Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template

2nd Review of Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP): Madagascar

Reviewer: Jürgen Blaser (lead TAP Reviewer) with the input of 8 additional TAP reviewers

Date of the last review: 7 October, 2010

Objectives of a Readiness Preparation Proposal (condensed directly from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

*The **purpose of the R-PP** is to build and elaborate on the previous Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) or a country's relevant comparable work, to assist a country in laying out and organizing the steps needed to achieve 'Readiness' to undertake activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), in the specific country context. The R-PP provides a framework for a country to set a clear roadmap, budget, and schedule to achieve REDD Readiness. The FCPF does not expect that the activities identified in the R-PP and its Terms of Reference (ToR) would actually occur at the R-PP stage, although countries may decide to begin pilot activities for which they have capacity and stakeholder support. Instead, the R-PP consists of a summary of the current policy and governance context, what study and other preparatory activities would occur under each major R-PP component, how they would be undertaken in the R-PP execution phase, and then a ToR or work plan for each component. The activities would generally be performed in the next, R-PP execution phase, not as part of the R-PP formulation process.*

Review of the Technical Advisory Panel
Readiness Preparation Proposal (Draft R-PP) submitted by the Government of Madagascar
SUMMARY

Introduction

Madagascar, the second biggest island in the tropics after Borneo, has all the principal tropical biomes represented in a relatively small area: tropical humid, semi-humid, semi-dry, tropical dry and tropical-temperate (mountain). The world's last remaining intact tropical semi-arid and arid forests are found in Madagascar. There are also large areas of grassland and shrubs. The state owns the majority of the forests. Deforestation and forest degradation has a long history in Madagascar and dates centuries ago. The estimated forest area at the end of 1950s was about 18 million hectares; recent studies estimate the remaining area to about 9.7 million hectares. While the deforestation rate in the period of 1980-2000 was around 1% in average, forest loss has diminished since then, to roughly 50,000 hectares of deforestation (0.4%). Traditionally, deforested areas ended up as low productive rotational agriculture (estimated to be about 80% of the deforestation area), charcoal, infrastructural development and mining areas. The main direct drivers of forest degradation are the production of firewood and charcoal, illegal logging and uncontrolled grazing of domestic animals in forested areas.

The high poverty rate of the rural and urban population, the frequent use of fire to deliver nutrients to the traditional paddy-rice fields and the use of fire to express political discontentment, combined with low public investment in forestry, low profitability of agriculture and poor suitability for agriculture of remaining forestland also contributed to the decline in forest loss. Despite of considerable investments in safeguarding the unique biodiversity of Madagascar with significant support by external resources, one has to assume that the trends in

deforestation and degradation will continue if the specific socio-economic context, the general unclear land-use and tenure situ cannot be adequately addressed.

Madagascar is a promising candidate to be integrated into international schemes to of REDD+. Beyond its longer-standing efforts to preserve its unique biodiversity, it has initiated, over the past decade activities to address wider forest land-use concepts, community forestry and environmental service programs. All of them, however, remain in an initial stage but they have the potential to be strengthened through a comprehensive national REDD+ strategy. With appropriate support, Madagascar could increase the sustainably managed forest area at decentralized level and start to address the core problems of DD which concern all other sectors intervening in rural areas. Much forestland has low opportunity costs. Since deforestation and degradation rates have been declining over the past years, REDD+ efforts can re-enforce this initial trend, particularly if poor rural communities are being empowered through REDD+ policies and larger social and environmental co-benefits can be generated. Long-term political commitment, stability and a corruption free environment, however, is the key for success.

Assessment of the R-PP

The proposed R-PP of Madagascar is a complete revised version from the prior DRAFT R-PP submitted to the TAP in March 2010 for initial review. Considerable efforts have been made to present a clear and concise document. The R-PP presented meets in nearly all components the required standards of the FCPF, with some nuances. The TAP team congratulates the Madagascar team for preparing this excellent report and for having dedicated considerable efforts in elaborating the R-PP and in consulting it with a broad array of stakeholders in Madagascar.

The TAP noted that the current R-PP document has been elaborated with considerable input from experts outside the administration. This raised the issue of ownership. However, a two-hour phone meeting hold on September 17 was reassuring in letting the TAP see that there is engagement of the government and other Malagasy stakeholders. It is important that the R-PP is understood by all parties and that the needed capacities are carefully built throughout the implementation of the R-PP. Thus, it is central to precise the level of involvement and capability of the civil servants and local stakeholders in the preparation and implementation of the R-PP. As capacity-building and consultations are woven throughout the different sections of the R-PP, there is some assurance that the country might be able to develop its own capacity during the next three years beyond the small group of doers actually in charge of the formulation of the R-PP.

There are a number of challenges which need to be addressed in the R-PP implementation, e.g. forest governance, pressure from other development sectors on forest and forest land, the high level of rural poverty, the cultural behavior towards resources use at local level. The prospect to obtain tangible REDD+ benefits might provide an important incentive to protect forests and a wider array of the country's unique biodiversity. Some of the challenges, such as the decreasing productivity of agricultural land, illegal logging or the conflict between different development visions, are not well addressed in the R-PP section on strategy (2b), but it probably will be in the future, during R-PP implementation, if the country follows the consultation plan that it sets forward.

The R-PP is overall a well elaborated document with many visionary elements that are innovative. The challenge will be in its implementation as capacities of the administration are limited. Considerable capacity building efforts for all stakeholders and outside support are needed to realize the R-PP objectives. The country has set a clear course ahead in terms of developing its capacities in REDD+ and, if the general political uncertainty can be overcome and a wide array of stakeholders become involved in the readiness process, there are some prospects that the country can tackle deforestation and forest degradation with a certain success.

