programme; <input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Support; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Source (Specify) ; <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Complementary support through the Governors' Climate and Forest Task Force (GCF) in 2014 has provided the only estimates of carbon levels for different forest types in Cross River State thus far. Arrangements have been made to begin real-time data collection at the state level through a forest carbon inventory beginning in August 2015, which will also include further support through the GCF to expand collection beyond 80 sites supported by the National Programme.

Indicators		Scoring Criteria	Score
Process Indicator	2.1. Has the country established a FREL/FRL?	0: No	2
		1: FREL/FRL capacity building phase	
		2: FREL/FRL under construction	
		3: FREL/FRL draft	
		4: FREL/FRL complete	
		5: FREL/FRL submitted to UNFCCC	
Robustness Indicators	2.2. A national forest definition for REDD+ adopted (consistent with GHG-I)?	0: National forest definition not adopted yet	0
		1: National forest definition adopted	
	2.3. Scope of the FREL/FRL defined (one or more of the five REDD+ activities: reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forest, enhancement of forest carbon stocks).	0: No	0
		1: Yes	
	2.4. Scope of the FREL/FRL defined (one or more of IPCC's five carbon pools: aboveground biomass, belowground biomass, deadwood, litter, soil)?	0: No	0
		1: Yes	
	2.5. The scale of the FREL/FRL defined (national/subnational)?	0: No	0
		1: Yes	
	2.6. Time period of the FREL/FRL defined (historic reference point chosen)?	0: No	0
		1: Yes	
	2.7. FREL/FRL data has been compiled (emission factors and	0: No steps taken towards data collection	1

	historical activity data)?	1: Data collection is ongoing	
		2: Data has been compiled	
	2.8. A methodology for establishing FREL/FRL has been identified?	0: No steps taken towards methodology development	0
		1: Methodology development is ongoing	
		2: Methodology has been developed	
	2.9. A timeline for submission to the UNFCCC has been established?	0: No steps taken towards submission to the UNFCCC	0
		1: Timeline for submission is being developed	
		2: Timeline for submission established	
		3: Submission took place in accordance with timeline	
	2.10. A plan has been established to update the FREL/FRL periodically?	0: No steps taken towards updating the initial FREL/FRL	0
		1: Plan for periodical update has been created	
		2: FREL/FRL is being updated according to plan	

3. National Forest Monitoring Systems (NFMS)			
Supported by (tick as many as applicable) : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Programme; <input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Support; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Source (Specify) ; <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable			
Please provide a brief description of the progress being made, if possible separating overall progress from the progress being made with support of the National Programme (100 words):			
The MRV System has been supported with a remote sensing software, which will be used to train stakeholders (in August) to undertake satellite information analysis needed for sustainable forest monitoring. Activity Data will be down-scaled to lower strata such as the three pilot sites, forest reserve boundaries and the Local Government Areas for monitoring at those levels. Additional forest inventory equipment is expected to be delivered in August, for stakeholders to collect reliable field data for Emission factor estimation (see preceding section on FRL).			
Indicators		Scoring Criteria	Score
Process Indicator	3.1. Does the country have an NFMS?	0: No	1
		1: NFMS capacity building phase	
		2: NFMS under construction	

		3: NFMS draft in place and capable of Monitoring and MRV	
		4: NFMS institutionalized and generating REDD+ Monitoring and MRV	
		5: MRV information submitted to UNFCCC in BUR Technical Annex	
Robustness Indicators	3.2. A Land Monitoring System in place to assess activity data?	0: No steps taken towards Land Monitoring System yet	1
		1: Work to establish Land Monitoring System ongoing	
		2: Land Monitoring System established and operational	
	3.3. Ground-based information to determine Emission Factors available?	0: No	1
		1: Yes	
	3.4. National GHG Inventory in place (in particular for LULUCF sector)?	0: No steps taken towards GHG Inventory yet	0
		1: Work to establish GHG Inventory is ongoing	
		2: GHG Inventory is in place	
		3: GHG inventory submitted in recent BUR	
		4: GHG inventory consistent with REDD+ results in the annex of BUR	
	3.5. Information produced by the NFMS transparent and made available to stakeholders?	0: No steps taken towards NFMS yet	0
		1: NFMS information is transparent but has not been shared with relevant stakeholders yet	
		2: Information produced by the NFMS transparent and made available to stakeholders	
	3.6. The NFMS is supported by institutional arrangements at national level?	0: No	0
		1: Yes	

