

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, April 20, 2012, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

- 1) *FCPF REDD Country Participant R-PPs will be reviewed and assessed by the FCPF Participants Committee, the FCPF's governing body, taking TAP comments into account. External (Technical Advisory Panel or other) and Bank reviewers may provide recommendations on how a draft R-PP could be enhanced, using this template on a pilot basis until a process is approved by the PC.*
- 2) *One set of criteria should be used for review: specific standards each of the current 6 components of an R-PP should be met.*
- 3) *Your comments will be merged with other reviewer comments (without individual attribution) into a synthesis document that will be made public, in general, so bear this in mind when commenting.*
- 4) *Please provide thoughtful, fair assessment of the draft R-PP, in the form of actionable recommendations for the potential enhancement of the R-PP by the submitting country. A REDD Country Participant would be allowed three submissions of an R-PP to the PC for consideration.*

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.

Synthesis Review of R-PP of (fill in country name): Pakistan

Reviewer (fill in): Sajidin Hussain and Jayant Sathaye co-leading five tap experts

Date of review (fill in): 10 Nov. 2013

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Overview and TAP General Comments:

This Second TAP Review focused on Pakistan Second revised R-PP submission (8 November 2013) that was submitted in November. It was designed to address the TAP First Review comments. The submitted draft addressed almost all the comments on each of the components with only a few minor items that need some attention. The text and inclusion of tables and figures in the overall document is now significantly improved. It is much easier now to read and understand the text.

Please re-check the acronym NORAD spelled as "North American Aerospace Defense Command". It must be in relationship to Norwegian development funding mentioned on page 69.

Also read through the final draft carefully to avoid typos.

Components 2, 3, and 4 reached the Met criteria while Components 1a, 1b, 1c, 5 and 6 would benefit by addressing a few small but relevant points. The table below shows whether each sub-component meets R-PP standard.

Components	R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 16, Geneva – First Review (October 2013)	R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 16, Geneva – Second Review (Nov-2013)	
<i>1a</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Largely Met</i>	
<i>1b</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	
<i>1c</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	
<i>2a</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Met</i>	
<i>2b</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Met</i>	
<i>2c</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>	
<i>2d</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>	
<i>3</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Met</i>	
<i>4a</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Met</i>	
<i>4b</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Met</i>	
<i>5</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	
<i>6</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	

First TAP Review (October 2013):

Background:

Pakistan submitted a second draft R-PP in September, 2013 for consideration at PC 16 (March 2014). TAP Team consisting of seven members reviewed the draft R-PP. Members submitted their drafts that were assembled to establish a synthesized review on 7-10 October, 2013, which is reported below with a summary of the issues that were described for each component.

Overview:

Major Strengths of the RPP:

Seven TAP reviewers have studied this version and their general impression is as follows:

1. The current version of the R-PP is quite well written and the ideas are presented in a comprehensive manner and the content under each component and respective sub-component have responded to the terms of reference set out in the R-PP Template. However, there are substantial repetitions in various sections (especially components 1 and 2) that may be removed to improve flows in the document.
2. The executive summary has provided a concise overview of the entire R-PP, in which the types of consultations and information sharing during the preparation of the R-PP are highlighted, as is a summary of the key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and associated strategy options.
3. It is evident from the R-PP that the rate of deforestation still needs to be further analyzed during the implementation of the R-PP and will certainly be needed in the construction of reference levels. In addition more systematic and precise data on carbon stocks in the chosen pools and forest definitions are required.
4. The proposed MRV system, including a system for monitoring of multiple benefits and safeguards seem sufficient, even though experience in the aspect of safeguards is still limited. What is unfortunate is that Pakistan does not have a long history of forest resource mapping and other forms of assessment, which it hope to build upon.
5. The proposed SESA and EIA frameworks are relevant and generally demonstrate an admirable understanding of the subject matter. However, there is very little work done on this topic and is going to require considerable inputs from various staff and local communities.
6. The reviewers have concluded that Components 1b, 1c, 2c and 2d largely meet the standard while all the other Components would require more work and therefore partially meet the standards.

Key Recommendations:

Despite the general positive observations there are still some items and issues that need to be addressed in order to meet the standards set for them. These are noted below, and their inclusion would assist in meeting each component standard.