Overall, in the TAP's view, Madagascar has submitted a valuable R-PP proposal that it commendable for further consideration by the Participants Committee. While the document has been well elaborated, a number of aspects should been kept in mind for the smooth implementation of the R-PP:

- The inclusion and transparent dealing with the civil society is a key element for success. The role of the Readiness Coordination Platform (PCPR) is crucial and it is important to fully integrate the civil society members of the PCPR in all aspects of implementation of the R-PP.

- The rural development context in Madagascar is extremely complex. It is important that the R-PP does not underestimate the issues involved in DD and that the solution package is not a technocratic, top-down approach as it has been in many of the past initiatives, e.g. the framework of the PNAE.

- The mainstreaming of REDD+ as a comprehensive approach in rural landscapes need to be better spelt out. Just dealing with mainstreaming REDD+ as at an activity level in the R-PP might not suffice to create the extra-sectorial changes needed to effectively tackle DD in Madagascar.

The TAP considers that the standards for all the components except for components 1a, 2b and 5 have been met. Specific recommendations for these components are outlined in the report by components beneath. For the other standards, the TAP comments in the present second TAP review should be understood as providing additional, optional, guidance to the team in Madagascar prior to submission of the R-PP to the Participants Committee.

In summary, the TAP assessed the Madagascar R-PP as follows:

1. **Organize and consult**

1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements. Madagascar's REDD Readiness arrangements include a high-level committee intersectorial committee, a steering committee established by the Ministry in charge of forests, a multi-stakeholder readiness coordination platform, an executive committee and an independent Trust Agent that will manage the funds allocated to REDD+. While general terms the TAP considers the proposed system as adequate, details must be given on the functioning and organization of the proposed arrangements, also in light of past experiences (e.g. functioning of CIME, the arrangements made in the *Plan d'Action Environnemental* (PAE) → **Standard not yet met.**

1b. Stakeholder Consultation and Participation. A formal procedure for consultation exists in Madagascar and will be used in the national and regional REDD+ readiness consultation process. Members of the multi-stakeholder readiness consultation platform (PCPR) will have specific roles in conducting and informing the stakeholder consultation process and assure adequate participation. Consultation has already occurred and was stratified to ensure collecting the view points of different actors. The R-PP was also validated in a National consultation in July 2010. The process planned for the consultation related to the REDD+ readiness arrangement includes the basic required steps and also conforms to the existing legislation in the country. → **Standard met.**

2. **Prepare the REDD Strategy**

2a. Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance. Well presented information is provided on the rates of deforestation in the recent past and the causes of both deforestation and forest degradation. An historical perspective on deforestation is presented but a more thorough analysis on degradation still need to be considered in the further process of preparing readiness. A comprehensive list and description of relevant legislation is given followed by an analysis of policy successes and failures. The section also outlines as major constraints to REDD+ forest governance problems, overlap with mining, precarious livelihoods of rural households and weak inter-sectoral synergies. The important aspects of land tenure, declining agricultural productivity and forest governance problems linked to illegal logging needs more attention. → **Standard met.**

2b. REDD+ Strategy Options. Madagascar has retained three possible strategy options (1) improved governance of the forest sector containing 12 intervention options, (2) manage access to the forests including 11 intervention options, and (3) reduced the dependency on resource with 9 intervention options. With these options in mind, the R-PP proposes to rely on consultation and analyses to identify the most appropriate

interventions in term of feasibility and cost that will reduce deforestation and forest degradation. As the main causes of deforestation and forest degradation in Madagascar come primarily from the other sectors, the mainstreaming of REDD+ in the country's overall development framework should be considered as an important component of the REDD+ strategy. What should be better expressed in the REDD+ strategy is the fact that most of Madagascar's deforestation comes from slash and burn agriculture; to address this central issue in an adequate way, the local people's needs and aspirations need to be sufficiently taken into account. The present R-PP focuses on governance, policies, capacities, but the central key of success is how to bring on board local people is not sufficiently described. → **Standard not met.**

2c. REDD+ Implementation Framework. Readiness for REDD-plus requires an efficient national institutional framework that is embedded in a larger national development strategy. Clear responsibilities among the authorities participating in the REDD+ processes regarding coordination, MRV and implementation have been proposed. Studies on the required institutional and legal reforms are proposed to be undertaken as studies to clarify carbon governance. What need to be further specified is the sub-national involvement by regional authorities and local stakeholders in the REDD+ implementation framework. → **Standard met.**

2d. Social and Environmental Impacts. A good comparison between the process of SESA defined by the Malagasy legislation and the safeguards procedures according to the operational guidelines of the World Bank (taken as reference at international level) is established. → **Standard met.**

3. Develop a reference scenario

Madagascar will follow the guideline of the UNFCCC in developing its reference scenario. Specifically it will couple remote sensing to ground truthing to estimate the changes in carbon stocks. The R-PP proposes to use new airborne approaches, especially light detection and ranging (LiDAR) that provide a means to estimate forest carbon density over large areas as a cost saving new technique to estimate the carbon stocks of the forest. The R-PP also proposes to develop specific allometric equations that examine the change in proportion of forests as a consequence of growth. The needs of capacity building is outlined to develop and apply the proposed methods, but has not been further detailed. → **Standards largely met.**

4 Design a monitoring system

The section on MRV makes several references to carbon credits and the MRV system is developed with the desire to engage in a market. The R-PP mentions that it will develop 3 monitoring systems at the national, regional and local level. Specific methodology for MRV will be adopted as REDD readiness will proceed but the idea is that changes in imagery at the national level will be verified at the regional and local level by field data. The section presents two already existing tools the environmental and social dashboards as relevant to monitoring. It indicates that a data base will be created and maintained and open to verification according to the standards of CCBA. The needs for capacity-building to implement this MRV system are detailed → **Standards largely met**

5 Schedule and Budget

A clear schedule for the activities is given and well as a detailed budget by activities is provided. However, considering that during the R-PP implementation, a considerable effort needs to be done in capacity building, the timeline seems to be overambitious. The budget needs some revision, indications on expenditures by source and some indication on how the R-PP will be funded. → **Standard not yet met**

6 Design a monitoring and evaluation framework.

This standard has been met, though the TAP proposes to simplify the monitoring and evaluation of the R-PP implementation.

