

National Programme Document Revision table

Country: **NIGERIA**

Comment (s)	Source (*)	Addressed in (reference to text and/or brief description)
A) Comments relevant to the document (revision and elaboration phase) (**)		
"Provide more details on the potential roles for the private sector"	PB-7: Decision 11(a)	More details have been provided under Output 1.2 (in Section 4.3). Effectively, specific attention has to be provided to the engagement of the private sector, which is a dynamic constituency in Nigeria and has already expressed eagerness for REDD+. In fact, the private sector is regarded as a crucial front of Nigeria's REDD+ process since the country has a dynamic business community and has shown interest in carbon schemes (Nigeria is among the few African countries that have managed to engage in the CDM). It is however important to define well its scope of engagement. A specific work stream on private sector views and engagement in REDD+ will be among the priority work streams at start of the programme's implementation. For this, the programme will bring international expertise for the matter, drawing from UN experience (including incipient UN-REDD work, such as a draft "Private sector strategy for the UN REDD Programme: A Latin American and Caribbean regional outlook"), successful NGO-business alliances for forest conservation, and the international banking community. These aspects, and others, have been detailed in the programme document (Section 4.3).
"Improve the risk management matrix with linkages to the results framework"	PB-7: Decision 11(b)	This has been done thoroughly in the updated version, with abundant references to specific output levels – see Table 10 (Programme's risk assessment), in section 7.2. In addition, a new risk has been added, namely "Risk of leakage: displacement of deforestation due to CRS activities", so to better respond to the decision 11/c of the Policy Board (see just below). Furthermore, the Programme Monitoring Framework provides a direct linkage between outcomes, indicators and risks (see Table 9, under section 7.2).

(*) Sources are: Independent technical review, Secretariat review, Policy Board comment, *et al.*

(**) As per the recommendation of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board comments from the Secretariat, independent technical review, and Policy Board will be presented in two categories: (a) comments to be resolved in the document (revision and elaboration phase); and (b) comments relevant to the inception and implementation phase.

Comment (s)	Source (*)	Addressed in (reference to text and/or brief description)
"Refine the approach to manage the risks of leakage, taking into account recent developments in the country to engage more states into REDD+"	PB-7 Decision 11 (c)	This request has been addressed by providing more detail in section 3.9 ("Strategy for REDD+ expansion to other states") and by raising this issue under outcome 2 (section 4.1). In particular, the modalities for expanding REDD+ to other states will comprise preliminary discussions with Government Authorities in the states that have indicated interest to participate in Nigeria's REDD+ Programme, following the adoption of the <i>Memorandum on REDD+</i> by the National Council on Environment in September 2011, calling on all states in Nigeria to participate in REDD+ as means of saving the remaining forest estates, achieving forest conservation, and promoting sustainable livelihoods. Already, more than 6 states have formally indicated interest to participate in REDD+, with scoping visits earmarked for 2012.
"The national Programme Document demonstrate clear ownership and commitment by the government and non-governmental stakeholders"	Secretariat comment, PB-7 Report (p. 12), as well as NP Submission Form (section 5/l)	Noted with appreciation – effectively a special care for national ownership (with related capacity-building) and for stakeholder engagement have been priority concerns for the joint Nigeria-UN team for REDD+.
"The risk assessment section, including proposed measures to mitigate risks, is further improved prior the National Programme Document's signature".	Secretariat suggestion, PB-7 Report (p. 12), as well as Secretariat Review at the NP Submission Form (section 5/o)	See response to PB-7 Decision 11(b) above.
"The vast majority of recommendations from the independent reviewers and the initial comments made by the Policy Board members have been sufficiently addressed"	Secretariat comment, PB-7 Report (p. 13) as well as Secretariat Review at the NP Submission Form (section 5/o)	Fine. No action needed. It confirms that comments and recommendations from the independent technical reviewers are already satisfactorily incorporated or addressed in the final version of the programme document.

