

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism  
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**  
(interim, January 10, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

***Objectives of a Readiness Preparation Proposal***

*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 Nicaragua**

**Reviewers: Tomas Schlicter, David Kaimowitz, and four anonymous reviewers**

**Date of review: June, 2011**

**Summary**

**Note: Nicaragua submitted an informal R-PP draft in January 2011, and the TAP reviewed it. However, Nicaragua withdrew the R-PP in March and the TAP synthesis review was not posted on the FCPF website, nor was the draft R-PP presented at PC 8.**

Nicaragua continues to experience rapid forest clearing for livestock and crops, particularly in the agricultural frontier regions of its two autonomous regions in the Caribbean Coast (RAAN and RAAS). It also has problems with illegal logging, forest fires, and forest loss due to hurricanes and pests.

The majority of remaining compact forest is in Indigenous Territories in the RAAN and RAAS. Non-indigenous farmers within those territories are responsible for most recent deforestation. Nicaragua has made major advances in demarcating and titling the territories and establishing territorial authorities, but this has yet to quell illegal migration into those areas.

Factors driving forest loss include: insecure land rights; agricultural and trade policies that promote cattle ranching, lack of incentives to maintain forest, road building near forests, weak capacity (and will) to regulate forest clearing and use, and widespread poverty. They have given a momentum to the expansion of the agricultural frontier that will be difficult to overcome. The government has made efforts to improve forest governance, control forest fires, and promote reforestation and community forestry, but so far these have failed to curtail forest loss.

Nicaragua is fortunate to have a wealth of data about forest cover and quality, including a recent National Forest Inventory. This will be useful for Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) and

preparing reference scenarios.

This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the Nicaragua R-PP that the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) has reviewed. The latest drafts have improved markedly. They have a wealth of information and adequately address many TAP concerns about earlier drafts. They do a better job of explaining the magnitude and causes of deforestation and current government policies, have more robust proposals related to institutional arrangements, consultation, strategy options, reference scenarios, and budgets. Their discussion of Indigenous Peoples issues and Nicaragua's two autonomous regions also improved.

Compared to the earlier versions of the R-PP we reviewed, our assessment of the budget options standard has gone from not met to met, strategy options has gone from not met to partially met, stakeholder participation and reference level standards have gone from partially met to fully met. The previous version had no section on Monitoring and Evaluation. This standard has now been met.

In other cases the government acknowledges the R-PP does not meet the FCPF's standards, but says that is due to lack of funds. In those instances the government suggests that the work be carried out after the FCPF has approved the R-PP and provided funding. The TAP cannot address that issue, since it does not have a mandate to determining which standards must be met before the R-PP is approved, only whether the drafts it reviews meet those standards.

The R-PP correctly points to Nicaragua's recent advances in regional autonomy in the RAAN and the RAAS and indigenous land rights there; and emphasizes the need to involve the regional governments in decision-making about REDD+ and to adapt the training, consultation, MRV, and other REDD+ activities to the specific needs, conditions, and collective rights of the autonomous regions and their Indigenous Peoples. This is one of its most positive aspects.

Strictly speaking, Nicaragua uses the term REDD only to refer to the financial mechanisms that form part of its National Avoided Deforestation Strategy (ENDE). However, for purposes of our comments we have adopted the more general FCPF terminology, and have used the term REDD to cover all aspects of the ENDE.

The TAP has identified four major areas where it feels that the current version of the R-PP still requires significant work:

- 1) **Ensuring all government agencies that must contribute for REDD Readiness to succeed are committed to it and feel full ownership.** This arguably includes the Secretary of the Presidency, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAGFOR), Ministry of Environment, National Forestry Institute (INAFOR), the regional governments of the RAAN and the RAAS, the judicial system, the Army and the Police, and others, as well as the Ministry of Environment (MARENA). Without the full participation of other government agencies it seems unlikely that Nicaragua could achieve REDD Readiness. MARENA itself has limited resources and capacity and lacks a mandate to make decisions about most of the relevant policies.

The draft has many positive statements about involving these other agencies at both the policy and technical levels and it mentions that there will be a high level Working Group on Avoided Deforestation and Reducing Forest Degradation. Nevertheless, the initial practice has been weak in this regard, the draft addresses this issue in multiple places in the text and says something slightly different in each one, and leaves key aspects overly ambiguous, such as how decisions will be made and how responsibilities and budgets will be divided.

- 2) **Explaining what new additional measures the government plans to take to reduce the expansion of ranching and basic grain production on the agricultural frontier, or at least give a clearer sense of how and when those measures will be formulated.** Given the powerful dynamism of the forces promoting forest clearing it seems quite unlikely that

Nicaragua could reverse that process without new additional measures.