As general recommendations, the TAP proposes to consider the following:

- The institutional context for REDD+ readiness management is crucial and needs to be as functional and operational as possible. In this regard, the situation of the Inter-Ministerial Committee for the Environment (CIME) as apex body for REDD+ implementation is crucial. The addition of a new entity (UP REDD) potentially creates confusion with the role of the PCPR and needs to be better justified.

- More thoughts are needed under the REDD+ strategy of forest governance. For example corruption is said to be a significant problem as well as the absence of intersectoral collaboration, but these issues are not mentioned under the governance option in the REDD+ strategic options. Likewise in the access option, the problem of illegal mining is not addressed, nor is the socio-cultural specificity that so much influence natural resources use in Madagascar (both, for destroying forests due to high poverty pressure and for protecting forests, due to cultural reasons).

- The R-PP retakes many of the conclusions made in the PNAE 20 years ago although it is known today that many of the approaches did not work in reality. It is important to clearly define the main governance issues in the process of the implementation of the R-PP and that approaches are proposed to delegate responsibility downwards, to the regions, to civil society and to professional institutions. The R-PP should make some observations on how it counters the critique and not falling into the trap of repeating the same errors as they have been made in the past.

- As there is a specific need for capacity building at all level during R-PP implementation, the timeline should be carefully adapted to this purpose. The budget should be made more transparent and eventually scaled down in some budget items and some ideas on funding sources beyond FCPF should be given.

The more detailed assessments and the main recommendations on the six components of the Draft R-PP of Madagascar are presented beneath. They include recommendations in a number of components and additional suggestions for those components, which in the TAP's assessment met the standards.

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3:)

Component 1. Organize and Consult

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness;

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The national readiness management arrangements are clearly outlined and well presented. The revised R-PP proposes a clear structure of the National REDD+ Readiness Management Arrangements, including
- A decision making level, entrusted to the Inter-Ministerial Committee on the Environment (CIME), (coordinated by the Ministry in charge of the Environment and Forests or by the Prime Ministry's office?)

- A steering and technical coordination level assured by the REDD+ Steering Unit (UP-REDD) under the Directorate-General of Forests (DGF) and the REDD+ Readiness Coordination Platform (PCPR) which succeeds the currently operating multi-stakeholder REDD Technical Committee (CT-REDD); and
- An operational level, the REDD-Executive Office (BER) and an independent Trust Agent for REDD+ Readiness (AFR).

While general terms the TAP considers the proposed system as adequate, details must be given on the functioning and organization of the proposed arrangements, also in light of past experiences (e.g. functioning of CIME, the arrangements made in the *Plan d'Action Environnemental* (PAE)

Involving a high-level intersectorial committee (CIME) in REDD+ readiness is important. Especially welcome is the acknowledgement that conflict on land use and development might occur and that CIME would be the forum to look for solutions. The TAP however requests clarification of the effective functioning and role of CIME. While in the current version it is described as having decision-making level on strategies and policies and well on intersectorial conflict management, in the last version of the R-PP, CIME was described as *"a structure …created in 1995 and included 8 governmental ministries… that have not been functional for four years. Given the current political situation, it seems difficult to revive it"*. The TAP questions what has changed meanwhile that CIME can take on the important policy work for the development of REDD+ in Madagascar.

While the 3 level management arrangements make sense, it still needs some more clarification. On the one hand, there are two steering entities: the PCPR (already envisaged in the first version of R-PP) and the UP-REDD (lately proposed and composed of only staff from forest administration). In addition, all incurring must be approved by these two entities (an a priori control). This practice might create delays or non-execution of some activities. The joint management of the Coordination level (UP REDD, CT REDD/PCPR) bears the potential for conflicts. As the UP REDD is described, it represents REDD at the Government level, and should thus be the working force of the Decision level, and not the leader of the Coordination level.

A single executive office (BER) is now proposed and its attributions (as its composition) are clearer. The choice for an independent fiduciary unit (that is already in place) is judicious. However, the composition of BER is not sufficiently clear. How many people? Are they "project type personnel" or civil servants? If the BER is composed of government officers of the Forest Administration and UP REDD is leading the Coordination level, the management arrangements would be completely Government dominated, what clearly is not wanted by the other stakeholders.

The distribution of the roles between the executive office and the fiduciary unit can facilitate the operations. The TAP concludes that the new role assigned to the CT-REDD that will become the PCPR (validation and technical coordination) makes the BER tasks easier, and ensures a "de facto" monitoring of activities implementation.

Recommendations:

While in general terms the management structure is well described, the proposal will be further strengthened if the following elements are adequately addressed in the R-PP:

- Clarify the inconsistencies in Figure 1, e.g. why appears the Ministry in charge of environment and forest like if it is included in the CIME? Why in the second box the UP REDD seems to be included in the Coordination Platform while in the text the UP REDD is described as the only body at the steering and technical coordination level? E.g. Figure 1 now gives the impression that the national Inter-ministerial

committee (CIME) is functioning under the Ministry in charge of Environment and Forests, while the text suggests that the CIME will be at a very high level, under the Prime Minister's Office

- In the previous version of the R-PP, the composition of the Platform was given. In this version, the composition of the UP REDD and the PCPR is not given. So it is difficult to assess if relevant stakeholders are involved as the standard ask it.

- Clarify the institutional affiliation of the REDD Executive office in particular (as a "technically and financially independent organ", according to Annex 1a)

- Add an annex that clarifies relationship and the differences between UP REDD, PCPR and the REDD Executive Office (BER)

- Give a clear statement on the functioning of CIME as a policy and strategic level body. Clarify how the REDD+ steering unit (UP-REDD) and CIME will interact (type, periodicity, and involvement of the broader PCPR).

