



National Joint Programme (NJP) Submission Form to the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board

1. Policy Board Submission	
Policy Board Meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No.1	Inter-sessional Decision <input type="checkbox"/>
Date of Meeting: 9-10 March 2009	Date of Inter-sessional Decision:

2. National Joint Programme Summary	
<i>Details of National Joint Programme</i>	
Country	Tanzania
Programme ¹ Title	UN-REDD Programme – Tanzania Quick Start Initiative
Implementing Partner(s) ²	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
<i>Details of Participating UN Organizations' Representatives</i>	
UN Resident Coordinator: <i>Name:</i> Oscar Fernandez Taranco	Contact details: <i>Telephone:</i> +255-22-2199201 <i>Email:</i> oscar.fernandez.taranco@undp.org
FAO: <i>Name:</i> Loiuse Setshwaelo <i>Title:</i> Country Representative	Contact details: <i>Telephone:</i> <i>Email:</i>
UNDP: <i>Name:</i> Alain Noudehou <i>Title:</i> Country Director	Contact details: <i>Telephone:</i> +255-22-219-9214 <i>Email:</i> alain.noudehou@undp.org
UNEP: <i>Name:</i> Angela Cropper <i>Title:</i> Deputy Executive Director	Contact details: <i>Telephone:</i> +254-20-7621234 <i>Email:</i> angela.cropper@unep.org
<i>Type of National Joint Programme</i>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Full NJP:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Full NJP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuation from an Initial NJP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Initial NJP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> New Initial NJP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuation from previous funding</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)</p>

¹ The term "programme" is used for projects, programmes and joint programmes.

² Refers to National counterparts. List the lead entity first.

12

3. Executive Summary

To facilitate REDD, efforts are urgently needed to adapt forest management systems, and establish financing systems and associated monitoring and verification systems attuned to country needs. These systems need to address concerns relating to the cost-effectiveness of REDD approaches, leakage, additionality, and the rights and responsibilities of local communities, amongst other issues.

The Quick-Start Initiative will strengthen Tanzania's readiness for REDD as a component of the Government's evolving REDD Strategy, and is integrated with other REDD activities in the country. Interventions are planned over a period of 12 months, laying the ground work for activities in later years. The Initiative is an integral part of the ONE-UN Programme in Tanzania and the Joint Programme on Environment, which has the objective of 'Increasing Funding for Environment Management from International Environment Funding Mechanisms with a focus on Climate Change and natural resource management'. The programme will have the following outcomes:

Outcome 1: National governance framework and institutional capacities strengthened for REDD (led by UNDP)

Outcome 2: Increased capacity for capturing REDD elements within National Monitoring, Assessment, Reporting and Verification Systems (led by FAO)

Outcome 3: Improved capacity to manage REDD and provide other forest ecosystem services at district and local levels (led by UNDP)

Outcome 4: Broad based stakeholder support for REDD in Tanzania (led by UNEP and UNDP)

These outcomes are aligned to the draft National strategy for REDD in Tanzania. The initial year of investment will prepare the ground for the decisions that will be made at the Copenhagen meeting of the UNFCCC. At that point decisions will need to be made on the activities and implementation modalities for ongoing UN REDD programmatic support to Tanzania. It is therefore expected that the existing programme of support will also help deliver a longer term package of assistance, linked to the goals of the UN REDD Programme and fully harmonized with the Tanzanian REDD Strategy and framework documents, and the donor assistance being provided by other countries.

4. Budget Allocation (UN-REDD Fund Source only)				
Outcomes	FAO (\$)	UNDP (\$)	UNEP (\$)	Total (\$)
1. National governance framework and institutional capacities strengthened for REDD		1,650,000		1,650,000
2. Increased capacity for capturing REDD elements within national Monitoring, Assessment, Reporting and Verification (MARV) systems	1,400,000			1,400,000
3. Improved capacity to manage REDD and provide other forest ecosystem services at district and local levels		550,000		550,000
4. Broad based stakeholder support for REDD in Tanzania		200,000	200,000	400,000
Sub-Total	1,400,000	2,400,000	200,000	4,000,000
Indirect Support Costs	98,000	168,000	14,000	280,000
Grand Total (\$)	1,498,000	2,568,000	214,000	4,280,000

NOTE: A breakdown of the budget allocations using the UNDG "harmonized input budget categories" must be provided to the UN-REDD Secretariat (for onward transmission to the Administrative Agent) with the signed NJP document. Please see Annex 1

5. Secretariat Review		
Submission Criteria		
(a)	Is the NJP consistent with the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Has the UN Resident Coordinator been involved in submitting the NJP?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Is documentation of the in-country validation meeting(s) included?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Did the validation include the national government counterpart (or designate)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Did the validation include civil society/Indigenous Peoples representation as per the UN-REDD Operational Guidance ³ ?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>

³ In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways:

i. Self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements:

- Selected through a participatory, consultative process
- Having national coverage or networks
- Previous experience working with the Government and UN system
- Demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society/Indigenous Peoples organizations

ii. Representative(s) who participated in a UN-REDD Programme scoping and/or formulation mission and sit(s) on a UN-REDD Programme consultative body established as a result of the mission

