

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

(interim, January 12, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

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

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

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

Review of R-PP of: Mozambique

Reviewer: Canada (lead), Japan, Norway, Suriname

Date of review (fill in): 16 March 2012

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

The March version of the RPP is a clear improvement compared with the previous versions. One of the main strengths of the R-PP is its underlining of the complex linkages between biodiversity, agriculture, forestry and energy supply. The R-PP submission addresses these complex issues with a stepwise and landscape-based approach. Further efforts remain under Components 2a, 2b, 4b, 5 and 6. Concerns with Component 1c and 2d can be addressed during Grant negotiation.

Format comments:

- careful attention to language quality is needed
- translation of maps would be appreciated
- the language/translation requires improvement in some areas of the R-PP to improve comprehension
- some confusion between normative and descriptive statements. For example, in Table 15 it is written in descriptive form that "*community consultation is conducted before adjudication of forests and land to commercial exploration for protection purposes.*" Further in the text however it is noted that "...*this process is often not implemented...*"

Gender Equality - Given that the R-PP identifies the challenge of ensuring the participation of women in consultation session (p. 41), it would be valuable to explain how women's participation will be better targeted in future consultation and training sessions, and meetings. This could be done in component 1c. Component 2d, which identifies questions that SESAs can address, could also help identify and target the gender equality dimensions of REDD+. Good to see gender disaggregated statistics in Annex 1B2 on Participants in training sessions.

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:

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard met. Questions remain around the role of community participation in decision-making bodies, but these concerns can be addressed under Component 1c or 2d. Significant improvements were noted in the following areas:

- Existing administrative roles and jurisdictional responsibilities over forest category of MINAG, MITUR, MICOA were explained and displayed concretely in Table 1.
- The joint coordination between MICOA-DNGA & MINAG-DNTF and the responsible authorities of each Sub-Unit of UT-REDD+ were both clarified.
- The ways on how to deal with indirect but significant issues on REDD+ such as energy, infrastructure development, agriculture expansion, and private sector participation were stated as to be ensured by those responsible institutions' participation in Technical Review Committee and its advisory roles for UT-REDD (page 25).
- 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 is demonstrated in theory.
- Coordination with agriculture, mining and energy ministries has now been addressed (p. 25).
- Opportunities for private sector participation now appear to be more clearly described.
- Capacity building activities are included in the work plan as it relates to awareness raising within key government sectors as well as training of the UT-REDD+.
- The budget now appears to be complete and is presented in Table 3.

Additional comments for consideration during implementation:

- Currently the REDD+ process is led by the Ministry of Coordination of Environmental Affairs with

the National Council for Sustainable Development (CONDES) as the main vehicle for coordination with other sectors. The question is to what extent this entity will be able to coordinate all the efforts required in different sectors and at different levels of the administration without a strong involvement of the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Finance, with the view to mainstreaming REDD+ in the national development strategy/public investment programming.

- the functioning of the central council, and its smaller decentralized versions could prove to be an effective tool, however the frequency of consultations from this central council seems to be (potentially) on the low end.
- some concerns remain about the effectiveness of interdepartmental engagement at the technical level, in particular the extent of involvement of agencies other than MICOA and MINAG (including MINAG units other than DNTF).
- Are there ways to ensure the possible participation of academia, civil society, private sectors and general citizens would be added in the process of decision making under the structure of Institutional Framework? It may be recommended to add a sentence in either in Component 1a or Component 2c in what way to ensure these sectors' participation in the consultation processes under each Sub-Unit or Technical Review Committee of UT-REDD+.
- Several reviewers noted that coordination/ownership between MICOA and MINAG remains unclear in the current draft. The R-PP is suggesting that a memorandum of understanding be signed between the respective institutions in order to formalize coordination at the level of ministers, but possibly some sort of higher level decree may need to be issued from the head of government instructing relevant institutions to participate and clarifying their respective roles and responsibilities in the process.
- Additional clarity could be given on the participation of community management committees in decision making at various levels. It reads as though the body that contains community and other representatives (COGEP) are more on the receiving end of government policy and recommended practices (as described at the bottom of figure 3, pp. 21-22 + fig 5).
- The budget includes \$300,000 for meetings and capacity building at the provincial level. It would be useful to examine how much of this is for capacity building, who are the beneficiaries and what the topics for capacity building would be. The previous Table 2 indicated that this capacity building may be awareness raising on REDD+ for key government sectors. It is not clear if any more formal capacity building activities are planned.

