

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 (fill in country name): Mozambique

Reviewer (fill in): Jayant Sathaye and Stephen Cobb co-leading six TAP experts

Date of review (fill in): March 14, 2012

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

Background:

Mozambique submitted a first draft R-PP in August, 2011 for informal consideration at PC 10 (October 2011). A TAP Team consisting of 6 members reviewed the draft R-PP, and Mozambique revised the draft R-PP based on comments from different sources including those from TAP, and submitted the revised R-PP in early October for informal consideration at PC 10. TAP updated the synthesis review to reflect changes in the revised draft R-PP.

Then, Mozambique submitted a revised R-PP for formal consideration at PC 11 (March 2012). A TAP team consisting of 6 members reviewed the R-PP and a draft synthesized review of all individual reviews follow.

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

Overall:

The revised R-PP provides significant improvements to the earlier version. It addresses the bulk of TAP comments that refer to the six components. Four TAP reviewers have studied the revised version. They have concluded that this version addresses TAP comments on Components 1a, 1b, 2c and 5 very well and meet the standards set for them.

Responses to other Components are also quite complete but there are a few items that still need to be addressed in order to meet the standards set for them, which are noted below. Their inclusion would lead to meeting each component standard.

The TAP's extensive editorial concerns in most components, identified in the 3 October 2011 TAP Synthesis Review were all addressed, apart from small quibbles:

- Heading styles and page numbering are still not correct from Component 4b onward.
- There are still some misspellings, largely about correct use of singular or plural nouns and adjectives

An important point, made during the TAP team call, is about the ownership of the R-PP. The TAP is concerned about the capacity of the authorities in Mozambique to continue work of the standard evident in this document, when it is clear from the attributions of those responsible for the R-PP, that a great deal of outside help by consultants or other was a key element in the attainment of its quality.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

Overall:

The revised R-PP provides significant improvements to the earlier version. It addresses the bulk of TAP comments that refer to the six components. Three TAP reviewers have studied the March 2012 revised version. They have concluded that this version addresses most if not all the TAP comments except those related to Components 2a, 4b, 5 and 6 need more effort to fully meet the standard.

As noted in the text below, some minor changes are needed in the other Components to make them fully responsive to TAP comments.

A few formatting concerns that need to be addressed in the final version are noted below:

1. Two copies of Component 2 heading on the same page
2. Heading styles still not correct -
 - a. Components 3, 4, 5 and 6 heading style should be Heading 1, not Normal,
 - b. Components 4a and 4b heading style should be Heading 2, not Normal,
3. The Table of Contents has correct numbers but because the heading styles are incorrect from 3 onwards, the links in the ToC do not work and updating could be problematic.
4. There are still a few grammatical issues, such as mixing present and past tense and with lack of spacing between words in some places especially in new sections of text, but they have been reduced in comparison to the earlier version.

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

Components	R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 10	R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 11 (March 2012)	
	Revised Draft R-PP October, 2011	R-PP January, 2012 Draft Submission	Revised R-PP March 2nd 2012
1a	Largely met	Met	Met
1b	Met	Met	Met
1c	Partially met	Largely met	Met
2a	Largely met	Largely met	Largely met
2b	Partially met	Largely met	Met
2c	Partially met	Largely met	Met
2d	Partially met	Largely met	Met
3	Partially met	Met	Met
4a	Partially met	Partially met	Met
4b	Not met	Partially met	Partially Met
5	Not met	Largely met	Largely Met
6	Not met	Largely met	Largely Met

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

This section is well prepared and the recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- The role of the Ministry of Tourism (MITUR) is now well recognized.
- Mechanisms were added to the work of UT-REDD+ to strengthen the cross sectoral, multi stakeholder aspects of the Working Group, so that the Technical Review Committee can take up its coordination role.
- The budget table has been completed.
- There appears to have been a detailed review and updating of the component.

Component 1a was substantially revised and meets the main recommendations of the TAP Review.

Additional improvements on the detailed TAP recommendations:

- The revised R-PP now describes in more detail and more clearly how REDD would be integrated in the existing institutional structure across ministries and admin levels.