152

5. Secretariat Review		
(f)	Does the NJP comply with the required format (<i>incl., cover page, results framework, etc.</i>)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(g)	Does the NJP comply with UN-REDD Rules of Procedure and relevant Operational Guidance?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(h)	Is the required budget allocation provided (see section 3 above)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(i)	Are the Indirect Support Costs within the approved rate?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(j)	Is the Programme Summary completed? (<i>for posting on website</i>)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
(k)	Is the Progress Report included? (<i>for supplementary funding only</i>)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If the answer was 'No' or 'Unclear' to any question, please explain here:</p> <p>(e) A number of civil society organizations and NGOs participated in the validation meeting of 24 February 2009 and the Secretariat notes that the conclusions of the meeting were incorporated into the submitted NJP. The Secretariat also notes with satisfaction that an additional civil society consultation was organized in-country on 5 March 2009, supported through UNDP's allocation from the International Support Functions, and looks forward to the conclusions of the meeting being reflected in the final NJP.</p> <p>(f) the organization of the document does not conform entirely to the template. This is due to the Secretariat receiving late advice on a change to the standard UN Joint Programme format – after the first draft of the Tanzania NJP had been prepared. The differences are not great. For example, the NJP does not have a separate section 'Strategies, including lessons learned and the proposed joint programme' that the other NJPs have. Furthermore, editing is needed to align the main text with the results framework.</p> <p>(i) some calculation errors were identified in the draft NJP. Section 4 (above) now reflects the correct figures to be considered by the Policy Board.</p>		

5. Secretariat Review	
Review Issues	
(a)	Ownership of the NJP by government and non-government stakeholders
<p>The NJP reflects strong government ownership. A good effort in the time available has been made to bring as large a group of stakeholders into the process as possible.</p>	

iii. Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g. the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Programme Steering Committee)

5. Secretariat Review

Review Issues

(b) Level of consultation, participation and engagement

The consultation, participation and engagement activities carried out by the programme preparation team are well described and appear very satisfactory given the time and resources available.

The NJP includes a useful section on the consultations that took place during the proposal development process.

(c) Programme effectiveness, coherence with country strategies and other relevant initiatives, and cost-efficiency

The proposed programme is coherent, well designed and cost-effective.

The formulation process involved significant coordination with other initiatives in Tanzania in order to ensure coherence, especially with the Embassy of Norway regarding the \$100m bilateral commitment as part of Norway's International Climate and Forests Initiative. This process is not fully reflected in the NJP, but should do so before the NJP is signed.

(d) Management of risks and likelihood of success

The delivery of a \$4m programme in Tanzania in 12 months is ambitious. The NJP will require significant oversight, coordination and logistical management if it is to be effective within 12 months. Already the anticipated start date needs to be adjusted. It would be useful to have a section in the NJP specifically on the management of risks and factors that may affect the likelihood of success. A Risk Log should be maintained.

Other points:

6. Independent Technical Review

(a)	Was an independent technical review undertaken?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
-----	---	---

If not, why not?

Synthesis of Independent Technical Review

This NJP document explicitly focuses on activities to be carried out during the period up to the December 2009 COP meeting in Copenhagen (e.g., page 4, last para). It is difficult to imagine significant progress being achieved and reported in time to affect the Copenhagen meeting.

The proposed programme of activities appears coherent and sensible given the limited time and resources available, although it is not clear how much progress can actually be made within the anticipated time frame given the existing capacity constraints.

The document relies heavily on an approach described as the 'National REDD Production Chain'. This appears to be a general approach that is being tailored to Tanzania, although much of the related text used here still appears generic. It would have been useful to have explained (i) where this approach originated, (ii) why it has been adopted here, (iii) at what level GoT and civil society have bought into it or assumed ownership, and (iv) which UN-REDD countries this is considered applicable to.

Experience suggests that much of this will be hard to implement, even though the proposed NJP for Tanzania is presumably only seeking to implement the initial steps of the 'National REDD Production Chain'.

While the need to coordinate with other donor-supported REDD activities is highlighted, the report does not explain how this will be achieved. Notably, the report refers to a five year, US\$100 million REDD initiative in Tanzania being funded by the Government of Norway. The draft NJP does not state what this programme - which has a budget 20 times larger than UN-REDD - aims to do. This makes it hard to assess how UN-REDD will fit in with other related initiatives in Tanzania.

7. Secretariat Response

- ☐ Provide comments and request re-submission to a future Policy Board meeting
- ☐ Provide comments to be addressed before forwarding to the next immediate Policy Board meeting
- ☐ Forward to the Policy Board (with comments if necessary) with a recommendation to fund specific portions or phases (including an inception phase) of the NJP
- ☒ Forward to the Policy Board (with comments if necessary) with a recommendation to fund the NJP.

7. Secretariat Response

Explanation of Response:

The Secretariat had the opportunity to provide detailed comments on an earlier draft NJP and the formulation team have provided responses.

The independent technical reviewer has also provided detailed comments that will be made available to the proponent.

The Secretariat supports the budget allocation request. At the same time, it will work with the proponent to finalise the NJP before it is signed and funds are released.

8. Decision of the UN-REDD Policy Board

Decision of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board:

- ☒ Full NJP approved, as per budget allocation in Section 4
- ☐ Initial NJP approved, as per budget allocation in Section 4
- ☐ Approved with a revised budget of \$
- ☐ Approved with modification/condition
- ☐ Deferred/returned with comments for further consideration

Comments:

The Secretariat will provide written comments to the proponent to be taken into consideration in finalizing the NJP document, as reflected in the Submission Form

8. Decision of the UN-REDD Policy Board


Angela Cropper
Deputy Executive Director, UNEP
Co-Chair, UN-REDD Programme Policy Board



Signature

11 March 2009

Eduardo Reyes
Sub-Administrator General,
National Environmental Authority, Government of Panama
Co-Chair, UN-REDD Programme Policy Board



Signature

11 March 2009

9. Administrative Agent Review

Action taken by the Administrative Agent: Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office, Bureau of Management, UNDP

☐

Programme consistent with provisions of the UN-REDD Programme MDTF Memorandum of Understanding and Standard Administrative Arrangements with donors.

Administrative Agent:

Bisrat Aklilu, Executive Coordinator, Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office

.....
Signature

.....
Date