

TAP Review of the R-Package Submitted by Madagascar

Independent TAP-Expert Review on the Self-Assessment Process and R-Package - 10.09.2017¹

Content

Purpose of the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) expert review	2
Methods Applied for the TAP Expert Review	2
TAP Review Part A: Review of the Self-Assessment Process and the Documentation	2
Review of the results of the multi-stakeholder assessment	2
Facilitation by an independent facilitator	3
Participation, communication and information	3
TAP Review Part B: Summary of the REDD+ Processes - Strengths and Weaknesses of the R-Package	3
Self-assessment of the readiness process	4
Understanding of the REDD+ Readiness process	4
Respect of the FCPF R-Package Guidelines	4
Component 1: Readiness Organization and Consultation	5
Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation	6
Component 3: Reference Emission Levels/Reference Level (Criteria 26-28)	8
Component 4: Monitoring Systems for forests, and safeguards	9
TAP Review Part C: Summary Assessment and Recommendations to the PC	11
Objectives of Madagascar Self-Assessment report based on the R-Package achieved	11
Timeframe and progress of the Readiness process	11
Important issues still need to be addressed	11
Annex to the TAP Review: Assessment of the supporting document: « Note méthodologique pour l'auto-évaluation du Dossier Préparatoire à la REDD+ (R-Package) de Madagascar »	13
Processus participatif de l'auto-évaluation lors de l'élaboration du R-Package	13
Points positifs	13
Points négatifs	13
Qualité du processus	13
Points positifs	13
Points négatifs	14

¹ TAP Expert: Jürgen Blaser

Purpose of the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) expert review

The TAP review of the R-Package document “Readiness Package (R-Package) for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Madagascar” Version 3.1 (21.08.2017) assesses (i) the process of this self-assessment by the BNC REDD+ (National Coordination Bureau for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), (ii) the results from the multi-stakeholder assessment of the Readiness process in the country, and (iii) the remaining challenges in the Readiness process. The review thus focuses on determining whether a due process and approach was followed while performing the self-assessment, and provides constructive feedback to the REDD+ country and the FCPF Participants Committee.

Methods Applied for the TAP Expert Review

A simple methodology has been applied which consists of the following steps:

- Step A: Review of the self-assessment process of REDD+ Readiness based on the report of Madagascar² and the documents provided in preparation of the R-Package.
- Step B: Review of the results from the multi-stakeholder R-Package self-assessment process.
- Step C: Assess what still needs to be done to further develop the Readiness Process (additional work plan).

The assessment is based on the [FCPF Assessment Framework](#) and on the R-Package document provided by Madagascar, including the documents linked as outputs within. An assessment of further needed achievements is also part of the present task.

TAP Review Part A: Review of the Self-Assessment Process and the Documentation

This part of the TAP report provides feedback on the multistakeholder self-assessment report and outcomes, including the summary of the multi-stakeholder process and discussions (Chapter 4 of the Self-Assessment Report August 2017) and supportive documents.

Review of the results of the multi-stakeholder assessment

Chapter 4 of the R-Package report includes a short summarized report on the views of the various interested stakeholders in respect to the development of the national REDD+ strategy, as expressed in 13 regional workshops and a validation workshop held at national level on June 21-23, 2017. Table 1 of the R-Package report includes the main views of stakeholders, although it is difficult to distinguish at the level of qualitative assessment the views of specific stakeholder groups.

The TAP reviewed as an additional document the « *Note méthodologique pour l'auto-évaluation du Dossier Préparatoire à la REDD+ (R-Package) de Madagascar* » available in French and dated 20 April 2017. This report laid out the process of multi-stakeholder assessment. Annex 1 of this TAP report gives a short TAP assessment on the methodology applied.

² Republic of Madagascar (2017). *Readiness Package (R-Package) for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Madagascar. Version 3.21. June 28, revised August 21, 2017. Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Ecologie, de la Mer et des Forêts. Bureau National de Coordination REDD+ (BNC REDD+)*

The country delivered a stakeholder assessment regarding all criteria of all R-PP components (Chapter 4 and Annex 1 of the R-Package). This shows good knowledge about the achievements made during the Readiness process. However, not all subgroups have rated all criteria, but only the close concerned stakeholders. For example, the civil society group only rated 13 criteria of the 34 (which is partly justified in the methodological note). In the TAP's view what is missing for the time being is a short analysis of the discrepancies among the different subgroups on the various criteria assessed. Such analysis would have helped the process on defining strategic measures and better address some problematic issues for future implementation.

