

**Grading for ER-PIN Assessments:**

Color	Qualification	Analysis
Green	The indicator is clearly addressed and supported by country stakeholders and other sources of evidence;	Reasons for attributed grade should be clearly stated and supported by evidence.
Yellow	The indicator is partially addressed, ER-PIN claims are contested, and/or supporting evidence is weak;	
Red	The indicator is not addressed or is mentioned but not defined/explained, nor supported by evidence and local stakeholder input.	

**Reasons**

**Section 1: ADVANCING INDIGENOUS AND COMMUNITY RIGHTS TO LAND AND FORESTS:** To what extent does the proposed emission reduction program protect and advance the rights of Indigenous Peoples (IP) and local communities (LC) to land and forests within REDD+ systems and processes?

**1) Stakeholder participation in ER-PIN planning and ERP design**

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
Red	1a) The ER-PIN design process shows evidence of full and effective engagement of locally affected populations and vulnerable groups, including women, indigenous peoples and local communities	No, there is no evidence of full and effective involvement. So far, the approach has been limited to initial dialogues within consultations. The ER-PIN notes that workshops were organized with the participation of local communities and traditional authorities (ER-PIN, p. 35-36), but does not describe a process. Furthermore, it does not address the engagement of indigenous peoples at all even though they were listed as a key stakeholder group in the R-PP (R-PP, pp. 17-18). See also R-PP, p. 18 and 34.
Red	1b) The ER-PIN presents a clear and realistic approach for ensuring IP/LC involvement in the design and implementation of the full ER Program	The ER-PIN vaguely describes a consultative process that predicts the cooperation with the Association of Territorial Forest Communities of Côte d'Ivoire (COFORCI) and mentions the rights of native populations without much detail (ER-PIN, pp 36-37). Furthermore, the ER-PIN states that local communities will participate in forestry development and management (ER-PIN, p. 29) and other activities such as deforestation surveying and collection of data (ER-PIN, p. 55). Nevertheless, descriptions of their engagement are superficial and do not spell out how involvement of minorities such as women and IP's will be ensured.

**2) Land and forest tenure**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>ER-PIN Assessment</b>
	2a) Robust tenure assessments (i.e., assessment takes into account customary and legal land hold, disputed areas, challenges, etc) in the geographical area of the proposed ER Program were conducted as part of the SESA	No, neither the ER-PIN nor the R-PP present a robust assessment of tenure rights in the geographical area of the program. The SESA was not yet concluded.
	2b) Land and resource tenure assessments were publically vetted and endorsed by all concerned stakeholders;	No. The ER-PIN does not include stakeholders' or experts feedback on land and resource tenure. Furthermore, SESA is not yet completed.
	2c) The land use / land tenure context of the proposed ER Program, including implementation risks (conflicting claims) and available arbitration processes is well defined.	No. The ER-PIN presents an overview of the most relevant national legislation (ER-PIN, p.17) and land domains within the area and a summary of land certificates issued by the State in the ER program area (ER-PIN, pp. 62-63). It also lists land-related insecurity and conflicts as major deforestation drivers (ER-PIN, p. 23) and as risk to the program (ER-PIN, p.37). No arbitration process is defined.
	2d) The process for addressing emerging land and forest tenure issues (e.g., conflicting claims, tenure insecurity for IP/LC and women) is clearly defined in the ER-PIN	No. The ER-PIN does not clearly describe a process either in the sections dealing with grievance mechanism (ER-PIN, p.61) nor in the section dealing specifically with land tenure issues (ER-PIN, pp. 62-63). Actions proposed are only vaguely presented and include support for the National Rural Land Ownership Security Program (PNSFR) (ER-PIN, p. 57) and development of a complaint management mechanism (ER-PIN, p. 34). Furthermore, the ER-PIN does not address the issue of irregular occupation of indigenous territories nor women's land rights.