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:

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard met.

- Information is now provided on REDD+ information and awareness campaigns. The R-PP does contain evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD+
- The R-PP does present evidence of Mozambique 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.

For any further revisions, the following recommendations could be taken into consideration:

- The text states that information on the basic concepts of safeguard and SESA were not explained well during the past consultation campaigns under the process of RPP formulation (page 43). Before implementation, the UT-REDD+ should add further implementation of SESA and safeguard workshops/consultations as part of the stakeholder analysis & consultative process.
- Results/evidence of past consultation are well documented, however it remains unclear how/to what extent stakeholder feedback has been integrated into the RPP.

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

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

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard largely met, pending inclusion a clause in the PC Decision/Grant Agreement regarding near-term public consultations re: conflict resolution mechanisms. This case highlights the need for the additional \$200k allocation of funds under Resolution PC/Electronic/2012/1.

- The process for consultations moving forward is well outlined and seems to be sufficiently encompassing, both in terms of stakeholders and issues. Issues discussed in consultations undertaken thus far are well explained, although the process for their consideration is a bit unclear. The budget now appears to be complete and is presented in Table 7.

Further recommendations towards implementation:

- The R-PP does not clearly put forward mechanisms for addressing grievances and resolving conflicts. A process for considering expressed concerns, grievances and recommendations does not yet appear to be described. No mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD+ process, for conflict resolution or redress of grievances are presented. To ensure a participatory decision making process, public

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

consultations could be conducted under the National REDD+ Information Platform to accepting questions, complaints, opinions and suggestions against portions of the Strategy (ie policies, strategies and guidelines).

- The “Strategy and Registration Sub-Unit” of UT-REDD could be assigned to develop a just and equitable mechanism after collecting the potential/existing conflicts and recommended framework to solve those issues. How are expressed concerns catalogued and addressed and by whom?
- The mention of government units targeted for further consultation and awareness-raising appears to confirm concerns expressed in 1a with regards to governmental ownership. Existing government authorities’ roles and responsibilities on public consultation, conflict resolution, and participatory decision making process can be described more and needs of the further capacity development of the authorities of both central and subnational levels can be included in the RPP implementation plan.
- Is there some central contact agency/position to respond to queries following dissemination of information campaigns, etc.?

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and sets the stage for development of the country’s REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

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

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard largely met - further revisions required. The March R-PP represents significant improvements over past drafts in the following areas:

- Enlarged figures, tables and maps facilitate clearer comprehension of status of land-use and forests in Mozambique. The inclusion of Table 8 showing the distribution of vegetation types and other lands by province is useful and particularly appreciated.
- More information is now included on existing laws and governance policy. For example, sections on illegal logging and unsustainable logging operations were combined in the previous draft but in the current March 2012 draft they are now more organized and comprehensible. Also, newly adopted policies such as PEDSA, ZAE, and new Forest & Wildlife laws are now properly introduced in the text.
- This section now includes a much improved and more comprehensive analysis of the direct and indirect causes of deforestation and forest degradation and includes more data on volumes and areas involved.
- Sections covering infrastructure and mining are now more developed although some reviewers felt additional information should be included based on the fact that 90% of arable land in some regions is allocated to mining.
- Table 14 provides a good summary of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of current legislation to address REDD.
- The budget now appears to be complete and is presented in Table 17.

There are however still some required areas for further improvements:

- SWOT analysis should be conducted on the newer policies (PEDSA, ZAE and Forest & Wildlife Law) would be of help to re-consider about the issue of Land and Forest and governance.
- Insufficient information on the status of land tenure and natural resource ownership. This information remains absent since the last PC Review (PC10). Land tenure and natural resource ownership is not sufficiently covered in this section. Page 79 discusses some use rights that can be granted to communities and investors, but it would be useful to see in a table the different categories of land tenures authorized, to whom and the areas under each of these. (Section 2b, p. 97, mentions that “More than 5 million ha across the country have been formally registered as community land.”)
 - The “Land Component of Millennium Challenge Account Project (USAID)” under implementation in technical cooperation with MINAG/DNTF which is aiming at providing DUAT (legal land use right) for citizens in selected provinces may be relevant to be described more here as one of the major on-going land reform efforts (http://www.mcli.co.za/mcli-web/news/2011/2011-1056/MCA_Mozambique_Newsletter_October.pdf).
- The available data/knowledge is not clear for each driver (comment from previous review insufficiently addressed)
- Governance challenges will be a major challenge which could require more than the envisaged measures such as better equipment and capacity building. It will be crucial to deepen analysis of this challenge and the related identification of mitigation measures when R-PP implementation begins.
- It is indeed worrisome to read in the RPP about huge tracts of land, up to 40% of the national land area already been allocated/claimed by REDD+ project developers. The reviewers share the urgent need expressed in R-PP for transparent rules and their fair and correct application will be especially important when it comes to allocation of land.
- Table 13, p.76-77: some interventions listed in the table are barely mentioned earlier in this section. A stronger rationale for each intervention would be important.
- Table 16 identifies activities to be undertaken to address the priorities identified under component 2a. A narrative description of these would be useful to include as it might provide a clearer indication of how the results of these planned activities are expected to address the drivers of deforestation.

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

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

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

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard largely met. It is indicated that the formulation process of “National REDD+ Strategy of Mozambique” has now been developed and will be subject of further discussions, consultations and improvements after R-PP approval.

- Substantial improvement in addressing risk for leakage, risks of implementation, costs/tradeoffs and generally in the aligning of Component 2b along the lines of the drivers identified in 2a.
- The budget now appears to be complete and is presented in Table 19, but there appears to be a shortfall labelled “TBI” (possibly meaning “to be invested”).
- Comment from PC10 review on prioritizing critical interventions sufficiently addressed.

There are however still some required areas for further improvements:

- Socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy is not discussed. The draft R-PP indicates that suggested strategic actions still need further analysis in order to define typical activities and practices, as well as cost structures associated with current and alternative practices.
- In page 91 and 92, “potential for leakages from implementation of these actions is minimal and shall be controlled in sub-national boundary areas”; however leakages across sub-national boundaries are generally predictable. Here the plan and the role of the national monitoring system should also be explained more clearly in this Component (e.g. Figure 24 in Component 4a).
- There are several “pilot areas” indicated variously across the RPP. It is recommended to compose a table on which area is for what pilot. Figure 21 is helpful but it does not clearly link to the text.
- Past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are not presented. However, in some cases recent actions for addressing a few of these drivers are described, as for instance in the case of: Unsustainable production of biomass energy, Illegal and unsustainable logging; and Investment policies and taxation.
- The text identifies several weaknesses identified a lack of awareness and capacity relating to existing laws and policies. Tables 18 and 19 do not address activities to solve these weaknesses.

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:

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard met. Major improvements have been made in the following areas:

- Proposed “National Accounting System” and its implementation framework are described more clearly in this version.
- Civil societies and private sectors involvement are clearly stated.
- The budget now appears to be complete and is presented in Table 20.

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:

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard partially met.

- The budget now appears to be complete and is presented in Table 23.
- A simple workplan is presented for the preparation of the ESMF. Less information is available to how the SESA will be followed however past experiences with SEA are well addressed.

There are however still some required areas for further improvements:

- It would be useful to clarify in this Component under what institutional framework will this workplan be implemented. In Component 1a there is an explanation that information platform including SESA is going to be created under UT-REDD's Strategy & Registration Sub-Unit (page 24). More explicit links between these two components would be well served and would clarify who will delivery the activities outlined in Component 2d.

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:

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard met. Improvements have now been made in the following areas:

- Step wise work plan is now proposed and includes figures/boxes that clearly explain step-wise activities (Figure28).
- In previous draft, writings of Component 3 and Component 4a had been confused. In this version these parts were both well organized.
- The relationship between national RL and sub-national/project based reference level (RL) are clarified. Roles and responsibilities of each organization were displayed.
- Public consultation process for comprising future projection part of the RL were clearly included in the work plan.

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-plus strategy in the forest sector.

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

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

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

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard largely met. Substantial revisions have occurred over the Fall 2011 version of the R-PP. Reviewers particularly noted the following improvements that were included in the revised version:

- A step wise work plan has now been proposed and is described in Figure 31.
- a strong system and institutional framework of “National Resource Information Platform” has now been developed under “National REDD+ Information Platform”. Information is now clearly portrayed.
- Basic information of Jurisdictional-Nested approach was explained and adoption of the approach would be a subject of discussion and decision among stakeholders during readiness phase of RPP implementation.