1. Pakistan's natural forests have been declining for all the reasons mentioned. What evidence is there for the political will that will change this trend in the context of R-PP implementation? Under sub-component 1a, Cabinet level interaction and participation is critical for successful operation of REDD+ programs since sources of D&D are often promoted by non-forestry ministries such as agriculture, mining, land use, power sector, etc. Some of these are not included in Annex 1.

2. A number of workshops have taken place with concerned stakeholders. Since those were the initial activities, community participation from grass roots level might have not been possible. Similarly user groups of women seem to have been left out. But at least a process had been initiated that will smoothly merge in the upcoming phase and catalyze into meaningful participation of all identifiable stakeholders in future.
3. An important element would be to provide information about the goals for accomplishment of GoP plans each year from 2014 to 2017 with their funded activities. It would be helpful to describe this in each Component Activities and Budget Summary Table. Each Table should also indicate how the government and FCPF funds are to be used for the listed activities.
4. Capacity building is an important topic for every component with particular needs in Components 1b, 4a, 4b and 6. Other components will also need this support particularly in 2d and 3.
5. In Component 5, please revise Table 5 and include this Table – Schedule and Budget R-PP Template Version 6. It would report on each sub-component costs for four years from 2013 to 2106 and a total amount. It should also include the total costs for each of the six Components.
6. Though a minor comment, the list of acronyms needs updating. Also if possible avoid repetitions especially in Components 1 and 2.

B. TAP Recommendations and questions that focus broadly on the R-P presentation are noted under each Sub-component. It has two items – Key Recommendations and Additional Recommendations. Key items refer to the important comments that will require more effort to address the requested changes. Additional items are simpler comments that may be addressed with less effort.

C. The TAP assessment of the standards for each section is summarized in the table below

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. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process, and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

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

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. Following items require a bit more work to address them.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Point 1 – When would the list of proposed members be provided? In time for the Geneva presentation?
2. Please include your response to Point 2 in Component 1a. The chart is not portrayed well, coordination mechanisms are not clear in the chart and not discussed in the text.

Component 1a largely meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

The 1a text provides good information about the progress made by Pakistan since 2012 in organizing a National Steering Committee and Provincial Coordination Committees. These undertake several activities to initiate evaluate and support various REDD+ activities. Each also supports additional working groups.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The composition of NSC is too large and needs to be balanced with lesser members from the Climate Change Division and more members from cross sectors e.g., development sectors such as energy, land use, mining, tourism etc. Reviewers also noted that the committee does not have any representative from forest owners/users and representation has not been given to forest industry stakeholders.
2. The organizational chart on page 4 portrays a Top-down command structure. Feed-back loop or mechanisms is not forthcoming, especially recommended is to depict Federal and provincial interaction mechanisms.
3. The Prime Minister's Task Force on Climate Change was constituted for policy governance on climate change impacts. How the REDD+ process would benefit from this Taskforce, may be briefly described in R-PP.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Annexure III says of proposed composition of Provincial REDD+ management committees. There is no list of the members to judge who would be in these provincial committees. Similarly members of the working groups may be defined.
2. The proposal does not seem to provide information about how NSC members and those of the Provincial REDD+ management committees would be engaged for detailed discussion particularly in cases where the subsidized activities such as for agriculture may have to be offset to reduce deforestation and degradation (D&D). It would be useful to provide more information about this process.
3. Table 1a is currently on page 7 but it should be placed on page 10 at the end of Sub-component 1a. It should also separate the activities that will be funded by FCPF and those that will be funded by Government of Pakistan.
4. An important element would be to provide information about the accomplishment of GoP plans each year from 2014 to 2017 with their funded activities. It would be helpful to describe this before Table 1a.

Component 1a partially meets the standard.**Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:**

The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus, and commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The campaign's major objective is to establish an early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process that sets the stage for the later consultation process during the implementation of the R-PP work plan. This effort needs to reach out, to the extent feasible at this stage, to networks and representatives of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers and forest dependent communities, both at national and local level. The R-PP contains evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that a reasonable amount of time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD-plus including the SESA.

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

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. Following items require a bit more work to address them.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Points 3, 4 and 7 were not addressed but set aside for future compliance. These seem appropriate. It is important though to include them in the R-PP Sub-component 1b.
2. Point 5 has not been sufficiently addressed. Number of participants has been included in the table. Please also include the list of workshop participants in the annex to get a sense of composition and type of the participants.
3. Also, Point 8 is addressed but it is not reflected in Component 1b text. Please do that.

