FIP Lessons Learned

September 27, 2017

Report Outline

Introduction

Chapter 1: Programming, Coordination and Transformational Impact of the FIP

Chapter 2: Forest Governance – Effective Policy, Institutional and Regulatory Frameworks

Chapter 3: Inclusive Stakeholder Engagement and Decision-Making Processes

Chapter 4: Private Sector Involvement

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Lessons Learned

WORLD BANK GROUP

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

Methodology

- ➢ Investment Plan review;

- ➢ Interviews with Government Focal Points, MDBs, CSO Observers, WB TTLs, CIF AU;

- ➢ Internal document review: Annual Reports, CIF knowledge products, IEG review;

- ➢ World Bank project documents (Concept Notes, PADs, ISRs etc.)

- ➢ Normative statements: Interviews, IEG report
- ➢ Positive statements: Investment Plan review, Annual Reports, knowledge products, interviews

➢ Tailor the theory of change to address the most crucial drivers of deforestation that will result in transformational impact.

➢ Theory of change can mean different things to different countries, it can range from co-management of forest resources (Tunisia) to de-risking projects in new biomes (Brazil, Cerrado).

➢ Theory of change at beginning versus now.

➢ Investment Plan development should build on existing plans and policies.

Programmatic Approach

➢ Generally considered to be positive by stakeholders, but did not help to catalyze private sector involvement.

➢ Monitoring and Reporting is a challenge for pilot countries.

➢ Important to FIP due to many drivers of deforestation originating outside the forest sector.

➢ Government agency coordination is an important factor in the success of the programmatic approach

Drivers of Deforestation

➢ Not all drivers identified were addressed specifically in project design

➢ In a few cases, the most important drivers of deforestation were not known at the time of Investment Plan development (Burkina Faso, Peru).

➢ Phase 2 countries often focused more on indirect drivers of deforestation, but the link between indirect and direct drivers was not always made in project design.

Stakeholder Engagement

- ➢ FIP has improved over time with regard to stakeholder engagement – seen as more adaptable than other climate funds by CSOs.

- ➢ Overall FIP related information flow occurred on a case-by-case basis, depending on CSO networks in regions and countries.

- ➢ Some consultations were for information sharing while others included more participation – only Indonesia and Peru mentioned CSO feedback explicitly in their IPs.

- ➢ **DGM** seen as an innovative and participatory mechanism by stakeholders. Should be replicated and expanded.

MDB Collaboration

➢ Level of success on a case by case basis depending on the country.

➢ When there was a link to other MDB activity or cross MDB coordination, FIP programming developed quicker (examples include Mexico, Brazil, DRC).

➢ More collaboration with MDBs observed in phase 2 countries, generally.

➢ Placing FIP in the right government agency(ies) had a positive impact on coordination and programming

➢ The primary agency(ies) responsible for forestry and REDD+ should be allocated government resources that are appropriate for its role in forest management and coordination

➢ The role of key individuals (FIP focal point, project managers, ministers of key agencies, etc.) that help build momentum towards transformation is essential

WORLD BANK GROUP

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

➢ FCPF Readiness phase is not necessarily a prerequisite to FIP investments.

➢ Burkina Faso was able to develop IP and R-PP concurrently.

➢ Mozambique is a positive example of FIP and FCPF coordination.

➢ FIP investments in DRC brought other financing instruments (CAFI).

WORLD BANK GROUP

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

Obstacles and Risks

➢ Phase 2 countries addressed more extensively the obstacles and risks in IPs than phase 1 countries.

➢ Obstacles and risks were commonly identified in the governance sector and include lack of capacity and risks from outside the forest sector.

➢ Phase 2 included more information on conflict resolution mechanisms than phase 1.

It is important to define success – do the original goals of FIP still apply or did the mission evolve over time?

1. A strong Theory of Change
2. Country ownership and the role of key individuals
3. MDB Collaboration
4. Programmatic approach: cross-sectoral approaches and consistency with national policy, FCPF, other MDB activity
5. Participatory approaches to stakeholder engagement
6. Capacity of management and staff at MDBs and Government.
7. Private sector engagement

WORLD BANK GROUP

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

Thank You !

www.climateinvestmentfunds.org

Select the three most important factors in FIP success in your country: here

1. A strong Theory of Change
2. Government champions and ownership
3. MDB collaboration
4. Programmatic approach: cross-sectoral approaches
5. Inclusive governance and stakeholder engagement
6. Capacity of MDBs and government
7. Private sector engagement

CLIMATE
INVESTMENT
FUNDS

Please select the three <u>barriers</u> to the FIP success in your country: <u>here</u>

1. A strong Theory of Change
2. Government champions and ownership
3. MDB collaboration
4. Programmatic approach: cross-sectoral approaches
5. Inclusive governance and stakeholder engagement
6. Capacity of MDBs and government
7. Private sector engagement

1. What's your country's experience

2. What barriers/negative experiences did you encounter?
How did you overcame or avoided these barriers?

3. What were the success factors or positive experiences
which can be replicated?

4. What would you advise to a country that is starting the FIP
process?