The current draft does not present such measures. It says that the ENDE will largely be implemented through existing forestry, agricultural, and environmental programs, but makes no clear argument for how that will limit the advance of the agricultural frontier. It briefly mention relevant options, such as efforts to clarify property rights in Indigenous Territories, incentive payments for maintaining forest, and promoting agricultural intensification and silvopastoral systems, but does not develop them.

- 3) **Making the document clearer.** There is material about many of the main topics the draft covers scattered throughout the text. For example, there are three major separate discussions in the text of the available data about the magnitude of land use change in recent decades in different parts of the text. Multiple sections discuss current government policies relevant for REDD. The same goes for the proposed institutional arrangements for implementing the REDD+ readiness activities and other topics. This has resulted in a lot of repetition and minor inconsistencies, and made the text harder to follow.

**The TAP’s main recommendations for improving the R-PP are:**

- 1) Clearly specify the composition of the policy-making group that will make the main decisions about REDD Readiness and how it will function and the practical responsibilities and budgets that will be allocated to each of the government agencies involved in the R-PP’s implementations.
- 2) Explain the process through which Nicaragua will design the necessary additional measures to improve forest cover and quality, give an initial sense of what they may consist of, and explain how the proposed pilot REDD activities, the changes in agricultural policies mentioned in the text, and the development of new financial incentives for REDD+ might relate to that.
- 3) Reorganize the text so that each major topic is only covered in one single location and the descriptions of the context are clearly divided from the presentation of proposed institutional arrangements and activities. Add standardized numeration for the text and the various tables, boxes, and figures.

The discussion below of each of the individual criteria also includes additional recommendations; many of which provide specific examples of these five main recommendations, or additional ways that the R-PP might be improved.

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements.	Partially met
Standard 1b: Information sharing and early dialogue	Partially met
Standard 1c: Stakeholder Participation and Consultation	Met
Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance	Partially met
Standard 2b: REDD strategy options	Partially met
Standard 2c: REDD Implementation Framework	Partially met
Standard 2d: Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment	Not met
Standard 3: Reference levels	Met
Standard 4a: Monitoring system: emissions and removals	Partially met
Standard 4b: Monitoring system: multiple benefits, impacts, and governance	Partially met
Standard 5: Budgets: Completeness of information and resource requirements	Met
Standard 6: Monitoring and evaluation framework (optional)	Met

## Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

*(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5:)*

### 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.

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

##### Assessment:

**The Standard element: "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:"**

The draft R-PP frames the proposal in the broader context of Nicaragua's development and environment policies, and the need to alleviate poverty, and devotes substantial attention to issues related to Indigenous Peoples. The proposal considers REDD to be the financial mechanisms of the National Avoided Deforestation Strategy (ENDE). The ENDE will be implemented through national programs such as the National Forestry Program, which, in turn, form part of broader sectoral strategies (e.g. PRORURAL Incluyente), and ultimately of general national strategies (e.g. PDHN).

It proposes a three tier institutional mechanism for the design and implementation of the REDD+ Readiness Process, in which the first tier makes policy decisions, the second tier provides technical input, and the third tier provide opportunities for comments and suggestions from a wide range of stakeholders. This approach makes sense.

The Secretary of the Presidency and heads of the Ministry of Environment (MARENA), Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAGFOR), National Forestry Institute (INAFOR), the Army, the National Territorial Institute (INETER), and the governments of the two autonomous regions (RAAN and RAAS) are all supposed to participate in making policy decisions.

The draft is much less clear about how those policy decisions will be made, what other entities will participate, and how the REDD policy body will relate to the government's national "Production Cabinet", pre-existing National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR) or the steering committee of the PRORURAL Incluyente Program. There are a number of subtle, but important differences, in the institutional arrangements presented in the lists of committee members (p. 3-5), cuadro 1 P. 40-41), figura 4 (p. 42), the diagram in 1c3 (p. 54), and the discussion in 2b8 and 2b9 (p. 105-107).

These are crucial issues. Without a well-functioning inter-agency policymaking body, there is a great risk that the REDD Readiness focal point will end up acting autonomously, and that the other agencies will not feel full ownership of and responsibility for the process.

Agencies concerned with defining and ensuring respect for property rights such as CONADETI, the attorney general's office, the police, the army, and the judicial system get comparatively little attention. This is surprising given the central role of illegal occupation of Indigenous Territories and protected areas in deforestation.

The draft notes that a much broader group of government, non-governmental, and technical cooperation agencies will participate in the technical working group, which is supposed to prepare technical proposals about REDD for approval by policymakers. This technical Working Group will

supposedly include most relevant government agencies and many non-governmental organizations. The R-PP goes into some detail about how the Working Group will function and make decisions and offers a tentative schedule for its activities. At some points it implies that major new policy initiatives will emerge out of Working Group discussions - that is unlikely.

To-date, the main groups involved in the R-PP's preparation have been MARENA, INAFOR, GTZ and, to a much lesser extent, the regional governments, and the Forestry and Environment Advisory Committee (CCF-A) of the RAAN. The text notes the main reason other groups have not participated more has been lack of funds for that purpose.