Component 1b largely meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

Awareness raising and sensitization towards the concept of REDD+ has become the government's priority since 2009. It has conducted many workshops annually through 2013. For example in 2012, selected ten districts across Pakistan were identified based on the forest types they are located in, hence covering regions with different forest types from Coastal mangroves to the dry temperate forests in Chitral and Gilgit-Baltistan. Based on the feedbacks from the series of workshops held at national, provincial and district levels detailed presentation sessions were held for developing Pakistan's REDD+ Readiness Roadmap and Readiness Preparation Proposals (R-PP).

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. In R-PP, there is a recognition of the importance of dealing with gender issues, but may need to provide concrete plans on gender issues and women involvement in REDD+ consultation process.
2. The reviewers recommend that REDD+ consultation and participation programs should "piggy-back" on and integrate as far as possible with, those of other ongoing national and donor-funded natural resource projects to avoid huge task of consultation fatigue. It would be useful to identify those initiatives and listed in R-PP for building the synergies prior to implementation phase.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

3. The R-PP document mentions that the government has carried out a detailed stakeholder analysis and defined and identified 16 key stakeholder groups. Some of the government departments have been lumped together and ranked 4 (indicating negative interest). This may not be true for all the departments. Local communities have also been ranked 4. It appears that the process of consultation was limited in scope and coverage which needs to be re-assessed in future studies and ranked accordingly.
4. Based on the above stakeholder analysis, 1b.8 Key Lessons noted that non-forestry departments and government bodies have limited interest in REDD+. This is probably

reflective of the fact that they have not yet been constructively included in the process. Please effectively engage these folks in your NSC, PCC and future consultation process to take ownership in REDD+ and interest.

5. Would be useful to provide information about the number of persons of particular types who participated in the 10 workshops listed on page 15.
6. Reference is made in 1b.4 to existing grievance redress mechanisms – one question will be whether any changes need to be made in these existing mechanisms if they are to be applicable for REDD+ policy. Also some salient points of the ‘Existing feedback and grievance redress mechanisms’ should be known and included in R-PP which are covered under the referred laws that could create an idea of preparation and baseline.
7. The reviewers recommend (optional recommendation) that in view of the fact that Pakistan has large land area, culturally and topographically diverse, with a relatively small and dispersed forest cover, consultation, participation and management implementation will have to be prioritized and carried out sequentially. The reviewers suggest that priorities by land cover type and provinces may be prioritized for REDD+ phased interventions based on some criteria e.g., those under D&D pressure or are endangered; they represent good opportunities for and have the potential for carbon capture/storage; and they have significant resource values (sustainable wood and NTFP production, watershed protection, biodiversity conservation).
8. At the moment there seems to be no practicable approach to engage transhumant graziers in dialogue, but their participation in some way is important. There had been some attempts by other organizations/NGOs to conduct studies and engage grazers in dialogue which could be looked into for insight and further expanded.
9. Table 1b provides very impressive list of consultations, capacity building, planned activities etc. It would be very useful to provide information about how the almost equal FCPF and government funds would be allocated to the yearly activities. Please include this information on Table 1d.

Component 1b largely meets the standard.

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) and concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a

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).

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:

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. Following items require a bit more work to address them.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. Point 1 (main comment) has been addressed only through a generic statement under 1c1. What is the basis of the statement should be briefly elaborated under this section.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

2. Please include the response to Point 2 (under additional comments) in the R-PP sub-component 1C.4.
3. The Point 3 noted for future compliance is not clear. Please explain it and include it in the Sub-component.

Component 1c largely meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

During the R-PP formulation phase the consultation process was confined to three levels i.e. district, provincial and national. During R-PP implementation phase the consultation will be extended to the grass root level in selected pilot sites. The earlier consultation process couldn't cover the gender concerns though already recognized by the Govt. of Pakistan. However, special attention is to be given to cover grass-root level consultations including gender concerns during the R-PP implementation phase.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The component needs a brief synthesis on the level of ownership the R-PP has generated in Pakistan and whether there are any dissenting opinion and the reasons for that.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Table 1c provides a limited list of coordination committees and consultations. It would be very useful to provide information about how the almost equal FCPF and government funds would be allocated to the yearly activities. Please include this information on Table 1c.
2. Also, please explain the goals that will be targeted to accomplish and the challenges for reaching the goals in each year.
3. For broader dissemination of information and getting prompt feedback, the development of REDD+ specific portal is a good suggestion. Funds required for the purpose have been perhaps included under 1b budget. If not these may please be incorporated under 1c budget.