- Give more clarity on the composition of BER. Make a better distinction of the steering functions of each entity: the BER for operational lead, the PCPR for the validation (action plan, deliverables,..).

- While the rationale for a Readiness Trust Agency is sound, its desired characteristics and policy framework has not been provided. It would be helpful if more details on a suitable existing agency were given since it is proposed that an existing agency could be nominated to play the role.

- Assess if the budget provisions proposed for the functioning of CIME and PCPR is sufficient to guarantee adequate representation and input from both bodies in the REDD+ process

➔ **The standard 1a has been not fully met**

Standard 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders: Inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, assessed in the following ways:

   i.   the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far[3], the extent of ownership within government and REDD coordinating body, as well as in the broader national stakeholder community; and

the Consultation and Participation Plan included in the R-PP (which looks forward in time); and the inclusion of elements in the R-PP that adequately document the expressed concerns and recommendations of relevant stakeholders and propose a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

In the previous version of the R-PP, the TAP noted that the consultation and participation process was well described, but the TAP was unsure on the involvement of key civil society stakeholders in the process, e.g. local communities active in the decentralised management of (forest) resources, farmers' organisations, women associations. It was also noted by the TAP that regarding sub-national and local levels, the proposal focused more in "informing" as in creating spaces for a joint decision-making.

---

[3] Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) 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 Program Steering Committee).

The revised R-PP makes more reference to concerted decision making as a key element for succeeding any REDD+ strategy. It also clarified also the ownership of the REDD+ process and makes reference to the fact that the R-PP itself has been formulated based on a broader multi-stakeholder process.at both the national and the regional level. It is interesting to see clear mention of the input and suggestions of different stakeholders or groups in the process of the R-PP formulation, as for example in p. 19 and 21 in the English version.

Madagascar indicates that the consultation on the REDD strategy will take place in three steps (i) information, (2) consultation and (3) dissemination. The communication strategy to disseminate information will employ a variety of tools, including reliance of media such as television which is on the one hand a novel but on the other hand a questionable tools as many relevant local stakeholders for REDD do not have direct or regular access to media in general and electronic media in particular.

Madagascar is a huge country with relatively limited access to all forested regions that makes it difficult to organize true consultations of those stakeholders that are directly concerned with deforestation and forest degradation. Thus, the proposal to concentrate on a number of key regions and ecosystems is the most efficient way to achieve a satisfying level of consultation and implication of local people. However, there is a need for more carefully developing the mechanism in each region on how the relevant stakeholders will be mobilized. As outlined in Table 5, many expected actors to be consulted are coming from the informal sector; they are, in addition to the factor of remoteness, even more difficult to reach; how their real involvement could thus be assured? The TAP reflected on the capacity of the REDD Executive Office (BER) to carry out the consultation and participation plan under its single responsibility, as it is small and needs to implement many activities. Thus, the TAP invites to reflect on the possibility to include the Readiness Coordination Platform in a more formal and organized way in organizing this process in close cooperation with regional entities.

One TAP member noted the importance of consultation with the juridical sector because of the importance of recognized forest governance problems in Madagascar's hot spot areas of deforestation and forest degradation.

Certain incoherence is found in the document and its annexes in respect to the number of regions covered by the consultation process, the number of persons and interest groups consulted etc. What needs to be clearly stated is how the observations and suggestions of local stakeholders will be taken into account in the REDD+ process. E.g. Local level stakeholders have stressed in the consultation process the need of a compensation plan with income generating activities, in response to limited opportunities for slash and burn. This is central for REDD to be successful on the local level and should be more developed. The fact that many local people do not trust government agencies is also an aspect that should be duly taken into account in developing the REDD+ process and sufficient weight should be given to include local stakeholders and civil society in the process.

In summary, the stakeholder consultation for R-PP reached so far a sufficient range of REDD+ potential zones. An effort has been made to involve all stakeholders in R-PP consultation with appropriate approaches for each entity (institutions, NGOs, and communities). One stakeholder group, the private sector (timber, fuelwood, land-users) is underrepresented. Nonetheless, the process of the R-PP preparation is obviously carried out according to good practices for consultation and participation and the plan for the consultation of the Readiness Planning is clearly laid out. Results as up to date are judiciously presented and documented, with maps as description. The process planned for the consultation related to the REDD+ readiness arrangement includes the basic required steps and also conforms to the existing legislation in the country. **Additional suggestions:**

- Reflect on how PCPR members (in particular civil society) and regional level bodies could effectively help the consultations process (reaching those who are really involved in (poverty driven) deforestation and forest degradation) in order to support BER in the difficult task to reach the relevant local stakeholders.

- Reflect on the possibility to better integrate the private sector in the consultation process

➜ **The standard 1b has been met.**

Component 2. Prepare the REDD Strategy

Standard 2.a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance: A completed assessment is presented that identifies major land use trends, direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD, and major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues. It documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD. The assessment sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The recommendations made by the TAP in respect to this chapter have been largely addressed, in particular the spatial analysis on the causes of DD and the coverage to all types of forests. The chapter is clearly written and well presented, giving a thorough overview on the involved uses in respect to land use, forest policy and general forest sector governance issues. The analysis of policy successes and failures as linked with the causes of deforestation is adequate. The new version of R-PP presents a rough but sufficient analysis of the causes of DD by regions, ecosystems, and biomes. What got lost in the analysis, however, is the importance of socio-cultural behavior as a cause for DD in Madagascar[4]. The legal frameworks supporting the REDD+ are roughly described, especially the forest policy and the code of protected areas. References have been made to tenure issues and its policy trends (especially the new land policy and local tenure security rights) as well. A good understanding of the issues linked to the forest definition is initiated in this section and completed in the reference scenario section. In addition, there is a review provided of the past experiences related to DD attenuation. Finally, the success and factors matrix shows a good vision of the whole.