MARENA will be the focal point for the R-PP and will have a small REDD Secretariat responsible for day-to-day implementation. For the most part, the role of the other agencies in the implementation of REDD Readiness activities is not clearly specified, and they could end up with largely figurative roles. The less clarity there is about the decision-making authority and the practical roles of the other agencies, the more likely that is.

The draft recognizes the autonomous status of the Autonomous Regions of the Caribbean Coast (RAAN and RAAS) and includes their regional governments in the decision-making bodies. It does not explain what their role will be in the implementation of the proposed activities. It includes proposals to adapt the national REDD strategy to the specific conditions of the Caribbean Coast and leaves open the possibility of sub-national REDD strategies for the Caribbean Coast, Rio San Juan, and Nueva Segovia.

The draft mentions several options for channeling REDD-related incentive funds and strongly implies that the National Forest Development Fund (FONADEFO) will play a key role in that regard.

**“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:”**

There is nothing about capacity building in this section.

**Summary:**

The R-PP recognizes the need for a cross cutting approach and multi-stakeholder approach and frames the problem that way. It mentions inter-agency mechanisms for policy-making, but it is still not fully clear how they will function. The functioning of the technical Working Group is explained in greater detail. There is little explanation of the roles different agencies will play in implementing many of the proposed REDD Readiness activities, and the implicit assumption seems to be that MARENA itself will implement most of them; which would seriously undermine the prospects for success. **The standard is partially met.**

**Recommendations:**

- Consolidate the information about institutional arrangements on p. 3-5, 40-42, 54, and 105-107 in one location and present a clear single explanation of what the institutional arrangements will be for providing input into, designing, approving, administering, implementing, and monitoring the REDD Preparedness Process are expected to be.
- Before the World Bank can approve funding for the R-PP's implementation, it would be necessary to clarify in much greater detail who will make decisions about funds are used and through what mechanisms as well as the role of each agency in the R-PP's implementation.
- It would be useful to have greater information about the expected formal governance and administrative relations between the National Production Cabinet, PRORURAL Incluyente, CONAFOR, and the activities proposed for funding in the R-PP.
- Give greater attention to the role of the agencies concerned with establishing and enforcing property rights over land.

- Section 1c3 should be moved into section 1a.
- Review the forest carbon calculations on p. 13 (i.e. 14.38 million tons of carbon, 5 tons of carbon / hectare). There seems to be a problem with them.
- Change the title of 1a.5 - since this section is about Indigenous Peoples, not about the autonomous regions.

**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:**

**Assessment:**

**The Standard element: “ The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus:”**

The National Forest Commission (CONAFOR) and regional Forest Governance Committees (GOFO) will be the main mechanisms for consulting with stakeholders; although other mechanisms will also be used. This approach seems appropriate.

The list of groups to be consulted is detailed and comprehensive. In general, however, the private sector is under-represented among the groups to be consulted. Perhaps most importantly there is little discussion of consulting with the farmers on the agricultural frontier, who are responsible for most of the deforestation.

**“The R-PP presents evidence of the government having commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The R-PP contains evidence that 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:”**

The Nicaraguan government has conducted an extensive set of consultations about forest policy in recent years and there have been many recent events about REDD organized by donors or NGOs.

So far the government has done relatively little to consult with stakeholders specifically about REDD, or to disseminate information to them about the topic. There have been some initial meetings, involving mostly government agencies, a list of which is provided in the text. The draft attributes the relatively limited progress to date to a lack of funds.

The draft includes a list of potential topics for training, but there is little discussion of the role of training in the REDD Readiness process, the criteria for selecting topics, and who would carry the training out, and it is not totally clear what resources have been budgeted for training.

It is not clear what has been budgeted for the pre-consultation activities. More generally, it is hard to see pair the activities mentioned in the text with those that in the budgets. The text mentions consultation and training activities that are not clearly visible in the budgets and vice versa.

**Summary:** The government has identified the relevant stakeholders. To-date, however, it has done relatively little in the way of information sharing or early consultation about REDD, although there have been some initial meetings, mostly with other government agencies. The R-PP says that is due to lack of funds and that it will conduct the activities after receiving the FCPF grant. It

gives a clear sense of what will be done. **This standard is partially met.**

**Recommendations:**

- Provide more detail about the content of the proposed training events.
- It would be useful for the training program to give greater attention to aspects related to cultural identity, spirituality, and Indigenous world views.

**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 far<sup>3</sup> (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; (v) 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:**

**Assessment**

- This is one of the R-PP’s best developed components. The draft includes coherent plans for consultation. The initial version already had a good section on this topic. The later ones have further improved on that.
- This component is comprehensive and it is developed on the basis of consultations strategies carried out recently to develop the National Forestry Plan and the Rural Development Plan.