4. Safeguards and the Safeguard Information System

Supported by (tick as many as applicable) : National Programme; Targeted Support; Other Source (Specify) ; Not Applicable

In June, the Nigeria REDD+ Safeguards Working Group was reorganized and began development of a country approach to safeguards that will build on the pilot experience in Cross River State. Subsequently, the National Safeguards Specialist, a CSO representative, the CTA, and the FAO, UNDP, and UNEP Regional Technical Advisors participated in the Regional Workshop on Safeguards in Nairobi.

<i>Indicators</i>		<i>Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Score</i>
Process Indicator	4.1. Does the country have a Safeguard Information System that provides information on how the Cancun safeguards are being addressed <i>and</i> respected throughout implementation of REDD+ actions?	<i>0: No</i>	0
		<i>1: Safeguard Information System objectives determined</i>	
		<i>2: Safeguard information needs and structure determined</i>	
		<i>3: Existing information systems and sources assessed</i>	
		<i>4: The Safeguard Information System designed, building on existing, together with any novel, information systems and sources clearly articulated in a national government-endorsed document</i>	
		<i>5: The Safeguard Information System is functional, building on existing, together with any novel, information systems and sources that are clearly articulated in a national government-endorsed document</i>	
		<i>6: Summary of information on REDD+ safeguards, informed by the Safeguard Information System, has been submitted to UNFCCC</i>	

Robustness Indicators	4.2. Each safeguard is clarified in accordance with national circumstances	0: No	0
		1: Partially, in terms of existing policies, laws and regulations and/or novel principles, criteria and/or indicators	
		2. Comprehensively, in terms of existing policies, laws and regulations and/or novel principles, criteria and/or indicators	
	4.3. Institutional arrangements for each identified function of the Safeguard Information System have been determined and agreed?	0: No	0
		1: Yes, institutional arrangements for functional responsibilities for the SIS identified within government.	
		2: Yes, institutional arrangements for functional responsibilities for the SIS identified within government and among non-state actors, as appropriate.	
		3: Yes, institutional arrangements for functional responsibilities for the SIS identified and assigned within government and among non-state actors, as appropriate, and through a multi-stakeholder consultative/participatory process as appropriate.	
	4.4. The Safeguard Information System provides transparent and consistent information that is accessible by all relevant stakeholders?	0: No, SIS not in place yet.	0
		1: Yes, SIS contains transparent and consistent information but has not made this information accessible by all relevant stakeholders yet.	
		2: Yes, SIS provides transparent and consistent information that is accessible by all relevant stakeholders.	
		3: Yes, SIS provides transparent and consistent	

		<i>information that is accessible by all relevant stakeholders, and meets SIS objectives.</i>	
	4.5. The Safeguard Information System is flexible enough to allow for improvements over time?	<i>0: No. Safeguard Information System not in place yet.</i>	0
		<i>1: Yes, Safeguard Information System in place but no plans articulated for improvements over time.</i>	
		<i>2: Yes, Safeguard Information System in place and improvements over time demonstrated</i>	