(*) Sources are: Independent technical review, Secretariat review, Policy Board comment, *et al.*

(**) As per the recommendation of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board comments from the Secretariat, independent technical review, and Policy Board will be presented in two categories: (a) comments to be resolved in the document (revision and elaboration phase); and (b) comments relevant to the inception and implementation phase.

Comment (s)	Source (*)	Addressed in (reference to text and/or brief description)
"Further explanation of how leakage will be addressed" / "Further reference to risk of leakage and illegal cross-border trade"	Secretariat suggestion, PB-7 Report (p. 13) / Policy Board suggestion, PB-7 Report (p. 13)	See response to PB-7 Decision 11(c) above.
"Show the linkages between the national and the state level and how the chosen two track approach to REDD+ readiness will be coordinated"	Policy Board suggestion, PB- Report (p. 13)	The linkages are already detailed in section 5.1 and in figure 10, and will be refined at the moment of the inception. In addition, when reviewing the document, it has been specified that, as of year 2012, the Special Climate Change Unit has become the Department of Climate Change, thus enhancing the national ability to coordinate and lead on climate change and REDD+ matters. Furthermore, local project appraisal committee and final technical review meetings were held in August 2012, with selected participation from both Federal and CRS constituencies for REDD+, smoothing coordination and collegially endorsing the final programme design and its joint implementation arrangements.
"Clarify on how successful the Anti-Deforestation Task Force in the Cross River State to 'control illegal timber harvesting' has been"	Policy Board comment, PB-7 Report (p. 13)	The specific oversight mechanism for the Anti-Deforestation Task Force has been specified in the document (section 2.6). The media attention and the fact that the timber exploitation moratorium has been expanded indeterminately are indicators of its success. In fact, the CRS urge for a REDD+ programme and systems for payment-for-ecosystem-services are due to the fact that control of timber extraction have an impact on the local economy that needs to be politically solved via other means.
"Better explain how information will be shared on how communities have been involved in the design and implementation of its UN-REDD National Programme"	Policy Board comments, PB-7 Report (p.13)	This comment is not very clear. A Stakeholders Forum on REDD+ is already constituted in Cross River State, and a similar platform will be constituted at Federal level (see outputs 1.2 and 3.2). Section 5.4 of the programme document outlines the "Programme support mechanisms", which include the platforms and means to channel information and conduct consultations. There are also explicit plans for communications and stakeholder engagement, including FPIC (also under outputs 1.2 and 3.2). In addition, media has been very active in Nigeria on climate change matters and REDD+ in particular since UN-REDD started to engage in the country.

(*) Sources are: Independent technical review, Secretariat review, Policy Board comment, *et al.*

(**) As per the recommendation of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board comments from the Secretariat, independent technical review, and Policy Board will be presented in two categories: (a) comments to be resolved in the document (revision and elaboration phase); and (b) comments relevant to the inception and implementation phase.