Component 1c largely meets the standard.

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy**Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:**

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and 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:***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. No further work is needed on the TAP comments in this sub-component.

Component 2a meets the standard.***First TAP Review (26 September 2013):***

Section 2a provides a very complete information about the causes of deforestation and forest degradation in Pakistan include illegal logging mostly for firewood, fodder and timber, population pressures, demand and consumption of products, land use change and natural or manmade hazards (page 31), and also about severity of direct drivers and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, but not much mention has been made of climate change which could be a potential future driver and thus may be briefly explained. The country has two main categories of forests, i.e., state owned and private. During the last two decades the country suffered a 25% reduction in forest cover, and indeed the R-PP program promises to provide a very nice way to reduce this reduction rate.

There are several major relevant knowledge gaps that would need to be addressed during the R-PP implementation. For instance, the existing government institutional setups lack coordination and in some cases there is duplication of efforts. Local community based organizations (CBOs) though present in most parts of the country, their maturity and capacities are still a question mark. In general forestry laws and rules are mostly for administrative than technical management of forests. No law provides for legal safeguards against over-exploitation of forests.

While many such challenges are described in the 2a text, it also points to a few strong activities that have yielded some benefits. Pakistan sets a new world record in 2013 by planting 750,000 mangrove saplings at Thatta, in a little over 12 hours. This is the highest number of saplings planted within a day in the world.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The Table 2a has listed a number of follow up studies that would help to generate information about five key topics such as value chain of forest products, update analysis of DD, demand

and supply of forest products, assessment of drivers' contribution to overall emissions. It would be useful to study land tenure and natural resource rights as this issue is very critical for indigenous peoples and local communities.

2. On legal aspect, which data would be used as a framework in implementing REDD+ readiness as this recognizes role of communities in managing and use of natural resource in a sustainable manner. This will help narrowing the gaps between communities and the state on forest management rights.
3. R-PP gives a forest cover of 5.2% or 4,180,500 ha (though the table on page 36 gives a conflicting figure of 3,609,000 ha), whereas other references provide a range of estimates from a high of 4.8% to a low of 2.4%. FAO (2005) figures on forest cover are 4.3%. Which one to use as a baseline, must be clearly stated. This discrepancy shall be resolved. Accurate clarification of the extent of forest cover by major forest types will be essential also to developing REDD+ strategies and establishing forest REL/RLs and a forest monitoring program
4. There are confusing statements in the R-PP document regarding forest policies in the provinces. In sub-section 2a.6 it is stated that all provinces have forest policies except Baluchistan, while in sub-para of 2a.7 it is stated that except in PK province there is no forest policy in other provinces. Which statement is correct? It is a proven fact that none of the policy initiative or the policy in itself can be successful and effective without a legal basis/supporting laws.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. While it is encouraging that Pakistan has predicted or used another foreign analysis about forest cover loss in the past. It would be useful to collect data to conduct such analysis annually.
2. Section 2a.7 provides an excellent analysis of the major relevant knowledge gaps that have played a role in deforestation and degradation. The key barriers noted in 2a.14 are critical to note, but there is no discussion of how adoption of REDD+ will help overcome those barriers.
3. In the table on page 46 (sub-section 2.b.1) there is a mention of rubber plantation which must be some misprint to look at.
4. A modest budget has been provided in table 2a. This needs to be adjusted or slightly enhanced to accommodate study on land tenure system and synthesizing lessons learnt from various projects implemented with support of federal government or undertaken by the provinces in the past 30 years or so.

Component 2a provided considerable information about land use change but would benefit from additional inputs suggested above. The standard is thus partially met.

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD-plus strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and a summary of the emerging REDD-plus strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD-plus strategy options. This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy; consideration of environmental and social issues; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD-plus strategy; and a plan of how to assess the 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-plus strategy over time.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. No further work is needed on the TAP comments in this sub-component.