5. Financial Delivery

Programme Outcome	UN Organisation	Amount Transferred by MPTF to Programme	Planned Budget for 2015 ³	Current Expenditure for 2015 (as of 30 June 2015)	Anticipated Expenditure by 31 December 2015
Outcome 1: Improved institutional and technical capacity at the national level	FAO	-	-	-	-
	UNDP	645,000	124,000,	77,054.24	46,945.76
	UNEP				
<i>Sub-total</i>					
Outcome 2: Framework for the Expansion of REDD+ across Nigeria prepared	FAO	395,000	293,000	58,134.2	92,000
	UNDP	90,000	90000	-446.95	89, 553.05
	UNEP	80,000	70,000	0	70,000
<i>Sub-total</i>					
Outcome 3: Institutional and Technical Capacity for REDD+ in Cross River State]	FAO	662,000	338,000	69,026.8	160,000
	UNDP	953,318	400000	74614.39	325, 385.61
	UNEP	258,000	140,000	20,000	120,000
<i>Sub-total</i>					
Outcome 4: REDD+ readiness demonstrated in Cross River State	FAO	-	-	-	-
	UNDP	555,000	60, 000	7891.48	52, 108.52
	UNEP	100,000	50,000	22,500	27,500
<i>Sub-total</i>					
Indirect Support Costs (7% GMS)	FAO	73,990	47,921	8,901.3	9,000
	UNDP	157,032.26		11135.37	
	UNEP	30,660			
Indirect Support Costs (Total)					
FAO (Total):		1,130,9900	678,921	136,062.3	261,000
UNDP (Total):					
UNEP (Total):		468,000			
Grand TOTAL:					

³As indicated in the 2015 annual work plan.

6. Adaptive management

Delays and Corrective Actions

1. What are the delays/obstacles encountered at country level?

Delays/obstacles include both “context” factors and programme factors.

Programme delays: 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, such as the PGA and the study on drivers of deforestation did not contribute as cogently as needed to the definition of strategic issues. The diffusion of effort was exacerbated by the failure to field the CTA until the very end of the programme as originally conceived.

Limited “ownership” of the REDD+ Programme: As the lead pilot state, Cross River State must move forward for the country to move forward. The most significant obstacle affecting the State level was the diminished political will on the part of the outgoing Governor, who left office at the end of May. In his handover remarks before several dozen senior civil servants in the Environment “cluster”, the outgoing Governor noted that (a) the conditionalities that had to be met to receive results-based finance would take “ridiculously long for anybody to earn anything” and that (b) although there is an “opening for sustainable management within the framework of REDD+” the Forestry Commission does not have the capacity to manage sustainable logging in the face of “corporations [that] come in with so much money they can corrupt anyone.” Because of this, he said, “I got to the point when I felt that it’s not worth my effort...I won’t insist on sustaining it to the incoming governor, because it’s not giving any return.” Similar detachment from the programme is also seen among FC staff. Despite participation in various one-off training and workshop events, only a handful of FC staff understand the fundamentals of REDD+ and fewer have shown interest in the programme.

Nonetheless, the incoming Governor has made statements that indicate support for the REDD+ programme. However, he has not yet designated a new State Coordinator, needed to provide both strategic leadership and the operational directives to bring needed state talent and financial resources to support the programme and overcome inertia within MDAs.

Policies and measures detached from REDD+ approaches The Governor has also announced new measures to combat deforestation. They may well go forward without adequate benefit/risk assessment, stakeholder engagement, or review of lessons learned from past experience, which is considerable and ranges from cautionary to inspiring. Similarly, the FC implements policies and takes measures without discernible consideration of or interest in REDD+ readiness and/or fulfilling the requirements for results-based payments. . In recent years, the FC’s funding was significantly reduced for activities to support sustainable forest management. Beyond the FC, agricultural concessions are made within reserves and approved for forested lands in communities without due environmental impact assessment.

Limited cross-sectoral engagement and information sharing across MDAs: The CRS climate change committee is inactive and the CRS REDD+ Technical committee, which should fall under it, is not yet established.

Limited transparency or accountability with regard to forest management and enforcement. The CRS FC and the recently disbanded Anti-Deforestation Task Force have not shared useful information on their oversight of forest resources.

2. Have any of these delays/obstacles been raised and/or discussed at the Programme Steering Committee meetings?

Yes; No

3. What are the delays/obstacles anticipated in terms of their impact on the National programme?

The delay in designating a State Coordinator and establishing a Technical Committee for CRS, may impact on efforts to generate the timely progress at pilot levels needed to inform strategy and safeguards.