- The mandate of CONDES as well as its performance in the past is outlined in more detail.
- It is now clarified that the current REDD+ working group (involved in drafting the R-PP) would become the “REDD Technical Review Committee” whereas the UT-REDD+ would be a different entity under MICOA.
- Although at least one explanation was given for the lacking participation of some stakeholders (due to a misperception that REDD was mainly about forest and environmental concern), the R-PP could be strengthened by outlining more clearly how an enhanced involvement of these stakeholders, including the private sector, would be attempted (e.g. invest more time in explaining why REDD would matter for these stakeholders, look for experiences in other countries how to improve / incentivize stakeholder participation etc.).
- One point that remains a bit unclear is the actual ownership of the R-PP process by MINAG. The revised R-PP states that coordination between MICOA and MINAG will be critical for REDD, while at the same time saying that this has been difficult. As things move forward, it may be useful to consider additional steps, including considering allocating more formal leadership roles, to strengthen commitment from MINAG.
- The revised R-PP identifies and outlines in greater detail which existing national expertise and platforms (academia, civil society and private sector) would make sense to be included in the REDD+ process.
- The following are minor comments to this section:
 - No page numbers makes referencing a bit difficult, please put page numbers. (general comment to the entire document - also please revise the Table of Contents);
 - Pg 15, second bullet - please correct, there are 6 National Parks, 8 National Reserves and 14 Hunting Areas (Coutadas) in Mozambique;
 - Pg 21, Table 1 - Align the design of the ToRs with recruitment (i.e. it seems that the recruitment of staff for the REDD+ TU will be completed before the design of the ToRs for the Unit are completed, and in principle it should be the other way around);
 - The budget for this standard (\$1.650.500) is below the one in Component 5, pg 143 (\$ 1.479.500), and in fact the total of Component 1 in Component 5, pg 143 (\$ 2.863.500), is different from the total in pg 9 (\$ 2.490.000). This also applies for Components 2b, 3 and 6. Please review and align budgets.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- Although the TAP review felt that this component met the main recommendations, additional improvements proposed in the comments - enhanced involvement of stakeholders, formalizing the roles of MICOA and MINAF, formatting and factual revisions -- were made in the revision.

Component 1a was further improved and satisfies the main recommendations of the TAP Review and meets the standard.

Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:

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

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

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

As noted in the TAP Synthesis Review, the planning for and the implementation of the consultation process seems to have been comprehensive. The recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- A table was added with the location, date, organizer and number of participants and REDD trainees in the consultations R-PP. It also includes more information on the questions that were raised and its relevance to the process.
- There is now the clarification that “Although during consultation discussions included aspects of relevance to SESA, this topic was not explicitly included in this phase. During the finalization of the RPP, a special focus will be to analyse the potentials environmental and social impacts of REDD+, as well as defining and monitoring safeguards to minimize adverse impacts.”
- The Table of interventions (now Table 2) was expanded.
- The budget table has been completed.
- Reference to the annexes could be made in the text (this is a comment valid for the other components of the R-PP).

Component 1b was revised according to the main recommendations of the TAP Review.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- The Component was already acceptable but the TAP recommendation of adding reference to the Annexes was made in the revision.

Component 1b was revised according to the final recommendations of the TAP Review and meets the standard.

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national

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

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- Within the list of entities to be consulted in the future, there is the recommended addition of "DNAC/ANAC once this becomes operational)"
- The budget table has been completed.

Recommendations not clearly addressed include:

- There does not seem to be specific mention of a conflict resolution mechanism, despite a clear recommendation. The R-PP foresees an activity to evaluate conflict management mechanisms in Table 3, pg 53, but given the relevance of this issue, the document could probably benefit from a reference and explanation in the main text.
- Information still needed about how the inputs from stakeholders have been incorporated into on-going planning, as well as ways to access the accuracy of data from government agencies and other stakeholders.

Component 1c was revised according to the main recommendations of the TAP Review, but not all (e.g. conflict resolution mechanisms) were addressed.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- Conflict resolution mechanism has been added as one of the issues that will be discussed in the future consultations with government agencies, private sector, NGO, and local communities.

Component 1c meets the standard and the recommendations of the TAP Review.

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:

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).

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- Most of TAP comments have been addressed. This section has been reviewed and much better structured, with inclusion of further information and data.
 - More analysis of DD drivers has been done - including the impacts of shift of settlement patterns, and growth of population, agriculture, illegal logging and mining, the energy sector - with analysis of their relative contribution to forest cover change, their actors and their motivations.
- The inclusion of the case study done with the University of Edinburg was interesting, as well as the Annex 2a on the scope and scale of the REDD + strategy.
 - The main causes of DD in Miombo and Mopane forests are now clarified to be similar.
- The budget table has been completed.

Some development of the text has been done, but recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review not clearly addressed include:

- More clarity still needed on impacts of tenure insecurity to deforestation, which is mentioned only in the SWOT table.
- Compilation is still needed of all available work done, so as to minimize the cost and enrich future assessment works.