Except for the REDD+ strategic options (criteria 16 to 18), there are statements for all criteria on their strengths and weaknesses, on recommendations, and on propositions for actions (Table 2 p. 34 sqq). However, there is no clear indication of how and when the BNC REDD+ / the country intend to implement the measures defined in the Action Plan.

Facilitation by an independent facilitator

The process of the multi-stakeholder assessment seems to have been done in a way that ensured a reliable process. The BNC REDD+ entrusted an independent consultant agency for the multi-stakeholder consultation and assessment which ensured impartiality and methodological rigor of the process.

The required documentation was adapted to the background of the participants (e.g. translated in local language) and provided in advance.

The rating occurred after discussion on strengths and weaknesses and actions to take, which probably increased the accuracy of the rating.

The results of the rating are presented both in global and separated ways according to the stakeholders' groups, allowing a detailed assessment of the rating results.

Participation, communication and information

An active participation of the stakeholders occurred through consultations, the creation of a platform including the civil society and the private sector. However, the results of the stakeholder assessment show a lack of feedback (top-down) and of capacity building, as well as concerns from the stakeholders about the opportunities to further participate in the REDD+ implementation and about equity in the revenue sharing process (p. 33). This is reflected by the ratings, where none of the evaluation criteria are "green".

Nonetheless, in the TAP's view, despite the fact that most ratings are in "yellow" (good progress but more efforts required) the self-assessment process have been done with great care and in an inclusive way. Additional efforts are needed to maintain the high level of communication and participation effort which has been launched through the REDD+ readiness process in Madagascar.

TAP Review Part B: Summary of the REDD+ Processes - Strengths and Weaknesses of the R-Package

This part of the TAP review focuses on the self-assessment results; progress indicators (color scores) for the nine subcomponents, significant achievements and areas requiring further development related to

the corresponding 34 assessment criteria, and activities that address identified areas which require further work.

Self-assessment of the readiness process

The [mid-term progress report](#) (MTR) was delivered and accepted in September 2016. The proposed activities to be financed by the request for further funds should occur in 2017-2018. The R-Package document was delivered less than one year after presenting the MTR (in August 2017). As a result, many of the proposed activities in the MTR have only been partially realized at the moment of assessing the R-Package (if at all). A major capacity building effort is for example one of the important issues that currently is in progress. The self-assessment thus reflects only the present perception, which is prone to evolve substantially over the coming months or year. This need to be taken into account when assessing the R-Package at the current stage.

Understanding of the REDD+ Readiness process

The R-Package document provides evidence that good foundations are up and running (e.g. the REDD+ Platform and the full operationalization of BNC-REDD+). However, the results of the multi-stakeholder assessment, through the expectations of more information, feedback, and involvement, show that there is work to do regarding this issue. A key element for a successful implementation of a national REDD+ strategy is the ownership by all stakeholders. This has to be kept in mind when implementing the Action Plan for completing REDD+ readiness.

Respect of the FCPF R-Package Guidelines

The R-Package document is complete and fulfills the FCPF requirements, although some hyperlinks to important outputs are missing and could not have been assessed in the short time slot available for the TAP review.

- A summary of the readiness preparation process is provided, from the conceptual stage (p. 8) to concrete achievements within the R-PP components. Future achievements are also listed.
 - ➔ *the illustrations in the document are not always easily readable due to technical issues with the layout (see e.g. Fig. 3)*
- A description of the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process is provided (but see observations in part A of the TAP report)
- The results of the multi-stakeholders assessment are provided, however in a very short and concise form (p. 33).
 - ➔ *Check carefully the contents of the Action Plan and what still needs to be done based on the summary of the components of the R-PP*
- Generally, the needed links to most of the important outputs are provided, and they are functional.
 - ➔ *However, the link to the deforestation maps (p. 25) leads to a general Google search; an important link to the Safeguards Information System and to the national standards (+ indicators) is missing (p. 28). Also the TAP recommends providing a link to the emission reduction program (ER-Program in Eastern Madagascar).*

Component 1: Readiness Organization and Consultation

Sub-Component 1a: National REDD+ Management Arrangements (Criteria 1-6)

Institutional arrangements for REDD+ (criteria 1-5, Yellow). The REDD+ national coordination bureau (BNC REDD+) was created in Feb. 2014 based on a MEEF ministerial degree with the main tasks to implement the REDD+ readiness plan and to prepare the ER-Program for Eastern Madagascar in the framework of the Carbon Fund. Support organizations have been put in place, at national and regional levels (see Fig. 2). Arrangements at higher government level (“COFIL”) are being designed for the implementation of the National REDD+ strategy and planned regional REDD+ strategies.