What still is missing to a certain extent is a clear description of actual (agricultural) land use and the reasons for the obvious decline in agricultural productivity. Fuelwood has been signalized as main problem of degradation, but the potential use of wood as a renewable resource is not mentioned in this context. Thus, there is a need to describe more in detail the stagnation in agricultural productivity and the causes that led to it, a more funded argumentation on the increase of population in the forest frontier and some clearer statements about the intensity of poverty in relation to deforestation and forest degradation.

The former TAP review pointed to the problem of land tenure (*tenure foncière*) and recommended to tackle this issue more in detail. Indeed, one of the core problems lies in the non-respect of the State tenure by the local population and the lack of land titles in general terms. There is not still sufficient mention on the rights of local people to access and possess land, nor is there mention of any traditional tenure rights (*droit coutumier*), that are linked to the recognition of actual land uses and often a main reason for dispute and conflicts. As the last TAP report pointed out, over 80% of the court cases in the country are related to land tenure which is unclear and simple customary rights often prevail.

The analysis of the governance issue is more complete than in the former version of the R-PP, and the comprehension of the concept is more comprehensive. The legal framework of the forests management is sufficiently described. However, the part related to the law enforcement does not sufficiently illustrates, neither

---

[4] Socio-cultural behaviour can also have positive spin, e.g. the role of sacred forests for protecting natural forests.

the reality nor the accuracy of the problems in this area. They are not only due to the lack of means (material and human) of the forest administration as mentioned in the R-PP. In 2010, the "authorized" timber wood exploitations, misconduct of the public authority and lack of law enforcement led the UNESCO to classify the Humid Forests of Madagascar among the World Heritage in peril. Studies focused on the timber rosewood trafficking are currently available (MBG, Global Witness, GTZ, MCD). Governance is actually one of the main issue for (production and protection) forest management in Madagascar, and will remain a challenge for the REDD+.

There is some inconsistency in numbers that should be corrected, e.g. forest allocation of 5.2 million ha for protected areas and 6.9m ha for production is inconsistent with total forest area of 9.72m ha, and planned allocation of 6m ha for protected areas and 3m ha for Kolo Ala (production forests). The deforestation rate of 0.8% per year from 1990-2000 is inconsistent with the 1.6 million ha of total deforestation presented afterwards.

Additional suggestions:
- Carefully address in the further analysis the recommendations made in the last TAP review, particularly the important aspect of access to land, land tenure and traditional land rights in relation to actual land uses, the lessons learnt from major forest sector initiatives implemented over the past 3 decades (what worked, what did not work and if so, why did it not work)
- Consider in the additional studies more in-depth the problems linked to the agriculture sector and forest governance.
- Broaden the governance analysis in the proposed studies and consider the integration of the recommendations made by the recent rosewood trafficking studies into REDD + strategy; and finally.

➔ **The standard 2a has been largely met.**

Standard 2.b: REDD strategy Options: Alignment of the proposed REDD strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies: the R-PP includes a summary of the emerging REDD strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD strategy options. This summary states:

    i. how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD strategy;

    ii. early estimates of cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental benefits;

    iii. socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD strategy;

    iv. major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD strategy; and

    v. risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits. The assessments included in the R-PP eventually should result in an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD strategy over time.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The TAP noted that this section has been completely reworked since the last R-PP draft. Existing knowledge in Madagascar has been evaluated, both on past experience in fighting DD and on more recent experiences in developing forest carbon projects and approaches, and this knowledge has been integrated in the REDD+ options. Considerable efforts have been made to bring down the REDD+ options from eight to three, as follows:

(1) Improve forest governance;

(2) Manage access to forest areas; and

(3) Reduce dependence on forest resources.

These strategic options adapted for REDD[+] retake to a certain extent those that have already been considered in the past in the PAE (*Plan d'Action Environnemental*). While there is good reasoning to work with such an adapted approach, it is hoped that the process will not end in a bureaucratic exercise, but in an overall largely accepted approach to effectively contribute to sustainable development at local level.

At a first glance, the restriction to three strategic options seems to be a logical and relatively simple approach, but the fact that there are in each option between 9 and 11 so-called intervention directions defined, implies that there is still wide array of interventions considered under the REDD+ strategy. The problem of complexity and an overloaded agenda in the REDD+ strategy that had already been observed in the TAP's review of the former Draft R-PP thus remains to a certain extent.

The 3 options presently proposed and their intervention directions are diverse, but they are, in the view of some TAP members, not logically structured yet. E.g. in some cases, it is not clear why an intervention direction is listed under a specific option. Under option 1, the main question is how to conduct the forest governance reform better this time than under the former Environmental Programme 3 (PAE3) of the World Bank, which addressed the same objectives. Option 2 seems to focus on regulatory (law enforcement) work, which has little chance to succeed in the actual political context and even might provoke local resistance. Option 3 focuses largely on general issues without really touching the central problem, slash and burn agriculture. What should be better expressed in the options is the fact that most of Madagascar's deforestation comes from slash and burn agriculture; to address this central issue in an adequate way, the villagers' needs and aspirations need to be sufficiently taken into account.

The present R-PP focuses on governance, policies, capacities, but the central key of success is how to bring on board local villagers is not sufficiently described.