Some specific comments:

- The drivers, indirect and direct have been separated, as suggested and further developed, with the inclusion of more information on population growth as a driver.
- In pg 54, text below figure 10, the values (6+4.1+3.3+3.2+13) does not add to the 26.9, but rather 29.6. Please have a look at the numbers.
- Enlarge figure 12, too little to see.
- In pg 70, the dates for Action Plans on control of erosion and fire is missing. Both this action plans have been approved in December 2007.
- In pg 70, in bullet referring to the Conservation Policy, last line - Resettlement has occurred in Limpopo National Park (the Transfrontier Park is called the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park, and it includes three national parks - Kruger, Limpopo and Gonarezhou).
- In pg 77, Table 12 - regarding the activity of mapping land rights, the team could most probably make use of the much work already being done by the MCC project/team working in DNTF reviewing the land cadastre.

Component 2a was substantially revised according to almost all the main recommendations of the TAP Review, with only a few (e.g. tenure insecurity) not addressed.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

The recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- Enlarged a figure to make it easier to see
- Provided dates for Action Plans for control of erosion and fire
- Regarding mapping of land use rights, made use of work done by the team working in DNTF

Some development of the text has been done, but recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review not clearly addressed include:

- The impacts of tenure insecurity on deforestation (this omission is particularly important)
- Compilation needed of all the available work done.

Some small points in the recommendations were not addressed:

- Correction of the total for areas of productive forest (referring to Figure 10).
- Correct spelling of Gonarezhou and Kruger National Parks.
- On p68, 1st paragraph, in the purple highlighted text, there is reference to “MODIA products”. This should be “MODIS products”

Component 2a was revised but a few items such as “tenure insecurity” are yet to be addressed. Standard is thus largely met.

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

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

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

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

This section was described in the previous TAP Synthesis Review as needing much further work. The recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- Reference is now made to the existing draft REDD+ National Strategy and its alignment with the identified drivers.
- Interventions to address DD drivers are now linked to strategic actions, with information on how the adoption/implementation of these interventions can be achieved/incentivized. It would be useful to identify critical interventions to be prioritized.
- Analysis of synergies of relevant country sector strategies, with a SWOT analysis.

- The budget table has been completed.

The following recommendations were made but not acted upon:

- There is still no mechanism for estimating costs and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, although there is discussion of the benefit sharing mechanism, to be specified during Readiness Phase.
- There is still no discussion on the risk of domestic leakage, although the topic is discussed in Component 3 (reference levels).
- More detail on pilot areas is still needed - are they fully REDD+ focused or remaining from previous studies.
 - It is now specified that the details of the design of a benefit-sharing mechanism (and presumably of the percentages to be shared across levels and actors, cf figure 22) will be determined during the readiness phase, which makes sense.

Component 2b was revised according to some but not all recommendations of the TAP Review. TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

The TAP review noted that some but not all of its earlier recommendations had been addressed. In the revision, these remaining recommendations were satisfactorily addressed:

- Mention is now made of the prioritised order of strategic actions
- There is now discussion of the need for cost-benefit analyses to be done, with recommendations on data sources and areas to be looked at
- There is now discussion of leakage under each of the actions to address the causes of DD
 - There is more detail on the pilot areas, which clarifies that some areas will be new and identified by the National REDD+ Working Group, while others are ongoing.

Component 2b and meets the standard. It was revised to address all recommendations of the TAP Review.

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

This section was described in the previous TAP Synthesis Review as needing to be improved. The recommendations from the previous TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- The workplan and budget table have been completed.

- Information is now provided on how REDD+ revenues will be managed at sub-national levels. On how REDD revenues will be managed at landscape and subnational level, the revised R-PP suggests a ‘development corridor approach’ and a ‘staged approach’. The staged approach may benefit from more clarification of what it entails.
- Information is also provided on how to motivate private sector and communities for REDD+ implementation.
- There are now details on monitoring performance and managing conflict, using national institutions such as IESE and INE for socio-economic indicators, and NGOs such as ORAM for assessing and managing land use conflicts.
- In pg 98, perhaps it meant District Muembe, instead of Niassa.

Component 2c was revised according to the main recommendations of the TAP Review.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- The TAP Review concluded that this component was satisfactorily revised. The recommendations that were made were tentative, and while some additional clarification was made, on the development corridor approach, little specific was added on the staged approach (but it was suggested only that its exposition “may benefit” from more clarification).

