

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, December 13, 2012, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)

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.

Review of R-PP of: Pakistan

Reviewer: Sean Richmond (UK)

Date of review: 28 November 2013

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

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:

Largely meets the standard

1. (1a.1) Please describe the chart that follows and provide more detail about how the bodies in the chart will interact.
2. (1a. 5) The functions of the National REDD+ Focal Point and NSC - it’s important that this body also has sufficient **convening and tasking** power to bring together relevant stakeholders.

In our (Indonesia) experience - parking REDD+ within a central body doesn’t work unless other ministries. We would recommend that the REDD+ Focal Point is fully mandated to convene and task other bodies of government. Senior levels signals of support & endorsement (e.g. PM attendance at openings etc.) will be critical to send the right message across government.

3. (Page 6) **Provincial REDD+ Management Committees** - What is the incentive for the provincial level REDD+ management committees to be active? How will their work-plans be defined and monitored? NGO membership also critical here.
4. (Page 7) **REDD+ Information Centre** - The IC should also seek to collect relevant planning data which could affect forest resources in future - e.g. data from mining, transport etc. It should not just stick to directly “forestry related” data - what is more helpful is if it can function as a source for data which will be relevant in the future.
5. (page 10) **Management Arrangements - governance options** - who has responsibility for making the final decision on which governance option will be selected?

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:

Feedback and redress mechanisms: as stated, existing mechanisms will need to be adapted to REDD+. However, do the existing mechanisms serve their intended purposes? Do users respect them and have confidence in them? Make sure that the current mechanisms function before

targeting them as the correct ones to adapt to REDD+.

Largely meets the standard

1. (1b.1, page 11) **Stakeholder mapping / analysis** - Surprised C&W (Communications & works) is not identified as a stakeholder given their responsibility for building / rebuilding much of the infrastructure that might open up forest areas and be damaged by extreme weather events. We suggest including them.
2. (Page 23) - **Capacity development**. Suggest all Provincial Forestry staff should have mandatory awareness training on the REDD+ plans - not sure who would fund this? Maybe an activity under this programme would be prepping the training materials with a view to identifying funding in future (either under government budgets or otherwise).

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) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and 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:

1. Largely meets the standard.
2. Agree with TAP no further comment.

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, 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

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).

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:

1. Meets the standard.
2. The paragraphs on drivers of deforestation and their severity by forest type on pages pg. 31 -3; although it is concise this could be made clearer by writing this information in tabular form, or by separating out the figures and referencing these specifically in the text.
 - a. This has been done well in Appendix V - and provides a very clear description of drivers by region. Perhaps this could be in the main body of the text or a paragraph inserted into the main body with a description of the table, reference could be made to the proposed pilot regions and how they relate to this table in section 2C3.
3. (Page 32, figures 2 and 3) could be improved by reordering the drivers to make it easier for comparison.
4. (Page 34) - Para on effects of deforestation - should also include the impact of increased soil erosion, landslides, and water run off on infrastructure, especially bridges and roads. We often find, for example, that bridges are damaged by trees and debris being washed downstream due to poor environmental management in the upstream area.
5. The data used in Forest Cover tables in section 2a.2 is very old, is there any more recent data (or at least should explain why the data set is so old).

Also, the figures in the table look to be incorrect for ha and % calculations. e.g. column 9: total change in ha between 1990 - 2000 = 2,527,000-2,116,000 = loss of 411,000 ha not 625,000. Why is column 9 in ha, and column 10 in %? It is important that these figures match those reported in section 2A5.

6. Section 2a.11. refers to "existing revenue distribution systems" that can be drawn on for REDD+ but doesn't provide any detail on what the existing systems are.

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:

1. Meets the standard.
2. Options are well set out.
3. Add Noragric to acronyms list (as noted).
4. (Page 40, para. 5) Important to add training / raising awareness in the judiciary on this issue and ensuring there is a clear legal framework in place against which to act, including prosecution if necessary - “no law provides for legal safeguards against over-exploitation of forests”.
5. Another primary root cause here is likely to be poor / unclear land tenure and enforcement of land rights. This needs to be looked at urgently as any measures for protection will fail if land tenure issues are not resolved.
6. **It is extraordinary that the draft National Forest Policy is still awaiting parliamentary approval**, in the face of an almost 25% decrease in forest resources nationally over a 15 year period from 1990 - 2005 (isn't there any more recent data?). I wonder also whether they should consider engaging with communities to generate a collective sense of management over forest resources - rule of law programmes in Pakistan often include components looking at Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanisms which allow issues to be resolved more quickly and locally. This might be relevant in some cases, but only if community leaders understand that the resources are something everyone should be seeking to protect.
7. (2b, Page 44) In the table - **proposed activities to address the causes of deforestation and degradation** - much of the focus is on analysis and better monitoring with little on empowering enforcement agencies beyond field forestry officers.
8. (2b.3 Page 48) As the TAP comments say, the risk analysis section is not currently drafted as risks. It should include: body is not able to convene / task other parts of government to engage in delivering this plan.