Thus some TAP members recommend to consider restructuring the options, along the following lines:

- Option 1: Forest Governance and REDD Management: the objective is to install good basis for REDD
- Option 2: Strengthen sustainable modes of forest management: the objective is to create and show the legal and sustainable possibility of forest management, like zonage, Kolo Ala, SAPM, Management transfer, Non-timber forest products, Reforestation
- Option 3: Mitigate forest dependence, reinforce production outside Forests and create incentives: The objective is to create alternatives to deforestation and degradation, via sustainable agriculture, land tenure, afforestation and agroforestry, payments for environmental services …
- Option 4: Strengthen control and law enforcement

The TAP also observed that the current propositions are not very well consistent with what has been presented in section 2a. E.g. even with an improvement in governance in the forest sector there will be little changes in the forest conversion rate for agriculture. The same is valid for e.g. the restructuring of the timber industry which will have few impacts on improving governance in managing and using natural forests. Reducing forest dependency for forest dwellers livelihoods has probably only few chances to succeed if they are not addressed under as a main objective and with adequate approaches, means and tools. It would be also necessary to improve the interest of local communities in the maintenance of forest to satisfy their needs. One of the conditions to reach that point is the increase in the forest rent (revenue). This is also a direct concern of climate change mitigation as REDD+ deals with the maintenance and increase of forest carbon stocks.

The development of alternatives to deforestation and forest degradation is not mentioned as a REDD+ strategic option, whereas the public consultation on R-PP mentioned this need. In addition, the compensation related to forest access restriction (mentioned in the SESA section) refers to community development activities.

The details of the strategy options do not capture the complexity of the issues mentioned earlier in the R-PP. For example corruption is said to be a significant problem as well as the absence of intersectoral collaboration, but these issues are not mentioned under the governance option. Likewise in the access option, the problem of illegal mining is not addressed (p. 48-49). While the strategy options focus mainly at the local level while it seems clear that attention should also be devoted to the national level.

Recommendations:
- Carefully consider the recommendations made in the above assessment section. As the main causes of deforestation and forest degradation come primarily from the other sectors, the mainstreaming of REDD+ in the country's overall development framework should be considered as an important component of the REDD+ strategy.
- Reflect on the REDD+ strategy options, taking into account the following recommendations:
  - ✓ Emphasize on maintaining existing carbon stocks through protected areas management, the management of designated production forests and community forests;
  - ✓ Improve the forest governance and address all deforestation drivers, including mining (along the lines as described);
  - ✓ Develop alternatives to DD in particular for the hot spot areas: e.g. forest restoration based on community efforts, afforestation and reforestation; fuelwood management (production and consumption); valorization of secondary forest products; promotion of the ecotourism; support community development (through incomes from REDD+);
  - ✓ Promote REDD+ mainstreaming in national and local development plans: maintenance of forests in the local and regional development plans under consideration of the new incentives that will be created through REDD+, integration of the fight against the DD in the development plans of strategic sectors (especially mines, agriculture and roads), integration of the fight against the DD in the regional and national references.

➔ **The standard 2b has not been met.**

Standard 2.c: REDD implementation framework: Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD in the country setting that identifies key issues, explores potential arrangements to address them, and offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

In general terms, the key requirements for implementation and ensuring accountability are sufficiently described and the priorities for the readiness preparation are logical and relevant. Readiness for REDD-plus requires an efficient national institutional framework that is embedded in a larger national development strategy (which is carried not only by the State, but also by stakeholders from the civil society and private sector). The R-PP would still benefit addressing this issue, as recommended in the last TAP review. It is advised to establish clear responsibilities among the authorities participating in the REDD+ processes regarding coordination, MRV and implementation. This should also include provisions in respect to sub-national involvement by regional authorities and local stakeholders.

The implementation framework generally covers well the main issues in this field. The aspects related to the forest carbon rights and its link to land tenure issues and/or the forest management is well mentioned. The chapter on carbon rights remains somehow vague. It should be noted that in the current decentralized setup,

Regions and Municipalities should need to be closely consulted on the question of carbon rights, considering that forests are not a 'Strategic Resource', which are exclusively managed by the Central Government.

Current experiences in term of benefit sharing also are well described and there is a good analysis of management options of the carbon sales incomes. However, a better integration of the experiences made in the piloting REDD projects in Makira and of the FORECA project (besides Zahamena) could improve the quality of the proposal.

The implementation arrangements and governance framework for REDD+ as outlined in Figure 10 on page 58 is generally acceptable. Additional thoughts could be undertaken in respect to the scheme on how funding is leveraged to the various levels (now part of the Management Unit, technical and financial). The annexes are very useful, and rich in information and possible options (e.g. the various revenue distribution models) are presented.

Additional suggestions:
- There is still a need to describe on how the future REDD+ strategy will be embedded in the larger national development framework
- Reflect on the way how incentives will be transferred those who finally are responsible for the REDD+ implementation on the ground and, e.g. through a study, develop the pros and cons of the various options that exist (e.g. State-based organizations as in the case of the PAE or private independent institutions, etc.

➔ **The standard 2c is met.**

Standard 2.d: Assessment of social and environmental impacts: The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the Bank's safeguard policies, including methods to evaluate how to address those impacts via studies, consultations, and specific mitigation measures aimed at preventing or minimizing adverse effects.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

This section is well described and has taken into account the comments made by the TAP on the last Draft R-PP (e.g. linking SESA closer to the REDD+ strategy options, scaling down the budget, etc). The document closely refers to the World Bank's guidance for strategic environmental and social impact assessment and the specific safeguard policies.
A good comparison between the process of SESA defined by the Malagasy legislation and the safeguards procedures according to the operational guidelines of the World Bank (taken as reference at international level) is established. In addition, the link between the SESA and the definition of REDD+ is well described and the terms of reference of the SESA takes in account the essential aspects of issues and compensation obligations. The mechanism as described can bring necessary adjustments for the strategy and the whole process.

- No additional suggestions

➔ **The standard 2d has been met.**

Component 3. Develop a Reference Scenario

Standard 3 Reference scenario: Present work plan for how the reference scenario for deforestation, and for forest degradation (if desired), will be developed, including early ideas on feasibility of which methods to use (e.g., scenario of forest cover change and emissions based on historical trends in emissions and/or based on projections into

the future of historical trend data), major data requirements and capacity needs, and linkages to the monitoring system design.