Component 2c and meets the standard and it was revised according to the main recommendations of the TAP Review.

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

This section was described in the TAP Synthesis Review as needing to be improved. The recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review were followed as below:

- The workplan and budget table have been completed.

The following recommendations were made but not acted upon:

- The R-PP still makes reference more to existing standards on SESA and EIAs in the country and past experiences and on who was involved in the past processes and could thus also play a role for REDD+, rather than on lessons learned from these past experiences to prepare a better informed REDD proposal.

Component 2d was revised according to some but not all recommendations of the TAP Review.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- The only outstanding recommendation requiring revision, that of lessons learned from past experiences in SESA and EIAs, was well discussed in relation to: data collection, approaches to developing reference levels, lack of legal provision for inclusion of forest communities in conflict resolution in SEIA and relatively weak law enforcement.

Component 2d meets the standard. It was revised according to all recommendations of the TAP Review.

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The TAP Review of October 3, 2011 noted that the major comments made by the TAP were not yet addressed. The component needs work on TORs and a work plan, how the history and future projections are made, including governance and policy changes, identification of responsibilities, capacity building needs, and a careful interpretation of some of the figures. There were no budget figures. The standard was partially met.

In the revised R-PP of January 26, 2012, the major comments of the TAP have been addressed with several substantive additions to the text and tables. A careful analysis of the issues, pitfalls, and way in which reference levels will be constructed is provided, and the use of high resolution satellite images in particular regions is explained. For example, a new box 1 shows how the Japanese satellite data will be used in the buffer zone around Chinanimani Nature Preserve - this is a good example of the detail needed to move the program forward. There is a new discussion of sub-national inventory which helps augment the material on data needs. The landscape-level corridor approach is more fully discussed, and leakage is addressed. Further explanation of the how the JICA support and the Brazil-Mozambique initiative will be used for building capacity is provided. Finally, there is a new list of the main interventions that will be undertaken. The budget figures have now been provided: Table 3 gives a summary of reference level activities and budget, with allocation among different sources. Annex 3.2 provides a draft TOR for development of the reference level.

Although there is still not a detailed work plan, the additional material shows that there is now a clearly documented methodology and the elements of a step-wise approach, and the groundwork

has been laid for creation of work plan as the next step (the outcome chains developed in the R-PPs of Kenya and Cambodia are good examples to follow here). The major drivers have been identified, and a clear understanding of the issues underlying the establishment of a reference level is demonstrated. With the information here, Mozambique has demonstrated a significant step towards an evolving operational system. The only area not discussed explicitly here is public consultation and peer review. There is reference to the consultation process near Table 16 (p.25), but no more discussion. As Mozambique moves forward, it should continue to ensure adequate public consultation and peer review.

With that point noted, the standard has now been met.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- The TAP review concluded that the standard for this component had been met but noted that there was still room for improvement in some areas. These were addressed in relation to the request for more detail of a work plan and a step-wise approach.
- However, there was also a request for more discussion of public consultation and peer review, and this was not provided in the revision.

Component 3 meets the standard. It was revised according to bulk of the recommendations of the TAP Review except for the discussion of public consultation and peer review noted above.

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The TAP Review of October 3, 2011 noted that this component still needs work on TOR for MRV, a work plan, criteria for indicators, capacity building, and transparency. There were no budget details. The standard was partially met.

In the revised R-PP of January 26, 2012, new material has been added that further explains stratified sampling and gives more detail on ongoing monitoring activities in different regions with future plans. A new figure 31 replaces the old figure 30, and provides a clearer illustration of how

the various institutions will interact (note that there is a link missing to the academia box). There is more information in the new list of Main Interventions. The schedule for monitoring (table 22) shows broadly when the various activities will take place, but it is not detailed enough to show, as required for meeting the standard, that there is in place enough information for the design and early implementation of an eventual operational MRV system. There is a start on an action plan, and the summary of monitoring activities and budget (Table 21) shows in broad terms what is planned, but more is required. Transparency is mentioned, but there is no indication of the approach that will be taken to guarantee transparency. The Mozambique-Brazil cooperation is mentioned, but there is not much about how the cooperation is helping with capacity development. The outcome chains developed by Kenya and Cambodia are good examples of the kind of information required now. Annex 4.2 provides a TOR for the design of the MRV - some blanks still need to be filled in, but this is a good start.