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:

1. Meets the standard
2. Has the Climate Change Division already expressed buy-in? Will the Forest Departments push back in any way?

3. (Page 51) Key steps - “Establishment of National REDD+ office *and notification of its formal mandate*” would be stronger.
4. (Page 52, 53) A very long list of **potential pilot areas** for the REDD+ strategy. How many of these will be selected in the end and how will this process be managed? How will own the final decision and what will it be based on? Will it be made at provincial or national level?
5. (Page 54 - Para 2c.6) **Role of national governments** - could really expand this paragraph and explain how Climate Change Division will bring together REDD work with wider work on resilience (currently not covered at all) and reducing emissions. Also clarify its convening and tasking powers.

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:

1. Pg. 58 there is no mention in this section on how appropriate stakeholders will be identified for feeding info into the ESMF.

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 modelling), 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:

1. Agree with comments of TAP on this section.

2. (Page 61) The data here is very old with no explanation as to why - this is needed.
3. The forest surveys required under the COP (Page 63, I. A) to depict the current situation can be quite resource intensive to obtain - is the forest department able to generate this data - if it hasn't generated this type of data for almost ten years, does it still have the technical capacity?
4. (3.1) Drivers of deforestation barely identified, not clear what the extent of their impact is and what their relative strength is.

Also not clear whether list of mentioned drivers is exhaustive (population growth and demand for forest products). Analysis could be more in depth e.g. why population growth is at the expense of forests (is it the need for space, increased demand for wood products, etc), why increasing demand for forest products (increased price of substitutes, domestic vs foreign demand, economic growth).

5. (3.2) In the list of information required on page 63 drivers of deforestation are not mentioned. I think the item listed under II C 2. Is very important and should be welcomed.

Would be great to see some sensitivity analysis around their different estimates depending on how drivers and policies are assumed to develop

6. (3.4) What does regular update of drivers mean? Needs a clear framework set out at the beginning on how changes will be incorporated.

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. It should also address 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:

1. Agree that the standard is partially met
2. Good breakdown of capacity building at different times and current capacities.
3. The R-PP demonstrates a good understanding of the process for forest monitoring and provides current status of forest monitoring capacity including the highlighting the data gaps.

However, the data on carbon stocks is not available on a national basis and the R-PP does not provide clarity on how this could be overcome.

4. Surprisingly, the R-PP does not indicate what satellite data is available and how it can be used. What capacity is there for interpretation and analysis this data?
5. The R-PP has no budget provisions for independent monitoring and review as listed in the TAP review.
6. Monitoring design should be stakeholder inclusive as required by the UNFCCC guiding principles, agree with TAP Review on this aspect.

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, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, 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:

1. Budgets seem low if the plan is to have one that allows for periodical on-going monitoring rather than just a study taking a snapshot of the system. Who will maintain it and pay for the maintenance? Will it be on core GoP budgets? Who owns the data in the MRV? Will it be transparently published / held online?

What is the system for ensuring that data is collected and uploaded in a coherent way, rather than being collected and owned by one government body, and only updated periodically?

2. How will systems be structured to encourage use by other government bodies? What about data on land ownership and land tenure - who holds that? Have they learned lessons on institutional frameworks from any of the other countries where attempts are being made to produce integrated MRV systems?

3. It's critical that NGOs, civil society and other stakeholders have access to the data and systems are in place to cross check it and challenge its accuracy. What are the plans for this? Some budget should be included to familiarise NGO and civil society and also media, with the systems implemented so they know how to engage constructively with them.
4. Many of these requirements are alluded to between pages 73 and 76, although budgets are very small for a national programme.
5. (Page 80) Conflict resolution - plan is "*availability of a conflict resolution mechanism at provincial and national level*". Suggest that conflict resolution mechanisms might be needed at a lower-than-provincial level -worth looking at alternative dispute resolution mechanisms here rather than focussing on formal administrative structures.
6. Page 82 confirms that monitoring will take place at provincial level highlighting that monitoring of MBICS is a new concept in Pakistan. Who will coordinate this at national level?

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 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:

1. Agree with all comments of the TAP.

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:

1. Agree with all comments of the TAP.