**The Standard element: “The consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far and the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community:”**

- (See discussion on this under 1.b)

**“The Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase:”**

- The text adequately describes the proposed Consultation and Participation Plan, which appears largely appropriate. There is a work plan including preliminary activities, a description of national and regional consultations, development of information materials, and a component for information and training for indigenous communities.
- The GTRE (Working Group on REDD Strategy) will lead the process, which is to be carried out mainly through Mesas de Trabajo (working groups) that include the main relevant actors. Specific Mesas de Trabajo are contemplated for the autonomous regions and center north of the country.
- Key elements of the plan will include confidence generation among actors, definition of participants’ rights and obligations, cooperation, and strengthening of networks that will include national and regional institutions, civil society, landowners and rural communities among others
- The section includes a specific Design, Consultation, Validation, and Dissemination Plan for the Autonomous regions, with details about how it will be organized and the process to be implemented.
- The draft gives due emphasis to the need to consult with Indigenous Peoples and recognizes their right to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (although at one point it talks about informed consultation, instead of informed consent). This is particularly relevant given that the majority

<sup>3</sup> Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and

of the remaining compact forest in the country is in Indigenous Territories. The text adequately describes the Indigenous Peoples organizations that should be consulted, including the territorial and communal authorities, and the Indigenous movements, NGOs, and associations, among others. It also recognizes the need to consult communities in their own languages.

- Perhaps the main weakness of the section is that it seems to imply that major new policy initiatives will emerge from the bottom-up, out of technical working group discussions. That is very unlikely in the Nicaraguan context, where most major policy initiatives have emerged from the highest levels of government
- It is not clear how the budget items related to the Working Group secretariat in table 1c relate to the budget in table 1b. There may be some duplication.
- Nicaragua's previous experiences with consultations about the regional autonomy law, the indigenous demarcation and titling law, and the national forest program provide useful lessons that could contribute in the development of the proposed consultations.

**The Standard element: "Concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP; and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances:"**

- These issues are largely absent from the text.

**Summary:** This is one of the draft's stronger sections. It gives a clear sense of what will be done. The draft commits the government to consult with most relevant parties and emphasizes consultation with Indigenous Peoples based on Free Prior and Informed Consent. However, there has been little consultation to-date. **This standard has been met.**

**Recommendations:**

- The proposed activities and the different components of the budget should be presented in a more consistent way. There needs to be a much clearer and easier to follow relation between the text and the budget and the text should clarify how table 1 c relates to table 1b.
- As it occurs in other parts of the document, some rearrangement would be needed, moving section 1c3, that deals with the institutional arrangements and presents little details of the consultation, into component 1a
- The text might mention that the activities undertaken will conform to the requirements of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and ILO 169, both of which Nicaragua has recognized (and in the latter case ratified) and how that will be achieved. This includes the need to adopt the consultation process to the traditions of the Indigenous Peoples and to apply FPIC. It might also want to mention that the consultations will conform to the requirements of World Bank safeguard policy 4.10 and the World Bank Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement.
- The R-PP refers to a few activities planned for March and April, 2011, but the draft was not submitted until the end of April, 2011. (p. 61) This should be corrected.

**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; 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:**

**Assessment:**

**The Standard element: "A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends:"**

The draft provides relatively complete and recent information about the extent and location of deforestation, and the methods used to measure it.

The draft emphasizes forest loss and its causes. There is little about where forests have improved; as they have in some places. There may be important lessons from those experiences.

**"A completed assessment is presented that: assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers:"**

The draft accurately identifies the eastward advance of the agricultural frontier, particularly for ranching, as responsible for most forest loss, and shows the decline in forest can be largely explained by a corresponding increase in pasture and crops.

Given the central role of pasture expansion in deforestation, the draft devotes surprisingly scant attention to analyzing this aspect. It says little about the size of the ranches involved, where the ranchers are from, what they produce, who they sell to, and why they prefer to clear new areas, instead of improving stocking rates, nor about how government trade, credit, infrastructure, and livestock policies have affected forest clearing for pasture expansion.

The draft has much less information about forest degradation than deforestation. This is understandable, since there is less available data. It provides information about the volume of illegal logging, and mentions forest fires, fuelwood extraction, and other sources of degradation; but does not clarify how these problems compare to the massive forest loss on the agricultural frontier.

The draft fails to distinguish between forest fires in broadleaf forest areas and those in the pine forests of the Caribbean Coasts. These have different causes, outcomes, and possible solutions. Nor does it mention mangrove loss, which is important in some areas.

The document adequately discusses some underlying causes of deforestation such as land tenure insecurity. In contrast, its' discussion of other supposed causes, such as expansion of industry into rural areas, rural - urban migration, and inadequate market economies, is confusing.