→ The operationalization of some of the crucial bodies for implementing the national REDD+ strategy is still in preparation and important structures at regional/local level still need to be formed. Communication should be improved and responsibilities, at government level, clearly determined (functionality of COFIL yet not proven).

Also, the civil society is not yet fully organized in OCSs: in the short term, efforts should focus on facilitating the organization of all categories of the civil society into groups that can be reached and express themselves about the REDD+ issues through the SLC (Local Consultation Bodies). This would answer some of the weaknesses listed in Table 2 of the R-Package document and is part of the recommendations and actions for Criterion 1. The worries on risks for nepotism and corruption must be addressed by full transparency (e.g. concerning the budget) and by full independence of stakeholders (e.g. for the attribution of projects). Action bullet 3 for Criterion 2 (a guide for the roles of the stakeholders) and an efficient complaints management system (action bullets 2 & 3 on criterion 6) are steps toward the solution for these issues.

Mechanism for information feedback and grievance (criterion 6, yellow).

→ Again, the self-assessment points out some worries related to transparency, lack of communication, lack of participation of vulnerable stakeholders and lack of consideration of their feedback. Efforts should focus on finalizing an efficient complaints mechanism (Feedback and Grievance Redress FGRM) to handle these questions as soon as possible.

Sub-Component 1b: Consultation, participation and outreach / awareness (Criteria 7-10)

Inclusion of stakeholders through an extended consultation, information and participation process (criteria 7, 8 and 10, yellow). The participation of all categories of stakeholders is not fully ensured: key reference persons (focal points) should be identified to relay the information, both in the top-down and bottom-up way. The operationalization of the SLC (action 1 criterion 7) will also help.

→ It should be kept in mind that consultation is not sufficient: the REDD+ process is a participatory one: the representation and an efficient participation of all categories of stakeholders should be a priority. The actions proposed for criterion 7 and 8 seem insufficient in this regard. There might be a need for capacity building to involve the population and ensure a better participation (see weakness 2, criterion 8 on the quality of village consultations).

Criterion 10 (orange): Here again, the weaknesses point out the lack of top-down feedback. Consultations have been made, but not all attendees were informed afterwards. In the TAP’s view, maybe the development of a systematic communication framework including the actions identified on p. 16 of the R-Package document could address this problem. However, it is important to deliver the

information directly to the stakeholders, not only to make it available through means that perhaps they don't have access to on a regular basis (e.g. internet).

Information sharing and accessibility of information (criteria 9, yellow). The Self-Assessment process recognizes that a national communication plan (*Plan Intégré de communication*) ensures efficient information sharing as part of the communication strategy. It also points out that some important information has not been transmitted yet (see p. 14, e.g. on the carbon revenue sharing mechanism and the REDD+ complaints management mechanism), which can explain the worries expressed as weaknesses in the R-Package document. However, it seems that consequent efforts have been made on the awareness-raising regarding the REDD+ mechanism as a whole. These efforts should continue. The actions planned seem to address well this question. However, the communication on the highly important topics of benefit sharing, property rights, and rights of use has not reached its goal, and misunderstandings from the population could impair the REDD+ process (see criterion 14 and p. 42 of the self-assessment report).

→ In conclusion for Component 1, the communication toward and the participation of all stakeholders should be further improved. In the TAP's view, substantial efforts were made, and the country should continue on this pathway when further implementing the Action Plan.

Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation

Sub-Component 2a: Assessment of land use, land use change drivers, forest law, policy and governance (criteria 11-15, yellow)

Analysis of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. The R-Package document mentions that all necessary studies are now over and the results have been incorporated in the REDD+ preparation. However, the assessment points out that not all studies are completed yet (p. 40). It also mentions that some important ecosystems are not yet analyzed (dry forests and mangroves for example). Some important social studies seem necessary for the long-term success of the REDD+ strategy (causes and propositions for solutions on the bandit – Dahalo – phenomenon, migration and demographic growth). This is only partly taken into account in the action plan for criterion 11. A brief summary of the drivers of DD is provided p. 17, but the main challenges to address these factors are not mentioned. In the TAP's view, the assessment of this issue (criterion 12) is not fully complete: it receives a moderately good grade (yellow) by the stakeholders, but no weaknesses are mentioned, no recommendations are made and there is no action plan. When reviewing the Action plan, BNC-REDD+ should reflect if there is any need of further action here. This seems to reflect in the criterion 13, where the analysis of the pitfalls and opportunities for the various REDD+ programs are not sufficiently identified.

→ NB: please provide a link directly to the report of the study on drivers of DD (p. 17).

Natural resources rights, land tenure, governance and implications for forest laws and policies. According to the R-Package document, the related studies have been undertaken and results allowed refining the REDD+ strategic options. Some important tools were created, such as a National Development Plan and a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment, but some are still not yet operational, e.g. the national forest policy (POLFOR) and the new forest code. The issues of land tenure, resource use and property rights, are not clearly stated yet (p. 19). However, the self-assessment does mention them as part of the future action plan (see strength bullet 1 of criterion 14 p. 42). Moreover, the communication on these important topics has not reached its goal, and misunderstandings from the population could impair the REDD+ process.

→ A brief summary of the results of the analyses of the studies on property and governance issues is missing. Only few challenges are identified and the TAP could imagine that this analysis is yet not complete.

Sub-Component 2b: REDD+ Strategy options (criteria 16-18, yellow)

The REDD+ strategy of Madagascar is underway. Four preliminary strategic options of the REDD+ strategy have been selected through a continuous dialogue with stakeholders. The options have been based on sectoral guidelines developed over the past decade.

BNC-REDD+ coordination role for REDD+ strategy options. The self-assessment process refers to the important role of BNC-REDD to coordinate national REDD+ programmes from various donors and institutions, as well as its effort to develop a monitoring/evaluation framework using strategic indicators. Thus, BNC-REDD defined a work programme to ensure that REDD+ actions proposed by the various promoters are beneficial, feasible and cost-effective, and that they fit into the context of the country's national development framework.

→ According to the R-Package document, the four strategic options have been selected for implementation of REDD+ and they take into account the results of the several consultations. They are not prioritized and the sub-measures are not listed, which makes it difficult to assess them in a more detailed way. The self-assessment doesn't provide any input on strengths and weaknesses, nor recommendations and actions to take, thus in the TAP's view, it does not provide yet the justification of the "yellow rating". However, the R-Package document states on p. 19 that the SESA and the consultation constitute the basis for the refined strategic options, and that an evaluation of the economic and financial aspects has been undertaken. Unfortunately, there are no further details on the results of these analyses. In the understanding of the TAP, the impacts on the actual policies have not been assessed yet, but here some discussions have been launched (see p. 19-20 of the R-Package report).

Sub-Component 2c: Implementation Framework (criteria 19-22, yellow)

Adoption and implementation of legislation/regulations (criteria 19 and 20). Madagascar is currently finalizing some important legislative processes, as mentioned before (POLFOR and the new forest code). A conceptual framework for the ER-Program is ready (see p. 20) and provides an overview of the institutions in charge, but not implemented yet. A clear definition of the pitfalls and barriers to an effective implementation is not provided in the document and should be done. Some actions could be foreseen before the finalization of the POLFOR and the Forest Code to ensure an immediate implementation in the field by competent and qualified staff.

Benefit sharing mechanism (criteria 21). The carbon right mechanism, including financing and benefit sharing, has yet not been finalized (ongoing study), but the conceptual broad lines provided in the R-Package document reflect on some basic and important safeguards (fair, inclusive, etc.). A detailed assessment in the context of the TAP review would require additional information, and materials such as draft documents. Discussions on the final mechanism should involve all parties (financing bodies, potential investors, "carbon providers") in order to propose and then ensure suitable technical means, methods, criteria for allocation, etc. Lots of work remains to fulfill the requirements of benefit sharing. Attention should be given to the participation and acceptance of all. An external and independent

supervision/rolling assessment of the mechanism, once effective, may ensure the required, and sought for, transparency.