There are however still some required areas for further improvements:

- Further revisions of the text could be made to further articulate the strong thought that has clearly been taken in developing Figure 31. The text could better portray the full depth of this diagram - both in the implementation and design phases, but also with particular attention to the role of participative approaches and independent monitoring (i.e. scaling up beyond pilots of community MRV) towards transparency.
- How will findings from pilots be fed back to improve REDD+ implementation? These subjects are mentioned in the current draft but continue to not be fully articulated. Given that the standard for this component is to outline preliminary plans, this Component could be considered satisfactorily developed following further information at PC11 or in the PC Decision/Grant negotiation.

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.)

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

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard partially met. Required areas for further improvements:

- An integrated monitoring system on non-carbon benefits should be included. Roles and responsibilities to develop the system should be described in the RPP. As seen in Component 1a and 2c, “Sub-Unit of Strategy and Registration” under UT-REDD+ may be assigned to take a leading role to develop mechanisms for tracking of non-carbon benefits as a consequence of the REDD+ activities.
- The list of items to be monitored in Table 31 will need to be finalized - including the methodologies and indicators/criteria for each item. Approving/finalizing this information does not clearly appear in the implementation timeline/table. Reviewers assume that this responsibility will be for the “Sub-Unit of Strategy and Registration” under UT-REDD+.
- No mention of ESMF in Component 4; future versions of this R-PP Component could potentially include a clear link back to Component 2d.

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:

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard Largely Met (pending revision of tables to meet consistency comments below)

Major improvement over the Fall 2011 version of the R-PP. Inclusion of Table 31 on schedule and budget clearly describe the summary of the budget and implementation plans.

There are however still some required areas for further improvements:

- Some attention needs to be given to ensuring the budget tables in each separate component align with the overall budget presented in component 5. In particular, Components 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b and 6 should be reviewed.
- It is not clear what the acronym TBI represents. Is this another donor or multilateral organization? A shortfall? If it is a shortfall, it would be helpful for the R-PP to explain how the Government of Mozambique intends on covering it (shortfalls are not addressed in Component 5).
- Table 31 (Schedule and Budget) captures elements from a more detailed table on schedule, budget

and allocation across donors (table 33), however the amounts for TBI and FCPF do not match between tables.

- Finally, Table 32 (Schedule for Implementation of the R-PP) is a helpful and detailed guide on timing for implementation, however, it does not indicate by when funds need to be received (from FCPF and other donors). Also, given that we are quickly approaching Q2 of 2012, where will the funds come from to implement the components identified in Q2 of 2012? Are these fast disbursing funds?
- It is likely that the implementation of the R-PP will require considerably more time than the three years planned and budgeted. This will also have considerable budgetary and resource implications.
- The lack of visibility/existence of Government budget allocation may raise concerns about the commitment to the REDD+ process. Of the total budget amounting to USD 23,785 million only USD 0,054 will be from the Government according to the R-PP. It could be explored the government might be able to take up some increased recurring funding for later phases of readiness or how existing government resources could be included/classified as counter-part funding?

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:

March 2011 PC-Review Recommendation: Standard partially Met. A major improvement over the last version of the R-PP.

- Good to see the risks and assumptions included in the table.
- Draft design of the programme monitoring framework for R-PP Implementation progress evaluation has now been proposed with an indication of the areas for further elaboration and planning by UT-REDD.
- The timing and frequency of M&E system implementation appears that it will be clarified by consulting with relevant stakeholders on the draft M&E design.

There are however still some required areas for further improvements:

- The Monitoring and Evaluation framework table outlined in component 6 does not align with the template - notably:
 - there is no indication of the timeframes required. While Table 32 in component 5 does identify schedules for each component, it is unclear whether this means that the evaluation will be completed immediately following completion of the component.
 - when would monitoring and reporting on progress occur?
- It would be helpful to see a distinction between process and output/outcome indicators.
- Further information on monitoring and evaluation, including TORs and explanatory text, should be included before approval (perhaps in an annex)
- It should be made clearer whether monitoring & evaluation will be the responsibility of UT-REDD's Administration & Accounting Sub-unit.