There is little discussion of the differences in how distinct ethnic groups perceive and use land and forest. Forests are much more important for the livelihoods and cultures of the Mayangnas and, to a lesser extent, Miskitus than for the mestizo settlers. The draft does not refer to traditional knowledge and resource management and how they might influence land use.

The draft's analysis of extra-sectoral policies that affect deforestation and forest degradation is limited, except for a relatively good discussion of land tenure insecurity. It does not say much about the effects of current agriculture or infrastructure policies on forests, although it mentions the government is initiating steps to keep its' agricultural policies from promoting deforestation.

The analysis of the forestry policies and their weaknesses is more complete, though still limited. The text notes that government agencies have limited resources to implement forest policies. It also notes the lack of financial incentives to conserve or manage forests. There is no discussion of the forest policies of the autonomous regional governments.

The discussion about policies is largely qualitative. The draft provides little data or quantitative analysis about the policies or their impacts.

**"A completed assessment is presented that: recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues:"**

The draft appropriately emphasizes Nicaragua’s recent advances in demarcating and titling indigenous territories, which are significant and promising. There is little analysis of the challenges that remain in this process, to define the rights of the various stakeholders in the territories and ensure they are respected. In Nicaragua that process is known as “saneamiento”. These issues are key for keeping mestizo settlers from clearing more forest in the Indigenous Territories.

There is no reference to corruption, which has been a significant problem affecting land rights and timber production. There is also no discussion of the impacts of forest law 462 or the timber bans (“vedas”).

**“A completed assessment is presented that: documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation:”**

The draft refers to important advances in establishing inter-institutional processes oriented to improve forest governance, in reforestation, and in forest fire management. While it mentions a number of weaknesses in policy formulation and implementation it never explicitly addresses the issue of why past efforts for addressing the drivers of deforestation and degradation have largely failed, and what that implies for what needs to be done in the future.

Nicaragua has implemented numerous forestry projects, including PROFOR, POSAF, Los Maribios, Fondo Silva, and Masrenace, among others. The document does not mention these, nor the lessons one might draw from them.

**“A completed assessment is presented that: 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:”**

The text includes a number of these elements, although they are never presented in a clear, coherent, and consistent fashion anywhere in the text. Most importantly in that regard, while the text refers to a number of gaps and challenges that have limited the effectiveness of past efforts it never explains what this implies for what would need to be done in the future.

**“Other:”**

The draft devotes substantial attention to presenting a multi-criteria model, the purpose of which is not clear (e.g. explain deforestation, identify where to apply particular policies, define priorities). Multi-criteria models could potentially be useful for REDD+ preparedness and valuable data was collected to prepare the model. However, for the model itself to be useful it would need clearer objectives, a clearer rationale for the selection of the variables, and more explicit hypotheses or assumptions about how each variable relates to whatever is being maximized. Given Nicaragua’s very limited resources, it is not at all evident that investing large amounts of money in perfecting the multi-criteria model would be the best use of those funds.

The budget for this component contains the most complete description of the additional studies proposed. The description of those activities in the text is extremely limited. Neither mentions who will carry out those activities, nor why those activities have high priority.

**Summary:** The analysis of the magnitude and location of forest loss is adequate. The discussion of the policies, market factors, and other causes influencing deforestation and forest degradation requires strengthening. **This standard is partially met.**

**Recommendations:**

- The analysis of the effects of recent policies on forest cover and quality could be strengthened, including a better review of the literature, more data, and an analysis that lends itself more to identifying the need for specific future actions.

- The text might pay more attention to the policy, market, and demographic factors that favor pasture and cropland expansion on the agricultural frontier, the actors involved in those processes, and the effectiveness of past efforts to address the problem.
- The text would benefit greatly from a more comprehensive analysis of the measures required for guaranteeing the integrity of the Indigenous Territories and their forests, particularly “saneamiento”.
- It would be good to have a list of the main forest-related projects implemented in recent years and some lessons from their implementation.
- A list of major infrastructure investments currently under discussion or implementation in or near forested areas and an assessment of their possible affects would be very helpful.

**Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:**

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

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

**Assessment:**

**The Standard element: “The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies.... This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD strategy:”**

This is arguably the greatest weakness of the current R-PP. The draft correctly identifies the advance of the agricultural frontier as the greatest threat to Nicaragua’s forests. However, it does not provide a clear strategy for addressing that threat.

“Cuadro 3” on page 79 says that the problem will be addressed through the national food, agroindustry, and forestry programs, and the national reforestation campaign, but the text never really explains how the government expects those programs to limit the advance of the agricultural frontier, and it is by no means self-evident. (On p. 97 the same idea is presented, although with a slightly different set of programs.)