Component 2b meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

This section is a good preparation particularly on a preliminary set of strategies in addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation identified in the table. The reviewers found the options for a REDD+ architecture developed by the Norwegian REDD Center Noragric as very relevant for their conditions, and they intend to place these for wider consultation and during the readiness preparation phase. They plan to put forth for discussion and agreement on any one or a combination for implementation in Pakistan This was used as a basis for drafting the 2b document.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. Section 2b.3 (page 48) is somewhat confusing because the identified "risks" appear to be more like desired outcomes. This needs to be revisited. A risk assessment might look at what the risks to the project would be if those desired outcomes were not realized, but that isn't included here. Social and environmental risks analysis of domestic leakages of GHG benefits and how these could be minimized (such as land use/ ownership rights, vested interests, climatic risk that may hinder the achievements of the project outcomes) could have been briefly indicated as risks which may be further elaborated in the already proposed study for risk assessment.
2. The budget given in table 2b needs to be realigned with the activities and sub-activities tabulated in pages 44-47 of the document as very important activities have been missed out from the budget.
3. CO2 emissions due to land use change and other woody biomass stock (section 2a3 page 36) is a sub-title in R-PP but missed out describing this sub-section. It would be good to provide the estimates of carbon stocks and depletion rates in line with the change in forest and land

use trends.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Four strategy options are provided to create a REDD+ regime in the country, and it is left for future consultations to determine the most feasible option. However, it may be useful to provide at least some background analysis and implications of the proposed options, to get a sense of the tradeoffs involved in these options.
2. Need to include under proposed activities to address causes of deforestation and forest degradation (table on page 44) some activities to address climate change related concerns e.g., assessment, adaptation, awareness.
3. The R-PP document refers to a Cost-Benefit Analysis. It may also consider including benefits in terms of biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects. Please include this in the text on page 48.

Component 2b provided considerable information about various activities but would benefit from additional input as mentioned above. The standard is thus partially met.

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.

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

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. No further work is needed on the TAP comments in this sub-component.

Component 2c meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

Very promising array of ideas is recommended in this category. The proposal has given substantial clear detail and discussion to meet the R-PP standard and convinced enough for a well development

of Implementation Framework for R-PP. This section is well described in particular on key instruments used for REDD+ implementation - institutional arrangements, financial arrangements and regulatory framework. In addition, it also addressed key activities to be undertaken in the readiness phase such as benefit sharing, and capacity building with concrete ideas on how to implement it based on existing knowledge and experiences. These are designed to use current ongoing schemes and then check their performance in the REDD+ program to decide the ones that would be best to implement at the end of the R-PP program.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. While there is discussion of land use no explicit attention is provided to land tenure. It is an important topic that is addressed in Component 2a. It should also be addressed in this component.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Pakistan Forest Institute does not appear in the list given in sub-section 2c.5. This may be considered including keeping in view that is the lead national institution.

Component 2c provided considerable information about various activities. The standard is thus largely met.

Standard 2.d: Social and Environmental Impacts during Readiness Preparation and REDD-plus Implementation:

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence in the form of an assessment of environmental and social risks and impacts as part of the SESA process. It also provides a description of safeguard issues that are relevant to the country's readiness preparation efforts. For FCPF countries, a simple work plan is presented for conducting the SESA process, cross referencing other components of the R-PP as appropriate, and for preparing the ESMF.

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

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. No further work is needed on the TAP comments in this sub-component.

Component 2d meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

The information provided is quite complete and the ToR captures all the major activities that need to be undertaken to establish a process for conducting social and environmental impact studies.

Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) will do and continue to assess social and environmental impacts. The ESMF is merely an instrument to map all impacts, manage them in an informed manner, and avoid the most unwanted impacts; It intends to capture both negative and positive benefits. It intends to review the guidelines of environmental impact assessment developed

by Pakistan Environmental Protection Agency and guidelines for social and environmental impact assessment developed by the NGO Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund (PPAF).

Section 2d.2 provides guidelines for a ToR listed in Annex XI. The ToR notes that the social and environmental impact assessment would comply with the World Bank's safeguard policies. It does plan to include principles deriving from existing rules and delegations of Pakistan.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The Table 2d. Indicates the SEIA, printing and workshops. There is no information in Table 2d. about workshops that will consume \$40K; 60% of the budget. Who will be engaged in the workshops from which Pakistan states? What topics will be covered and what will be the main goal?

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

2. R-PP states that PPAF has said to have developed a framework (ESMF) for physical activities that will be reviewed and upgraded in the context of REDD+ during the readiness phase is a sensible proposition, rather than reinventing the wheel. Some explanation is required to show how the existing ESMF is linked closely to REDD+.
3. The reviewers recommend that in addition to periodic carbon monitoring, the socio-economic conditions may also be monitored with relation to the baseline.