Comment (s)	Source (*)	Addressed in (reference to text and/or brief description)
"Nigeria could also consider if they wish to apply the Social & Environmental Principles and Criteria [by UN-REDD] and the draft Tool as a way of voluntarily strengthening the risk management framework"	Secretariat Review, NP Submission Form (section 5/o)	Nigeria has already expressed willingness to employ the UN-REDD's <i>Social & Environmental Principles and Criteria</i> in the development of its national REDD+ safeguards system (this is further confirmed in text revisions of sections 3.7 and 4.5 of the programme document). In fact, Nigeria has launched a work stream on REDD+ safeguards, establishing a team, which has received initial training on the basis of the mentioned UN-REDD social & environmental policy guidelines.
B) Comments relevant to the inception and implementation phase (**)		
"Further detail on the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and, in particular, the multi-stakeholders exercise to discuss them" / "Improving the analysis of drivers of deforestation"	Policy Board suggestion, PB-7 Report (p. 13) / PB member's comments circulated before the PB-7 meeting (as per the NP Submission Form, section 6)	The sources of the preliminary discussions on the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation have been specified in the document (i.e. table 3). In addition, the Nigeria REDD+ University, with 200 participants, in March 2012, served to continue discussions on the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, as well as on the strategic options to address them. This comment pertains to the REDD+ readiness process and the programme will address it in outputs 2.1 (national level) and 3.3 (CRS level) as well as provide complementary analysis under outputs 2.3 and 4.1.
Ensure the two-track approach adheres to UNFCCC agreements and that risk of displacement of emissions is duly taking into account.	PB member's comments circulated before the PB-7 meeting (as per the NP Submission Form, section 6)	UNFCCC agreements allow for sub-national approaches as an interim measure, while a REDD+ country builds the capacity to implement at a national scale. Nigeria will actually offer, through its REDD+ readiness approach and process, a test on the feasibility and benefits/issues of a national cum sub-national approach. Nigeria has modalities in place to expand to other states beyond CRS as well as a plan to develop the national forest monitoring system. This is consistent with UNFCCC decisions on subnational and national approaches. Regarding risk of displacement of emissions in such approach, see response to PB-7 Decision 11(c) above.

(*) Sources are: Independent technical review, Secretariat review, Policy Board comment, *et al.*

(**) As per the recommendation of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board comments from the Secretariat, independent technical review, and Policy Board will be presented in two categories: (a) comments to be resolved in the document (revision and elaboration phase); and (b) comments relevant to the inception and implementation phase.

Comment (s)	Source (*)	Addressed in (reference to text and/or brief description)
Miscellaneous requests of clarification: clarification on the conceptual framework for Nigeria's approach to REDD+ safeguards; a description of the role that illegality plays on driving deforestation in Nigeria; add more data on forest resources; and clarify the level of co-financing needed to achieve the proposed results.	PB member's comments circulated before the PB-7 meeting (as per the NP Submission Form, section 6)	Clarifications on these matters were provided at the PB-7 plenary by the Nigeria delegation. Further information will be raised during the REDD+ process itself. Regarding co-financing, the UN-REDD budget will support a robust REDD+ readiness in Cross River State (as model for the rest of states in the country) and basic REDD+ policy and capacity-building at federal level. In addition, the budget will fund efforts to systematise and disseminate the REDD+ readiness models and lessons from Cross River State (see output 4.3: "CRS established as centre of excellence & learning on REDD+). The country will seek co-financing to expand REDD+ in other states and to complete the national-level process (e.g. ensuring a full MRV system in place across the entire country). In this sense, fund-raising & donor liaison are planned activities (output 2.3). Finally, the UN-REDD Secretariat has stated: "the vast majority of the recommendations have been sufficiently addressed in the National Programme Document [as submitted to PB-7]" and "acknowledges that some recommendations are relevant to the inception/implementation phase" (NP Submission Form, section 6).
"Furthering the stakeholder engagement process"	PB member's comments circulated before the PB-7 meeting (as per the NP Submission Form, section 6)	This is a crucial part of Nigeria's REDD+ process and clearly retained in the programme document and in the planned activities under UN-REDD finance. Furthermore, the recent Nigeria REDD+ University, with around 200 participants, attendance by international speakers and themes of multi-stakeholder discussion, shows that stakeholder engagement is an inner component of Nigeria's REDD+ process. Finally, it is to be noted that the final, joint meetings of the local project appraisal committee and technical review (August 2012) stated among its 6 core recommendations that "Awareness creation, advocacy and the roles of CSOs/Media should be stepped up as early REDD+ actions" (see Appendix I).

(*) Sources are: Independent technical review, Secretariat review, Policy Board comment, *et al.*

(**) As per the recommendation of the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board comments from the Secretariat, independent technical review, and Policy Board will be presented in two categories: (a) comments to be resolved in the document (revision and elaboration phase); and (b) comments relevant to the inception and implementation phase.