The budget for this component contemplates activities that could arguably play important roles in an effective REDD+/ENDE strategy, such as defining tenure rights in Indigenous Territories (“saneamiento”), financial incentives for conservation and sustainable forest management, forestry extension, land use planning, and programs to reduce forest fires, forestry pests, and the negative impacts of climate change on forests. However, the document does not elaborate on these, or how they might fit into a national REDD+/ENDE strategy. (Indeed they are not even mentioned in the text, outside the budget.) The budget implies that the government plans to implement pilot REDD+ activities as part of the REDD+ Readiness process, but the role of such pilot activities within the national or sub-national REDD+ / ENDE strategies is not clear.

The draft is stronger with regards to options for reducing degradation. In that case the claim that an improved version of the existing National Forest Program could significantly reduce degradation

is much more credible. While the draft does not clearly describe how that is likely to occur, it is much easier to imagine what the links might be between the proposed actions and the desired outputs.

**“The R-PP should include: a summary of the emerging REDD strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work for assessment of the various REDD strategy options:”**

The draft probably accurately reflects the fact that many aspects of the REDD strategy remain undefined. While it is rather vague about to what extent improved land tenure security, particularly in Indigenous territories, the use of financial incentives such as Payment for Environmental Services, and better management of protected areas (among others), will be significant components of the evolving ENDE strategy, that probably reflects the government’s own uncertainty on these issues. In that regard the standard is somewhat ambiguous about the degree to which the proposal should present a set of credible policy options for reducing deforestation and degradation to meet this criterion.

Some relevant analytical work is proposed in 2a (not 2b), however, the text never clarifies why that work would be of the highest priority for addressing the existing gaps in knowledge that need to be filled in order to develop an effective and efficient REDD strategy.

**“This summary should (include) a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD strategy; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD strategy; and a plan of how to assess the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits:”**

The section does not have any of this. There is no analysis of costs and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, analysis of the political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD strategy, discussion of synergies - conflicts with existing policies, nor a plan for assessing leaking.

**Summary:** This aspect, which is fundamental to the R-PP, is weak. The document gives an overview to the government’s general approach to forest policy issues, but does not really explain what new actions the government plans to take to reduce deforestation and degradation, nor does it discuss its potential feasibility, constraints, costs and benefits. In particular, the draft never explicitly addresses how the government plans to curtail forest clearing for pastures on the agricultural frontier. At some points it implies that the government feels its’ current efforts will reduce deforestation and degradation, without new additional activities, at other points it briefly refers to new activities such as addressing conflicting land claims in Indigenous Territories and Payment for Environmental Services, with little explanation. **The draft partially meets the standard.**

**Recommendations:**

- This section requires re-working. The revised version would need to follow the guidelines more closely and explain what the possible new components of a REDD+/ENDE strategy are likely to be (particularly those that will address forest loss on the agricultural frontier) and discuss their potential costs, benefits, feasibility, synergies and conflicts with other national policies, and the issue of leakage. The activities mentioned in the budget for the component could potentially form major components of such a strategy.
- The diagram on p. 107 is arguably the clearest exposition in the text of what the elements of an effective REDD strategy in Nicaragua might be. Fully developing the argument behind that diagram might be the most practical way to explain what Nicaragua’s ENDE / REDD strategy is, as currently conceived. That would require not only listed policy measures but explaining why the government feels those measures will reduce deforestation and degradation.

- If it is premature to say what the new additional strategies for reducing the expansion of the agricultural frontier might look like the draft could be more explicit about how those strategies will be developed. Given the powerful forces promoting livestock expansion in forested areas it seems clear that would probably require political decisions at the highest levels of government.
- The budget section should be better integrated with the rest of the text and a greater portion of the section 2b should consist of a description of the activities described in the budget.

### 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:

#### Assessment:

**The Standard element: "Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them:"**

The section includes a discussion of PRORURAL that seems to have relatively little to do with institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD+.

The second part of the section focuses on four implementation issues: legal and administrative issues related to the implementation of REDD, development of an administrative system for REDD payments, geographic targeting of REDD activities, and possible REDD pilot projects. These points are mentioned briefly, but not developed. There is no discussion of why these issues are key, or how they relate to points made elsewhere in the text. . If one were to read this section separate from the rest of the document one would might well get the impression the authors felt that REDD payments would be the main new policy initiative designed as part of the REDD Readiness process to reduce deforestation. It is not clear if that is what the authors intended.

**"Offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package:"**

There is a very skeleton work plan related to the four topics mentioned above, which is mostly in the budget itself. The budget seems reasonable and reflects activities listed in the text.

**"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:"**

There is no discussion of land ownership and carbon rights, key governance concerns related to REDD plus, and only limited discussion of institutional arrangements.

#### Summary:

There is no much material in this section. It is hard to say to what extent it meets the standard, as the standard itself is not particularly clear. **The draft partially meets the standard.**

#### Recommendations:

- The R-PP should provide greater justification for the need to carry out the activities mentioned, including how they fit into the wider REDD Preparedness context.