Component 2d largely meets the standard.

Component 3. Develop a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level

Standard 3: a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level:

Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (monitoring system design).

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)

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

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. Following items require a bit more work to address them.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Point 2 – Please make the 3.8 Work Plan chart's capacity building dates consistent with the revised ones in Table 3.

Component 3 meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

In 1992, the total area of natural forests was 3.59 million ha (4.1% of the country's total area), which had shrunk in 2001 to 3.29 million ha (3.8%). This assessment includes only those contiguous forest areas which can be detected from satellite data. Very thin forests and isolated trees on natural landscapes were covered separately under field-based surveys and are reflected in farmland forests. However, many other organizations reported both higher and lower deforestation rates.

Forest cover per capita is declining due to increase in human population as well as deforestation. However, at the same time the tree cover on farmlands has increased significantly. All provinces except Sindh registered a positive trend in farm forestry.

The demand for forest products far exceeds the current level of sustainable domestic supplies. Thus, there is a gap of 29.36 million m³ in demand and supply, which is being met mainly by overexploiting the forest resources and partly through import of paper products and timber. The key challenge, however, is high demand of wood for fuel. Currently, the management approach focuses on extraction of resources with almost no management input and investment in production.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The Government of Pakistan and Azad Jammu and Kashmir both may accept the RELs, RLs, baselines and projections. No reference (emission) levels will be developed for AJK, Why is AJK left out?
2. Work Plan (3.8) shows capacity building occurring in 2016 2nd half until through 2017. Why is it being delayed? Capacity is intended for calculation skills, remote sensing and ground truthing. This training would be useful to initiate earlier in 2014 than in 2016. This is particularly important since there is little or no capacity for RELs/RLs.
3. There are no funds allocated for capacity building in Table 3. Please include it and allocate funds.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Table 1 shows the total no. of trees, standing volume, volume and tree density. Have any data been estimated about the carbon content of the trees?
2. Carbon pools included in the RELs and RLs will initially be limited to above-ground biomass. They are supposed to collect five data sources, above and below ground biomass, soil, litter and two more. At a minimum, data should be collected for the first three options that constitute bulk of the carbon content of the forest areas. Please provide an approach for doing this work. Component 4a data collection may support this also.

Component 3 standard is partially met.

Component 4. Design Systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards

Standard 4a: National Forest Monitoring System:

The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD-plus 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. The R-PP should also address the potential for independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize 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:

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. No further work is needed on the TAP comments in this sub-component.

Component 4a meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

Like Component 3 this section presents a technically reasonable design. The R-PP points out the current status of forest monitoring and includes shortcomings regarding data. Existing monitoring methods and standards vary across the related agencies, data on carbon stocks is not available on a national basis although can be derived from data with a different focus than carbon.

Information collection, analysis and reporting are aimed for at Tier 2 for the most dynamic carbon pools for each forest type, with a progression in future years towards Tier 3 for selected areas, conditions, and pools. The only greenhouse gas considered will be CO₂, except where other gases are relevant such as in coastal and (methane) in wetlands.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. There is little or no information about shortcomings related to lack of methodology. What kind of methodologies would be developed and established to collect 4a data? Please include this in the text.
2. As in the case of Component 3, it would be useful to initiate capacity building in 2014 rather than in 2016. Some more detail on exactly what capacity is needed to carry out this program would be helpful. Enhanced capacity building on information collection, management and analysis, including quality control and reporting, will be necessary.

3. The R-PP has not provided any budget provision for independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal is also silent on workable ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities, other than providing a list of capacity needs. Please provide the aforementioned information in the text.
4. The component is vague about who is to be consulted in generating data. Would be useful to ensure that participants include forest resource users at the community level, forest group members, women and indigenous groups. Monitoring design should thus be rethought to increase the level of people's participation in data collection and evaluation.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. It would be useful to know exactly what satellite data is available and what will be used. Please include this information.
2. The budget seems low for what needs to be done, and it should be related to the MRV discussion and budget for Component 2c.

Component 4a standard is partially met.

Standard 4b: Designing an Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards :

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, rural livelihoods enhancement, conservation of biodiversity, and/or key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

(The FCPF and UN-REDD recognize 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:

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. No further work is needed on the TAP comments in this sub-component.