(The FCPF recognizes that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The steps outlined in arriving at a reference scenario make logical sense and demonstrates a better understanding of the MRV component in the current version of the RPP than in the first. The R-PP presents a well-arranged set of steps that are required in the run-up to the development of a reference scenario. By going the first of those steps, Madagascar will be capable of creating the basis for a well established methodology.

There are five REDD pilot projects ongoing in Madagascar since several years (see also table in the Annexes of the R-PP) and valuable information can be obtained from them. Some of these projects have developed methodologies for carbon assessment (e.g. FORECA) that should be carefully evaluated in the further process of developing a reference scenario.

The initiative that led to a workshop in 2009 to identify methodological elements to be adopted at the national level is both positive and essential (p. 74). The R-PP further indicates that during the preparatory phase a single methodology will be adopted for any future project. This section of the R-PP is well documented and thoroughly elaborated. It is clear that the country will receive excellent technical support from the Carnegie Institution. The authors are knowledgeable about the different technical options available which suggest that the country will be in a good position to develop its reference scenario.

It is yet not clear which forest definition Madagascar will choose in the preliminary step. Madagascar proposes to adopt a definition of forest with 15 (?) or 20% cover which does not seem appropriate for all ecosystems in the country. While this might suit there spiny forest, 20% cover for the dense wet forest will mean that such forests are highly degraded. Efforts have to be done that such situations are well reported and do not go unnoticed. If forest degradation processes will be hold in account, it will be necessary to collect data on resilience and restoration processes in different forest types and determine the maximum/optimum carbon storage that such degraded ecosystems can reach over time.

Step 3 (modeling the future evolution of carbon stocks) is a very huge work specially in determining the relevant variables and equations in which they are involved. Historical causes may change and there is a lack of data to achieve trustful results in a short term. A way out might be to start with rough approximations and then, over time, using the monitoring activities to develop more trustful models. One TAP member stated that the PAE has managed in the recent past to reduce deforestation rates from 0.85 to 0.55% per year. This was achieved in an era of political stability and high government commitment to protect forests. Since then, Madagascar suffers from political unrest, which bare the risk that deforestation rates are increasing again. Thus, realistic goals need to be formulated when addressing future deforestation.

A number of detailed observations by TAP members on the reference scenario include:

- The issues of "Forest Definitions", is well addressed and the inclusion of eco-regions such as the Spiny Forests makes sense.
- An account of past attempts to estimate cover and carbon stocks has been provided and proposes to integrate existing projects (eg Environmental modeling and modeling land use changes) into the process of developing a reference scenario (this is useful and technically sound)
- On carbon pools, above-ground biomass seems to be the preferred pool; some TAP members questioned the decision on not to integrate soil carbon in the analysis.
- Proposes an interesting methodology (CLASlite) which seems to have the potential to detect both deforestation and degradation.

14

- The choice of variables (socio-economic, demographic, bio-physical and governance) is relevant and comprehensive.

The last TAP review made some detailed remarks on the capacity needs and proposed to undertake in an early stage of the R-PP implementation a thorough analysis of existing capacities/capacity gaps. An assessment of existing skills and expertise could help to estimate the needs for the concerned agencies e.g. regarding capacities for certain techniques and methodological issues (forest/carbon inventory, remote sensing techniques, comprehensive understanding of REDD and IPCC guidelines). Once that existing data and capacities are assessed, Madagascar needs to address how to overcome the identified gaps. The new version of the R-PP gives some more details on the capacity building needs and strategies and on how existing capacities can be strengthened. However, there is no information on how the required activities are managed and employed and what budget would be needed to undertake the proposed extended capacity-building proposals.

Additional suggestions:

- In respect to Remote Sensing, consider further assessing existing capacities/capacity gaps and specifying strategies of capacity building, and reflect on how existing capacities can be strengthened and how the required activities are managed and employed. Show clearly also in the budget how capacity building will be financed.
- On reference scenario modeling, reflect on the following suggestions:
    - Take in account re-growth processes in different degraded forest types and determine the carbon potentials of them
    - Reflect on the simplification of modeling future evolutions of carbon stocks at the R-PP stage
    - Consider making an explicit attempt to estimate below-ground biomass, segregated by eco-regions since carbon partitioning ratios (between above and below-ground) may differ.

➔ **The standard for component 3 has been met.**

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

Standard 4: Design a monitoring system: The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation. The system design should include early ideas on including capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor other benefits and impacts, for example rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD implementation in the country, and to assess the impacts of the REDD strategy in the forest sector.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD monitoring system with this full set of capabilities.

(The FCPF recognizes that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The section on MRV has been completely redrafted. Thus there is little value to refer back to the TAP's comments on the prior R-PP.

The section is much more improved than the first version and has interesting features or sub-components such

as: Monitoring emission factors and activity data, regional and local level monitoring (particularly of drivers) which will use existing monitoring tools such as Food Security and Rural Information Systems (SIRSA), ROR, Regional land planning schemes (SRAT), Environmental and Social Dashboards, SIMIRALENTA, STRAT, TBE and TBS. However some TAP members questioned the status of these instruments. Are they currently still used? Are they operational? Are their data updated? In annex 4a2 for example, the last TBS is dated 2003. Thus, some clarifications should be given in this regard.

In general terms, the proposed approaches for monitoring are in line with those presented under the reference scenario. In addition, some of the monitoring components are based on existing monitoring systems. However, if the use of Lidar is mentioned for the evaluation of carbon stocks in the reference scenario, only Landsat and VHR image processing will be used to monitor in the same time the deforestation and change in carbon stocks. Thus, there is some discrepancy in the methods/instruments used between the reference scenario and the monitoring approach.