National REDD+ registry and system monitoring REDD+ activities (criteria 22, orange). The process to develop a register and a monitoring of the REDD+ activities just began and is in its design phase.

Sub-Component 2d: Social and Environmental Impacts (criteria 23-25, yellow)

Analysis of social and environmental safeguard issues. The SESA process and ESMF (*Cadre de Gestion Environnementale et Sociale*)³ aim at creating a sustainable institutional structure that ensures effective management of social and environmental issues beyond the Readiness phase. The SESA process has been comprehensively implemented in a participatory way. Its input was integrated in the strategic options until the REDD+ activities. It determined the impacts of the REDD+, prioritized environmental and social issues and provided recommendations to address them. The final SESA report is not yet finalized, but 3 intermediary documents are linked.

→ Additional actions could include measures to conduct a continuous SESA (monitoring process), since issues will rise during the technical implementation of measures and activities.

REDD+ strategy design with respect to impacts. The R-Package document mentions an assessment of the strategic options with regard to the environmental aspects but not in regards to social aspects. It might be a simple omission in the document – it shouldn't be an omission in the REDD+ process. As stated before, the SESA recommendations served to refining the REDD+ strategic options. However, the safeguard information system is not finalized yet. Also, the self-assessment points out some worries about behavioral changes as an impact of the REDD+ mechanism, which should be further investigated by the SESA.

Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). The ESMF is currently in preparation, as well as the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), and the Process Framework (PF) (see p. 23). Its design should answer the concerns about prospecting of behavioral issues mentioned above.

→ The TAP recommends that the action plan for this criterion 25 could include measure(s) to address the weakness bullet 3 (p. 46), maybe in systematically involving a referee in the discussion. This person could dispatch feedback from stakeholders afterwards and keep the process flexible enough so that feedback can be considered.

Component 3: Reference Emission Levels/Reference Level (Criteria 26-28)

Methodological basis for the establishment of Reference Level developed (Criterion 26, yellow). The carbon assessment was concluded for the Eastern humid forests in 2016, and in 2017 for the western dry and semi-dry forests; the assessment for spiny forests and mangroves are planned for 2018 and are part of the Action Plan. The FREL of Madagascar was technically assessed (TA) by the UNFCCC in early 2017; Madagascar submitted to the UNFCCC a reviewed FREL document in late May 2017 for a

³ The ESMF sets out the principles, rules, guidelines, and procedures to assess potential environmental and social impacts and risks, and contains measures to reduce, mitigate, and/or offset adverse environmental and social impacts and enhance positive impacts and opportunities of said projects, activities, or policies/regulations.

second TA. The national FREL will be constantly improved based on new data and new methodologies available.

→ The Action Plan needs to consider improving FREL with the outstanding data (which is underway).

Use of historical data, adjusted for national circumstances (Criterion 27, yellow). As laid out in the R-Package document (page 25), Madagascar has a considerable package of knowledge and interactive maps on disposal to track historic and present level and hot spots of deforestation. Work is progressing by updating the national deforestation data with the 2016 inventory. Additional studies are underway on forest degradation as well as on allometric equations and biomass factors for secondary forest formations.

Technical feasibility of methodological approach and UNFCCC compliance (Criterion 28, yellow). According to the R-Package document, the FREL used the UNFCCC, IPCC and FCPF guidelines as a basis. The methodology is a calculation of forest losses and gains to estimate the variation in the carbon stock. The remaining work is, as proposed in the R-Package to further improve the FREL.

→ Overall the TAP notes that the methodological issues relating to FREL have not been commented and rated by many stakeholders, including VOI, CSO, PFR and ministries present in the validation workshops.

Component 4: Monitoring Systems for forests, and safeguards

Sub-Component 4a: National forest monitoring system (criteria 29-31, yellow)

Proposed monitoring approach (Criterion 29). The national forest monitoring system (*Système national de Surveillance des Forêts*, SNSF) is based on a forest surveillance system (NFMS): satellite monitoring, combined with a national forest inventory (currently in phase 2 of 3 of implementation), and a national greenhouse gas inventory (reporting system, which still needs to be clearly structured for operationalization, see p. 26).

→ The TAP recommends that stakeholders are well informed on applied monitoring approaches (e.g. through capacity building sessions)

Demonstration of application (Criterion 30). The process of establishment of the Geomatics lab is well described; it is a main pillar in the implementation of the national forest monitoring system. However, the TAP is not able at this stage to review the proposed procedure to identify leakage and other impacts of the REDD+ activities since information is lacking. The inclusion of all stakeholders in the elaboration of the conceptual system needs to be further described. However, provisions are made in the action plan to address this issue (e.g. through a technical working group).