- The authors should clarify in this section and other sections of the text whether the government sees the creation of a set of financial incentives for REDD+ as one of the main new policy instruments to be used to reduce deforestation or degradation, and what, if any, the other new policy instruments might be.

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

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the World Bank's or UN-REDD Programme's safeguard policies, including methods to evaluate how to address those impacts via studies, consultations, and specific mitigation measures aimed at preventing or minimizing adverse effects. For countries receiving funding via the World Bank, a simple work plan is presented for how the SESA process will be followed, and for preparation of the ESMF.

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

**Assessment:**

**The Standard element: "The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the World Bank's or UN-REDD Programme's safeguard policies:"**

The proposal for social and environmental impact assessment does not include a work plan. It recognizes the need to comply with World Bank safeguard standards but has only a limited description of the specific activities planned, and it is not clear that those activities would meet World Bank safeguard standards. The text proposes to wait until after the R-PP has been approved and funded to develop a more robust framework for the SESA, using funds from the project for that purpose.

There are some general comments about activities that might be conducted to assess social impacts.

The draft mentions that this component will be closely related to the activities developed in the Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) component, but the section on that component does not provide much further explanation on what they might consist of.

The draft does not address whether REDD activities that limit agricultural or forestry activities in one location are likely to generate negative environmental impacts in others, or how that issue might be looked at.

**Summary:** This section lacks sufficient detail. It commits the government to conduct a SESA that complies with World Bank policies and guidelines and other relevant standards, but provides very little information about who, will do what, when, and how, and it is not clear that what is suggested would actually meet Bank safeguard standards. **This standard has not been met**, but could probably be met without much additional work.

**Recommendations:**

- Some external assistance may be required to help Nicaragua plan its SESA and adequately complete this section of its R-PP.
- The section should provide greater detail about the methods to be used in the SESA, the institutional mechanisms for conducting the SESA, and the rationale for each, including a work plan.
- The SESA should probably consider the following three issues, among others: 1) The livestock sector is very important in the Nicaraguan economy and has played a major role in recent economic growth strategies. It is not clear what impact serious efforts to curtail livestock expansion in forested areas might have on economic growth, social variables, or the

environment in other regions; 2) Many of those clearing forests on the agricultural frontier or engaging in illegal logging and other types of forest degradation are very poor rural families. It is not clear how proposed efforts to limit their ability to clear or exploit forests will affect their livelihoods and what possible alternatives might exist for them; 3) Cultural impacts and impacts on gender relations may be important in this case.

- Once the SESA work plan is developed the budget should be reassessed. The current budget may be too high.

### Component 3. Develop a Reference Level

#### Standard 3: 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 (MRV 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:

##### Assessment:

**The Standard element: "Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation, conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed."**

- This section adequately presents what data is available, what data is needed, and what steps need to be taken to fill the gaps and prepare adequate reference scenarios, including a discussion of capacity building and technology transfer.
- The current version of the R-PP has adequately responded to most of the comments that the TAP made about this section in a previous review. It proposes a stepwise work plan, indicates the institutional responsibilities for the activities, and has an improved budget.
- The R-PP does not analyze much how exogenous socio-economic, demographic, and policy changes might affect reference scenarios, or what methods to use for assessing that.
- The section strongly implies that Nicaragua will develop sub-national reference scenarios for high priority regions that have rather distinct characteristics with regards to their deforestation and degradation. This may include the two autonomous regions (RAAN and RAAS), Nueva Segovia, and Rio San Juan.
- Reference scenarios will be developed following the IPCC tier 1 approach. However, the text also mentions using other methods, such as the development of national allometric equation, which is a little confusing.

**Summary:** The R-PP provides a great deal of relevant and useful information and ideas for preparing reference scenarios, and there is a consistent plan for its development. **The R-PP meets this standard.**

##### Recommendation:

- It may be useful to clarify to what extent and why the country will go beyond using a tier 1 approach and adopt certain tier 2 methodologies.
- Explain the role that the autonomous regions will be expected to play in preparing the

reference scenarios.

- It would be useful to give greater consideration about the relation between possible socio-economic, demographic, and policy scenarios and the reference scenarios for land use change.
- There is a problem with the page numbering, which effects the numbering for the remainder of the text and should be corrected.

#### Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

##### Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:

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 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:

###### Assessment:

**The Standard element: "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 draft does not present a complete and coherent proposal related to MRV, but it does mention a number of specific activities to be carried out.

The R-PP proposes to concentrate MRV activities in high risk areas, some monitoring activities are to be carried out in other forest areas as well.

The text does not mention how frequently the different variables will be monitored.

Nicaragua proposes to wait until the project begins implementation to develop a full monitoring plan. It feels a need to consult with different stakeholders before developing the monitoring system.

**"The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD strategy in the forest sector.:"**

The draft proposes a number of activities for improving capacity, both with regards to training human resources and obtaining equipment and software. There are also some proposals regarding external technical assistance.