The R-PP refers to Tier 3 accuracy but neither this section nor the previous one provide sufficient information to suggest that such level of precision will be achieved. The articulation between the three levels of monitoring, national, regional and local, is not perfectly clear although mention is made that the national database will be fed by the aggregation of regional data (p.83).

The use of a novel approach, the Dashboard, to monitor the causes of deforestation at the regional level is interesting. The willingness of Madagascar to develop MRV systems not only for carbon, but also for co-benefits, including governance, should be commended. It has been underlined by one of the TAP members that generally the requirements of the FCPF in respect to carbon monitoring are overly ambitious and it would be already an achievement to well monitor proxies at the level of carbon.

It should also be noted that in the view of most TAP members, the sub-section on capacity building is realistic and reassures that the MRV proposal has been well thought out. The Monitoring System proposed includes a wide array of possibilities, potential actors and data. In this respect, some TAP members observed that practically all past environmental projects have shown severe lacks in capacity of establishing even very simple but reliable data bases; therefore, they recommend that in the initial phase monitoring should be based on a minimum data set that can be sufficiently managed by local institutions and stakeholders. This approach would also help to designate clear hierarchic responsibilities and help to design a focused capacity building programme to include, over time, more parametes in the monitoring process.

One TAP observed that that a reference to the establishment of sampling plots for carbon measurement is missing. The national sampling plot system based on the current classification of forest cover should be proposed, which could eventually make use of existing monitoring system. Generally the TAP remarked that the reporting on carbon stocks is not sufficiently elaborated in the proposal.

Another TAP member proposed to integrate the (important) cultural dimension in the monitoring system and define cultural indicators to monitor behavioral change in respect to resource management.

Some TAP members mentioned that too many technical proposals have been made in respect to organizing the MRV, which risks resulting in a patchwork of different options which will be finally difficult to assess. The argument is that it would be an advantage to already indicate which of the technical options are the preferred one to be applied.

Finally, some more specific technical observations have been made by TAP members. E.g. it is proposed that REDD data should be systematically geo-referenced with GIS, overlapped with satellite images and visualized in maps to allow all stakeholders to interpret data and to take adequate decisions. In respect to the use of radar-images it has been noted that seasonal change in humidity interferes with rigidity-measures used to calculate forest volumes. Finally it has also been observed that data collection at community level is a good and laudable approach, but that the feasibility to do so is far from evident. Experiences from the past PAE program and the

FORECA project has shown that only very simple tasks can be handed over to local communities so far.

Additional suggestions:

- ▪ Reflect further on the potential of operationalizing some of the existing monitoring instruments for REDD+ monitoring
- ▪ Reflect on a stepwise approach in respect to the amount of parameter included and data collected.
- • Check consistency of approaches between reference scenario and MRV, e.g. in conformity to scenario reference methodology, the use of Lidar for control plots is necessary for the monitoring. .

➔ **The standard for component 4 has been largely met.**

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirement. The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD readiness, and identifies capacity building and financial resources needed to accomplish these activities. A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF, as well as from other international sources (e.g., UN-REDD or bilateral assistance) are summarized by year and by potential donor. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP, and is sufficient to meet the costs associated with REDD readiness activities identified in the R-PP, or gaps in funding are clearly noted.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

While in general terms, the total budget seems to be acceptable, there are some activities that seem to be overestimated, e.g. communication activities that could be combined in the process; the high costs for the assessment of past efforts and international experiences of DD; the total costs of historical analysis of deforestation is 456 k, but software and the Landsat satellite images are free, and the image processing of the whole forests under REDD+ can be done rather quickly with CLASlite.

The total costs in respect to the reference scenario are very high. E.g. it is envisaged to allocate 441 k for the development of allometric equations; however the R-PP mentions that new allometric equations are already developed elsewhere. The total estimated costs for capacity building is 534 k and two field surveys are proposed for carbon stocks measurements (for 318 k). Thus, there should be some room for reducing the actual allocation of nearly 2 million US$ to this component.

In addition, the budget is proposed by activities only. It would be useful to add a table in the budget chapter that indicates planned budget figures by source (for what it is spend, e.g. salaries, traveling, consultancy fees, equipment, office costs). It would also be important to indicate who the beneficiaries are.

The total budget of about 5 million US$ exceeds the provision of the FCPF. Madagascar should give clear indications on who will complement FCPF in funding the R-PP (e.g. which bilateral donors will be involved, which foundations, UN-REDD?, other sources).

The R-PP has been formulated with considerable support by international consultants. It is important that in the further process of the R-PP implementation, a broad group of interested parties from Madagascar, inside and outside the Government, will be integrated in the R-PP implementation to create the necessary ownership for REDD+ in the country. This will need considerable capacity building activities. The timeline proposed for the R-PP implementation to achieve readiness is very ambitious and it is questionable that it allows conducting the necessary capacity building as needed. Thus, it is recommended to seriously consider if the proposed timeline (until end of 2013) is sufficient to achieve readiness in Madagascar.

Additional suggestions:

- Revise the timeline of activities considering the overall ambitious goals to be met in a relative short time frame and the considerable capacity building needs that are necessary to build a broad ownership for REDD+ in Madagascar.
- Revise and consider scaling down budget figures proposed for some of the activities (see above)
- Give information that allows an appreciation of the budget by sources of expenditure and by type of beneficiaries
- Indicate (at least approximately) who else will be a funding partner of the R-PP besides FCPF, as the budget exceeds the funding provision of FCPF

➔ **The standard for component 5 has not been fully met**

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6: Adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The R-PP is well elaborated and easily allows defining the outcomes and deliverables to be achieved over the period of implementation of the R-PP. They can be easily framed into a monitoring table. While further procedures and processes to monitor the R-PP implementation can be developed, it current proposal is very ambitious and goes beyond the needs. Also, the budget seems to be on the upper limit.

Additional suggestions:
- Consider simplifying the proposed monitoring and evaluation framework.
➔ **The standard for component 6 has been met.**