→ Proposal in the Action Plan of a forest tracking system in ER-Program areas with stakeholders

Institutional arrangements and capacities (Criterion 31). SNSF yet not functional, but provisional steps have been taken to allocate space and human resources in the newly constructed offices of the BNC-REDD+.

→ The conceptual framework for the data management and rules of use/sharing has been elaborated in a participatory manner. A number of additional work elements is listed in the Action plan.

Sub-Component 4b: Information system for multiple benefits, other impacts, governance, and safeguards (criteria 32-34, yellow)

Identification of relevant non-carbon aspects, and social and environmental issues (criteria 32) Non-carbon aspects and, social and environmental safeguard issues of REDD+ preparations have been identified in the SESA process, and while defining national social standards. Non-carbon aspects yet not taken sufficiently into account in the design of the national REDD+ strategy, especially the identification of alternatives to current practices that cause DD.

→ In the TAP's view non-carbon benefits are particularly important in the framework of the implementation of a national REDD+ strategy, in particular the important factor of livelihoods (extreme rural poverty as a DD driver and the extraordinary biodiversity in the few remaining intact landscape of the country).

Monitoring, reporting and information sharing (criteria 33).

The system for monitoring, reporting, and sharing information relating to non-carbon aspects is currently in preparation, but no conceptual technical framework is detailed in the R-Package document, except for the dissemination of the information (see p. 29). The indicators for the monitoring have been identified as part of the safeguards information system (SIS); although a link to the latter is not done in the document; participation and transparency criteria however have been clearly referenced.

Institutional arrangements and capacities (criteria 34). The concept of these arrangements seems to be well defined, according to the strengths reported in the self-assessment, but it is not yet implemented. The need for capacity building is taken into account.

TAP Review Part C: Summary Assessment and Recommendations to the PC

Objectives of Madagascar Self-Assessment report based on the R-Package achieved

Based on the documents consulted, as well as additional web and e-mail consultations and the review of the first draft of the ER-Program, the TAP reviewer concludes that **the enumerated accomplishments described in the Madagascar Self-Assessment report and based on the R-Package have been effectively achieved**. Also, the proposed work programme for consolidation of the Readiness phase in an Action Plan is well prepared and potentially will lead to full accomplishment of REDD+ Readiness within a reasonable time frame (2018/2019). In spite of the complex and diverse enabling conditions in the country, Madagascar has already reached a high level of preparation for REDD+ in September 2017.

Timeframe and progress of the Readiness process

The progress of the country in the Readiness process is well detailed for each component of the [Readiness Preparation Proposal](#) (R-PP). However, there is often no timeline specified for the future achievements to be done. Also, the progress on the drafting of the REDD+ National Strategy is neither clear, nor enough underlined. This needs to be further specified in the review of the Action Plan.

Important issues still need to be addressed

Madagascar has made considerable progress in its REDD+ readiness. As assessed by the stakeholders, a number of activities still need to be conducted to consolidate the Readiness phase, which can be implemented in a reasonable time frame and in parallel to the preparation of the ER-Program:

- Table 2 in the R-Package participatory review process (Chapter 4) gives a synoptic overview of the remaining work to be done in the REDD+ Readiness Phase between November 2017 and December 2019. This table should be completed by a more specified work programme with clear budget allocations, timeline and responsibilities for the remaining tasks in Readiness that will be conducted in parallel and in support to the ER-PD programme preparation. The comprehensive Action Plan should become an integrated annex of the R-Package review.
- There are some elements that need to be further clarified in the process of preparing the ER-PD. Some of these issues that have arisen in the Readiness phase will continue to be important in the further development of REDD+ as a GHG mitigation scheme, including, *inter alia*:
 - a. Further information sharing on the experiences in the ER-Program area and with associated REDD+ projects in other provinces in the country;
 - b. Continuous policy dialogue at the level of national government and law makers to consolidate the REDD+ approach and to create the enabling conditions for a national REDD+ Program;
 - c. Conclude the national RL and introduce a national MRV system based on the current achievements;
 - d. National REDD+ registry, benefit sharing and FGRM
 - e. Harmonization with future ER-Programs beyond the Carbon Fund (submission underway), particularly with the Green Climate Fund (already approved proposal GoM and CI) and other potential programs.