**"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 describes the efforts of the main government agencies to monitor forest - related indicators. It also presents a number of the limitations of the current system, including issues related to human resources, equipment and infrastructure, inter-institutional coordination, and

methodological issues. These descriptions are mostly qualitative, with little qualitative data.

The proponents acknowledge the weakness in equipment, personnel both in quantity, and with the adequate training, and (as noted previously) the text includes activities related to the strengthening of capacities.

Although the proposal mentions that civil society, communities, and academic institutions will participate in monitoring and proposes MRV-related training for community groups, it does not explain how. Similar, it mentions that there will be systems of independent verification, but does not provide concrete proposals for ensuring that occurs.

**Summary:** The section does a reasonable job of describing the current MRV situation, including the main limitations and challenges, and partially explains how the government plans to monitor forest carbon emissions. The discussion of other aspects is rather superficial. **The standard is partially met.**

**Recommendations:**

- Given the current state of MRV activities in Nicaragua and the limited consultation about the issue to date, it may not be realistic for the R-PP to include a detailed explanation of what its future MRV system will look like. Nonetheless, the R-PP could and should go further towards presenting a strategy and general work plan for designing and implementing an MRV system,
- Much, though not all, of the necessary material required for the general strategy and work plan is already in the text. However, it is presented in a somewhat disorganized fashion. If this material were presented in a more structured way it would help to meet the standard for MRV.
- The section should say more about what is planned in relation to: a) mechanisms for inter-institutional coordination, b) participation of communities, civil society, and academia, c) measures to ensure transparency, and d) the specificities of the autonomous regions.

**Standard 4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts, and Governance:**

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.)

**Assessment:**

**The Standard element: “The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability, 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 R-PP presents a preliminary plan, which includes harmonization of indicators, a socioeconomic and environmental monitoring plan, feedback based on consultations, and validation and monitoring.

There is no mention of monitoring cattle ranching or pasture expansion, illegal logging, migration to the agricultural frontier, or leakage. There is a reference to monitoring the implementation of the safeguards and it is proposed to link the development of this component to the SESA, but no explanation of what that might entail. Likewise for monitoring of other relevant socio-economic and institutional variables.

It is assumed that standards as VCS or CCBA are going to be useful for the MRV’s implementation.

MARENA is proposed to lead the monitoring of environmental processes, but nothing is mentioned about who is going to carry out the monitoring of socioeconomic aspects, including governance.

While the preliminary plan seems consistent, there is no mention as to how will local communities and autonomous regions participate in the MRV

**Summary:** It is very difficult to the TAP to judge a component that is not yet developed and that therefore consists in a list of intentions that is consistent with the need to monitor environmental and socio-economic variables. **Standard partially met**

**Recommendations:**

- The section should say more about what is planned in relation to: a) mechanisms for inter-institutional coordination, b) capacity building, c) participation of communities, civil society, and academia, d) measures to ensure transparency, e) the specificities of the autonomous regions, and f) monitoring of co-benefits, and who will carry out these activities. Where it is still not possible to say what activities will be undertaken, it should at least explain how and when those activities will be designed.
- Provide further information about the preliminary work plan and include them in the budget.

**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:**

**Assessment:**

**The Standard element: “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 R-PP provides a summary of the total proposed budget. This budget simply restates and summarizes in one place the partial budgets that appear earlier in the text.

With a few small exceptions, the budgets do not specify which funds will be invested in the autonomous regions.

There is a strong risk that the majority of resources may be devoted to strengthening institutional capacity of the central government agencies in Managua, and not enough resources get used to strengthen the institutions in the regions at greatest risk of deforestation and degradation.

Component 1.b’s funding needs may have been underestimated and component 2.d’s funding may be excessive.

**Summary: Standard largely met.**

**Recommendations:**

- A full budget should be provided in section 5, in addition to the summary budget that is already there.
- It would be useful to have information about the distribution of funding between different central government agencies and the different regions and the rationale behind that distribution.

## 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:

#### Assessment:

**The Standard element: "The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule:"**

- The R-PP provides preliminary thoughts on how they would structure a process of monitoring and evaluation of REDD+ readiness. It indicates that the REDD Secretariat will be responsible for this process and that it will rest on three types of actions (1) internal evaluation (2) external evaluation and (3) assessment of the tools, policies, and technological development. The approach proposed is sound.

**"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 section provides a very useful matrix with a full list of expected results, indicators, verifiers, responsible entities and risks.

**Summary: The standard is met.**

#### Recommendations:

- It might be appropriate to create a monitoring unit within the Secretariat, which could develop a work plan during the first months of the project's implementation.
- The proponents should make clear which activities will be internally monitored and which will be monitored by external parties. Also a paragraph explaining the selection criteria of the independent external parties would be welcome.