**3) Assignment of rights to forest carbon**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>ER-PIN Assessment</b>
	3a) The legal framework for carbon rights is defined in the ER-PIN	No. The framework concerning carbon rights is not yet defined.
	3b) The process for dealing with contested and/or overlapping land, forest and carbon claims is defined.	No. The R-PP assesses overlapping as a potential cause of conflict among stakeholders in agricultural and mining areas (R-PP, p. 104), but the development of a dispute settlement mechanism is still in design phase (ER-PIN p.61).
	3c) The legal basis for the transfer of ER titles is defined.	No, it is not defined.

**4) Equitable benefit sharing and non carbon benefits**

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	4a) The ER-PIN presents a transparent and verifiable process to equitably share carbon-related benefits (e.g., REDD+ revenue streams).	No. The ER-PIN presents a benefit-sharing plan that should be developed in a collaborative process by September 2016 (ER-PIN, p. 64-65). The ER-PIN also envisions a Payment for Environmental Services (PES) for reforestation and agroforestry activities, as a part of the benefit-sharing plan. Under this mechanism, landowners with formal recognition will have ownership of trees and receive compensation for carbon rights (ER-PIN, p. 64).
	4b) The ER-PIN presents a transparent and verifiable process to prioritize and equitably share non-carbon benefits (e.g., alternative business models and revenue streams).	No. As self-assessed in the ER-PIN, non-carbon related aspects still require further development (ER-PIN, p. 13). The document summarizes expected non-carbon benefits vaguely. (ER-PIN, p. 65)
	4c) The benefit sharing mechanisms outlined in the ER-PIN are broadly supported by indigenous and forest dependent communities, including women.	No. The benefit-sharing plan is still in design phase, and it does not describe how minorities such as women would be included.

**5) Alignment of ERP strategies with main drivers of deforestation**

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	5a) The drivers of deforestation and forest degradation identified in the ER-PIN are consistent with expert analyses and local stakeholder input.	Partial. The R-PP describes a series of workshops with focus on informing and receiving feedback of stakeholders about main deforestation drivers (R-PP, pp. 20-30). Those drivers match the ones described in the ER-PIN (ER-PIN, p. 22). Furthermore, there is an underway study on the identification and mapping of deforestation and forest degradation drivers for the preparation of the REDD+ strategy (ER-PIN, p. 11). Still, the ER-PIN lack up to date analysis in the geographical area and uses as reference studies on the deforestation drivers from Geist and Lambin of 2001.
	5b) Challenges to overcoming identified drivers (i.e., technical, institutional, political or economic) are clearly defined.	Yes. In general, challenges are clearly defined (ER-PIN, pp. 26-27)
	5c) Proposed ER Program interventions specifically target the main drivers and their related challenges.	Yes. In spite of the preliminary stage of the program, the proposed interventions are linked to the main drivers and respective challenges. (ER-PIN, pp. 28-33)

## 6) Safeguards framework

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	6a) The country has completed its SESA and elaborated an ESMF (yes/no; if yes then consider b through e; if no, got to 6f)	<b>NO</b>
	6b) The assessment of social and environmental considerations was conducted in a transparent and participatory manner.	
	6c) FPIC is presented as a requirement of the ESMF.	
	6d) The EMSF identifies key steps, including budget and timeline, to strengthen forest governance issues within the national legal framework	
	6e) The ER-PIN presence a credible grievance/dispute resolution mechanism, based on the FGRM assessment.	
	6f) The ER-PIN describes the design of the Safeguard Information System and its application in the context of the ER-P.	Partial. The design of the Safeguard Information System is described in the R-PP (R-PP, p. 222). It states that it will rely on the national monitoring systems and develop a participatory platform. Its indicators on governance, socioeconomic situation and environment are, however, vague and overly broad (R-PP, p. 223-225).
	6g) Proposed safeguards adequately address the land and resource rights of indigenous peoples, forest communities and women	No. The ER-PIN does not address the rights of local communities and women within proposed safeguards. The R-PP only states that the rights of local communities and women will be taken into consideration within the safeguards indicators (R-PP, p. 224).

**Section 2: BROADER GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES FOR ADDRESSING DEFORESTATION DRIVERS:** To what extent does the proposed emission reduction program consider other key forest governance challenges for achieving REDD+?