4. How are these delays/obstacles being addressed?

In mid-July, the UNDP regional technical advisor, the UNDP Country Office Environmental Advisor and the CTA received assurance from the Governor that he would make whatever effort was needed to ensure Cross River State's readiness to receive results-based payments. Nonetheless, he is concerned that the timeframe for preparing a strategy will be too slow and is cautious about overly spending time on analysis and capacity-building in the face of urgently needed actions.

The UNDP and UNEP are going forward as quickly as possible with recruitment of Consultants to carry out needed strategic analysis. Terms of reference have been drafted for studies to inform REDD+ strategy development and future REDD+ implementation. FAO is reviewing its overall support for analysis of drivers to determine how best to apply the remaining resources.

At least until the State Coordinator position is filled, the REDD Programme will seek to identify, develop, and use multiple channels to ensure the Governor hears REDD+ advice even when others may ignore it. This is premised on an assessment that (a) various interest groups actively seek to influence the Governor, (b) the UN-REDD programme does not have access yet for informal dialog with the Governor, and (c) the Governor may maintain some misconceptions about the REDD Programme that may be attributed to the interest groups that seek to influence him for which continuous engagement from UN-REDD is required to fully overcome such.

Furthermore, it is envisaged that, through the strategy development process, considerable efforts would be made to engage the FC and key Ministries, Departments and agencies more intensely in mainstreaming REDD+ into their policies, plans and operations as well as "owning" the strategy development process. This is intended to address the issue of "limited ownership" by FC and MDAs. Efforts would also be made to continue to engage the highest level of Government in CRS with the support of the FME and senior UN officials in country. The Governor has specifically called for a workshop on climate change and REDD+ to be sponsored by the State and facilitated by UN-REDD. This is expected to provide an opportunity to further galvanize support from key State actors.

In addition, drawing from lessons from the Anti-deforestation task force and past experience, the UN-REDD team has already provided strategic and technical advisory support to FC on how to better incorporate adequate benefit/risk assessment, stakeholder engagement, and lessons learned from past experience into the Governor's new measures to combat deforestation.

There may be the need for the national programme to collaborate with FCPF efforts to develop the two new pilot states, Nasarawa and Ondo in addition with CRS. This may be necessary to aggregate experiences that will inform national level processes in future. However, modalities for engagement in the two new states have to be put in place.

Finally, further programme delay has been addressed with the re-orientation and re-focus on the national programme through alignment of the annual work plan and budget to the Warsaw Framework elements.

While these delays/obstacles have been/are being addressed, lessons have been generated for the future not only for the national programme in Nigeria but for the UN-REDD Programme at large; notably, how NPs are generally designed and implemented, how to manage expectations on what the NP can deliver and cannot deliver within a given timeframe, the need to focus on key 'readiness' elements from the outset in order not to be sidetracked and the need for focused and targeted stakeholder engagement at various levels.

Opportunities and partnerships

1. Over the reporting period, have any opportunities that were not foreseen in the design of the programme been identified to help advance efforts on REDD+?

The UNDP/GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) support for the CBR+ initiative will provide support for community-

level engagement on livelihood activities aligned with REDD+ requirements. UNDP/GEF support for sustainable fuelwood management has also been designed. The GCF's support for carbon sample plot measurement has moved MRV design, methods, and field data collection forward significantly. Collaboration is being discussed with a UNDP programme on food security and resilience, now under design with the federal Government.

2. How are these opportunities being incorporated into the work of the National Programme?

A country CBR+ was developed and approved with the engagement of key stakeholders. Start-up of the programme is expected by the end of 2016. The UNDP/GEF sustainable fuelwood management project was validated at the national level in July and includes activities in Cross River State. The GCF recently approved a grant for carbon measurement that will be matched 45 percent by the UN-REDD programme funding. FAO is redesigning the carbon measurement activity to integrate these two work streams.

7. Targeted Support

Summary of Targeted Support (250 words):
Not applicable.