Component 4b meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

This section is designed to focus on multiple benefits that may be derived from reduced environmental emissions and other impacts, governance and safeguards. Monitoring of MBIGS, however, is a novel concept for Pakistan. While there are various institutional processes that have a bearing on MBIGS none of these are specific to the requirements for MBIGS monitoring for the

National REDD+ Program. The entire forest statistical system needs to be carefully reviewed; including clear identification of data needs and gaps and forest boundary demarcations using modern techniques like remote sensing and GIS.

The proposed Standard 4a text focuses on a national consultation process to establish MBIGS, development of the monitoring system, future institutional arrangements, safeguard information systems, and capacity building. For 8 out of 10 described major elements no formal monitoring systems exist.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The total budget allocated for this project is \$62K of which \$30K is for capacity building. It seems like a very limited budget to undertake activities that have never been conducted in Pakistan. It is not clear how 10 different current and projected features and a capacity for MBIGS monitoring could be accomplished. Please explain this and if possible allocate more funds for this activity.
2. As regards socio-economic impacts, it has already been proposed to conduct a baseline study and impacts verified periodically. Concerns of women folk as users must be addressed and safeguards provided to as a separate group. Their quantity and quality should be monitored by developing appropriate indicators.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Biodiversity conservation should be included in the MRV system which will be measured and mapped by remote sensing techniques. Flood control and reduced water pollution should be incorporated in the REDD+ pilot activities that would engage indigenous peoples and local communities. .
2. The proposal states that “participation will be on a rotation basis” (4b.5. p82), the meaning of this statement is unclear and requires further clarification.
3. A uniform format needs to be developed for SIS on which the provinces report to the national level and for further communication to the UNFCCC.

Component 4b: Noting these deficiencies, 4b standard is partially met.

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD-plus 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 and/or UN-REDD, as well as from other international sources (e.g., 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-plus readiness activities identified in the R-PP. Any gaps in funding, or sources of funding, are clearly noted.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. Following items require a bit more work to address them.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. Point 3 was not addressed. It is important to include it in the R-PP Component 5. (New template version 6 is attached if not readily available)

Component 5 largely meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

Schedule and budget in this section is well presented in matrix. It's also clear on how much budget is needed and the source for implementation of the proposed activities.

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The total funding sought from all sources is US\$ 4,189,000 with \$3.4 million from FCPF, \$109,000 from UN-REDD and \$688,000 from Pakistan National Govt. The activities could be expanded by increasing the provided funding. Component 4b would be one topic that could use these higher funds.
2. Budget Table 2d costing activities for Social and Environmental Impacts has a line item for consultative workshops. It would be useful to break the cost of these workshops down into those involving provincial offices, those for local line agencies and those for local-level consultations with CBOs.
3. In Component 5, please include this Table – Schedule and Budget R-PP Template Version 6. It would report on each sub-component costs for four year 2014 to 2017 and a total amount. It should also include an item about the total costs for each of the six Components.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

4. Also, if possible, please indicate which activities would be supported by each of the three funds – FCPF, UN-REDD and Pakistan Government. This information could be placed in schedule and budget in each table reported in Component 5, and also placed in each component.
5. An amount of US\$ 410,000 has been provided for technical support as appearing in table 1a. At least half of it may be utilized for expatriate experts as elaborated in sub-section 1.b.
6. The budget for component 1a seems disproportionally high, and the budget for component 4a seems low. These numbers should be checked and adjusted as necessary.

Component 5: Noting this deficiency, the standard is partially met

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6:

The R-PP 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:

Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. Following items require a bit more work to address them.

Additional Recommendations and Questions:

1. Point 3 was not properly addressed. It should refer to each of the Components 1 through 4 and not numbers like 1.1.1 etc.

Component 6 largely meets the standard.

First TAP Review (26 September 2013):

The document provides useful and relatively complete information on most of the Components. It provides good description of major activities with clear indicators

Main Recommendations and Questions:

1. The program monitoring and evaluation framework would benefit by presentation in a log frame format. For example, this was adopted by Thailand in its submission to FCPF and it could serve as an example for Pakistan to implement.
2. The monitoring framework provides no apparent measure of quality, indicating the effectiveness of project performance. The proposed monitoring framework should be re-examined and the indicators revised to include measurements to include evaluations of program quality in addition to the quantity measurements currently presented.
3. There is no information in the first Sub-comp.no. column. This is needed to increase understanding of the activities.

Component 6: Noting this deficiency, the standard is partially met