### 7) Government capacity and coordination in ERP planning and implementation

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
Yellow	7a) The ER-PIN shows evidence of coordination across sectors, line ministries, and levels of government (local, sub-national, national).	Partial. The ER-PIN presents an institutional arrangement to coordinate across sectors (ER-PIN, p. 72). Still, the ER-PIN does not clarify the extent of participation of important actors such as the "Decentralized Organizations" in monitoring and enforcing program policies (ER-PIN, p. 38), or "recipients", constituted by local communities, directly affected by the program (ER-PIN, p. 39).
Red	7b) The ER-PIN identifies opportunities for community-based interventions, including natural resource management, tenure recognition, and other dedicated REDD+ investments.	No. The ER-PIN affirms local communities will assist in forest monitoring and other activities as collection of forest data and surveying reforestation expansion (ER-PIN, p. 55). Their roles, the institutional arrangements and local structures are not defined yet.
Red	7c) The ER-PIN discusses efforts to combat corruption and the measures that will be used in the ER Program.	No. The ER-PIN does not address the issue. The R-PP assesses corruption as a political and institutional risk (R-PP, p. 65). It also states that corruption risks will be evaluated in accordance to the United Nations Standards, through participatory processes (R-PP, p. 65), and that REDD+ processes could lead to better governance and less corruption (R-PP, p. 111).

**8) Transparent monitoring and oversight of REDD+**

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	8a) The ER-PIN shows evidence of an open-access information management systems for REDD+	No. As self-assessed, activities monitoring system still lack further development (ER-PIN, p. 13). The ER-PIN states an information platform concerning program aspects such as governance benefits and impacts should be expected by July 2016 (ER-PIN, p. 12).
	The ER-PIN proposes mechanisms to independently and transparently:	
	8b) Monitor the social and environmental impacts of REDD+ investments;	No. A Forest Monitoring System program will be established as a branch of the existing National Forest Monitoring Mechanism (NFMS), with due adjustments to meet FCPF criteria, by mid-2017 (ER-PIN, p. 51). A monitoring system exists at national level, however it requires considerable improvement to develop a GHG inventory (ER-PIN, p. 53). With reference to the monitoring of social aspects of the program, as already stated, program still relies on the completion of the SESA and the SIS.
	8c) Monitor the application of safeguards via the Safeguard information system	No. SIS has not yet been developed.
	8d) Monitor the effectiveness of governance-related interventions;	Partial. Despite relying on the completion of monitoring mechanisms, the ER-PIN describes diffuse monitoring mechanisms related to governance structures already in place, despite not being yet related to REDD+. Decentralized institutions, such as prefectures and regional councils, will monitor the application of laws and regulations, while representing the ER program related ministries. Additionally, Regional Committees are also in charge of overseeing program's implementation (ER-PIN, p. 38-39).
	8e) Track and coordinate international finance flows;	Partial. The ER-PIN explains what bodies are responsible for fund mobilization and management (ER-PIN, p. 3, p. 38). Still, the document does not present a transparent monitoring scheme for financing (ER-PIN, p. 14).
	8f) Monitor the distribution of carbon and non-carbon benefits	No.

**Section 3: OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>ER-PIN Assessment</b>
	9a) The proposed emission reduction program protects and advances the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to land and forests within REDD+ systems and processes.	No, although the ER-PIN mentions local communities several times, it does not clearly specify how the ER-Program can benefit them and promote their rights, nor does it guarantee sufficiently means for their participation in the program design. Furthermore, the ER-PIN is almost silent about Indigenous Peoples participation.
	9b) The proposed emission reduction program presents a credible plan for addressing governance issues at national and sub-national levels, and establishes clear processes for monitoring progress on critical risk factors.	Partial. The ER-PIN does describe how institutional arrangements are coordinated among government sectors and through sub-national levels. Nevertheless, it does not describe clearly how local actors will participate in institutional arrangements, which is a major concern considering the turmoil Côte d'Ivoire has faced in the last years. Furthermore, the ER-PIN lacks further details of the design of a monitoring plan.