Five regions in the Eastern humid part of Madagascar have been chosen for initial investment approaches and for a jurisdictional ER-Program. The region includes two large-scale VCS projects (CAZ and Makira) and will also soon be (partly) subject of a GCF project with REDD+ elements. As REDD+ is a national approach, it is important to synergistically improve the knowledge and information base of REDD+ forest management and land use in all regions and through a stepwise approach. The overall aim is to develop a shared strategic vision between REDD+ and sustainable forest and land management that takes into account the overall framework condition for natural resources management, *inter alia*, institutions and their governance; law enforcement; fight against illegal practices; access rights to land and natural resources; civil society inclusion; constructive dialogue between all stakeholders.

In the view of the TAP expert, it will be important to *continuously strengthen the governance structure of the national REDD+ process*. The ambition is to anchor the REDD+ process at the highest political level possible, or at least to get sufficient support to the MEEF to address the huge problem of deforestation and forest degradation in the country with the necessary convening power to ensure lasting results. As the self-assessment process has highlighted, the national and regional platforms have become real drivers in the Readiness process and could play a pivotal role in the future. Whatever the final proposal for a REDD+ governance structure will be, the current institutional situation does not suffice for a full implementation of a national REDD+ strategy.

Annex to the TAP Review: Assessment of the supporting document: « Note méthodologique pour l’auto-évaluation du Dossier Préparatoire à la REDD+ (R-Package) de Madagascar »

Processus participatif de l’auto-évaluation lors de l’élaboration du R-Package

Points positifs

- Le processus est participatif : les principaux acteurs au niveau du gouvernement ont eu la possibilité de collaborer à l’élaboration du R-Package ; les autres parties prenantes (société civile, secteur privé, etc.) ont aussi pu participer à l’élaboration du R-Package.
- Les moyens participatifs semblent avoir été appropriés : le document et les échanges sur le document ont eu lieu via les plateformes mises en place pour assurer la participation efficiente de tous au cours de la réalisation du R-PP (site internet du BNC-REDD+ et du MEEF, ainsi que les autres plateformes ou regroupements des parties prenantes à la REDD+).
- Les catégories des parties prenantes ont été adressées individuellement, ce qui suppose un processus adapté à chacune d’entre elles et assure en théorie de meilleurs résultats en termes de participation et de feedbacks.
- La présence souhaitée des représentants des parties prenantes, c’est-à-dire les membres de la Plateforme Nationale REDD+, aux réunions de consultation et à l’atelier de validation du R-Package, auquel participent également 2 autres participants des réunions, est aussi garant d’une bonne participation, assurant en théorie le relai des opinions de chaque catégorie de parties prenantes.

Points négatifs

- Il est fait mention de réunions de consultation (paragraphe 1.1 p.4), ce qui ne laisse pas entendre le degré de participation souhaité.
- On peut déplorer le délai trop court entre l’information aux parties prenantes (8-12 mai 2017) et la date limite de réponse (fin mai 2017).
- Il n’est pas fait mention de mesures particulières pour atteindre les parties prenantes à la base, qui ne peuvent se déplacer aux réunions de consultations, ni des moyens par lesquels leur voix est relayée.

Qualité du processus

Points positifs

- Le R-Package a été élaboré avec l’appui d’une consultante externe
- Les consultations sur l’auto-évaluation se sont basées sur les critères d’évaluation préconisés par le CFPF. Ces critères sont rapportés en annexe du document, avec mention des catégories grossières des parties prenantes qui les ont évalués.
- Les résultats des réunions de consultation sont intégrés au draft du R-Package et validés lors de l’atelier de validation.

Points négatifs

- Bien qu'il soit évident que toutes les parties prenantes n'ont pas forcément le niveau d'information et de connaissance adéquat dans tous les domaines évalués, on peut déplorer que tous les critères n'aient pas été évalués par toutes les parties prenantes. Par exemple, le critère numéro 1 sur la responsabilité et la transparence n'a pas bénéficié du regard externe aux administrations : on ne connaît pas l'avis de la société civile sur ce point. De plus, le processus de sélection (quelle catégorie de parties prenantes évalue quels critères) n'est pas indiqué.