Note that the Reference Level component 3 has been developed in more depth, and has the kind of analysis that would be useful to have here for MRV Components 4a and 4b. Mozambique has perhaps rightly focused first on Reference Levels, and then plans to further develop the MRV plan. But it would be best to do these in parallel, since information for reference levels feeds into the development of the MRV system. The MRV plan needs to be strengthened before the standard can be met.

At this time, the standard is only partially met.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- The standard was judged to have been met only partially, but the revision appears to answer some of the concerns of the TAP review. Much more detail is provided, in a stepwise framework similar to the development of Component 3, on how an MRV system will be designed and implemented. There is greater mention of the technical and financial assistance to be provided by JAXA and JICA.
- However, there was no additional information on an approach to improve transparency, nor on how Brazil-Mozambique cooperation will help capacity development.

Component 4a meets the standard. It was revised according to bulk of the recommendations of the TAP Review except for the discussion of transparency and capacity building noted above.

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The TAP Review of October 3, 2011 noted that this component had not been completed, and the standard was thus not met. Areas of improvement included a strategy for multiple benefits, initial indicators, data on migration, monitoring governance, a work plan, and a detailed budget.

In the revised R-PP of January 26, 2012, a detailed table (21) of preliminary indicators has been added that meets the TAP recommendation. A summary of monitoring activities and budget (Components 4a and 4b combined) gives useful detail. But although there is clear understanding and list of the issues to be addressed, and a placeholder in the schedule for monitoring (table 22) that says "establish a system for monitoring multiple benefits of REDD+ and governance" there is no detail either here or in the annex that could be the basis for a transparent system for monitoring and reporting on non-carbon aspects of REDD+. This could be started with the information in Table 21. Also, there needs to be attention paid to Mozambique's ESMF.

Noting these deficiencies, the standard has been partially met.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

- The TAP review noted that this standard was only partially met, since it lacked detail on a transparent system for monitoring and reporting on non-carbon aspects of REDD+ or on Mozambique's ESMF, and no new text was added in the revision.

Component 4b: Because no new text was added on these deficiencies, the standard has been partially met.

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD 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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

- TAP comments have been addressed.
- The document has included detailed tables with schedule and budgets, to inform the various activities, and which funding support is being requested from FCPF and other sources. However, since the two tables make use of different terms for its activities (e.g. first activity in Standard 1a. in Table 23 refers to national and sub-national institutions, in Table 24, first activity refers to costs of UT-REDD +) it is not too easy to make a linkage btw the two. If possible, use similar language.
- The time-frames in Table 21 could be aligned with the ones presented in each of the components. Furthermore, as per comment made in Standard 1a, there is a need to align the values described per standard, as some do not match (i.e. 1a, 2b, 3 and 6).
- The allocated time per activity appears sometimes a bit short (e.g. set up institutional arrangements at subnational level in 6 months?)

Component 5 now addresses the main recommendations of the TAP Review.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

The TAP review felt that this component addressed the earlier main recommendations but made some requests for revision, which do not appear to have been made:

- No improvement to the linkage between the language in the Tables showing the schedule for implementation (Table 32) and the detailed budget (Table 33).
- Alignment between the budget tables in each component, which differ from figures in Table 31 Schedule and budget, and Table 33 Detailed schedule (which also differs from Table 31).
- The allocated time for activities was suggested by the TAP review as being too short.

Component 5 still needs to address the recommendations of the TAP Review. It largely meets the component standard.

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:

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The recommendations from the TAP Synthesis Review (to provide ANY content for Component 6) was followed as below:

- A table with outputs/ results, indicators, MoVs and assumptions is provided for the broad components, but it is not very detailed.

BUT

There is still no narrative description or any other information described.

An M&E framework table has been inserted, but the document would greatly benefit if it included in the beginning some text explaining the laying out of the M&E plan, its objective, the guidelines for gathering baseline data, the roles and responsibilities (is it the sole responsibility of the UT-REDD+ or other stakeholders too?), as well as reporting requirements for all REDD + activities.

Will the R-PP further indicators for each component be further defined? Will it make use of SMART indicators (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound)? For example, Budget table in pg 147 makes reference to the development of indicators and completion of assumptions; this could be explained in a text format in the beginning of the component.

Component 6 has not met the main recommendations of the TAP Review.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

This component did not meet the main recommendations of the earlier TAP review, and this revision made only one change that was requested: it does provide some introductory text on the

process and structure of the M&E plan. However, it does not make other changes requested:

- There is still no narrative description of the points in the table of outputs, indicators etc.
- There is no further explanation of the development of indicators.

Component 6 largely meets the standard, and needs to address the above queries in order to fully meet the standard.