

**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

Reviewers: Juergen Blaser, Jayant Sathaye + 4 reviewers

Date of review: October 3, 2011

Short Summary of Comments by TAP of Mozambique's R-PP

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

The present submission is the first draft R-PP for consideration by the TAP and has thus benefitted from TAP comments. TAP reviewers include in-country specialists on this topic.

Overall, the R-PP is very well composed and addresses most of the key issues requested by the FCPF for four of the six components. Since this is the first draft of the R-PP, standards are only partially met in Components 1 through 4 and not met in Sections 5 and 6. Section 5 requires an explanation of the detailed

budget, which is not included in the document as yet, and Section 6 is not yet covered. The TAP review team has several clarifications and questions that are noted in each component. Addressing these topics would make the R-PP more comprehensive and it should readily be able to meet the standard.

The R-PP builds on the RPIN that Mozambique had submitted in March, 2008 with support from the Norwegian government. In Southern Africa, Mozambique is one of the few countries besides Zambia and Angola substantial forest cover and would do well to participate in the REDD Process.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- Figures and tables should be captioned to facilitate reference in the text.
- All maps, tables and figures should have a legend, and be more legible (some have very small fonts) and easily understood.
- Also revise misspellings.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission:

Overall, the present DRAFT R-PP is a good basic document that includes all necessary information and generally also sets a good basis for the analytical and piloting work that is planned to be undertaken in the readiness phase. Further revision of the document in line with the TAP's comments is recommended.

Component 1a:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- Overall, this section is well prepared and the proposed REDD+ structure has most of the members that would constitute a complete group. It is encouraging to note that the ministries include those of agriculture, energy, finance, and science and technology among several others. As the R-PP notes in a later section deforestation and degradation results in part because of differences in policies and programs of energy and forestry, and agriculture and forestry ministries. The South-South Collaboration with a Brazilian institution presents a promising initiative for learning and knowledge sharing

Areas that still need to be improved:

- Mozambique's Protected Areas (National Parks, Reserves and Hunting Areas), covering about 16% of land of the country, are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Tourism (MITUR). Although MITUR is part of CONDES, it is not included in the list of stakeholders within this standard as other Ministries are. How will REDD+ Initiatives be implemented inside Protected Areas with no strong involvement and engagement of MITUR in the process?
- Will the UT-REDD+ temporarily replace the Working Group just for the preparedness implementation phase, until the Technical Review Committee is formalized? If so, how will it guarantee the engagement of cross sector, multi stakeholder nature that currently exists in the Working Group within that phase?
- Chart on p. 25 is very useful, but it needs to be expanded with more detail.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission:

- Very detailed review and updating of component 1 a, based on the TAPs' recommendations.

Component 1b:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- The planning for and the implementation of the consultation process seems to have been comprehensive, there has been a useful dialogue, and there is a useful list of the results, frequent

questions, and pilot areas for focus. An engagement of sub-national stakeholders, especially local communities, seems to have occurred relatively early on in the REDD process. This is a good start.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- The process of consultation included five workshops. It would be important to include a table or list with the names of the main organizations and the number of participants in the workshops.
- From the results and issues that derived from the consultations it seems that it did include discussion of issues resulted with SESA, however the R-PP is not clear in this regard, making only a definition of what SESA is in section 1.c. Would be helpful to clarify if during the consultation process, the importance of the SESA was explained to all involved stakeholders.
- Table of interventions on p. 37 is good but needs expansion

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Under component 1 b, all important elements that had been requested by the TAP to be improved have been addressed.

Component 1c:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- A comprehensive plan for moving forward with consultations, with target groups and objectives, is presented here together with a more detailed table of activities, responsibilities, locations, and time frame. The R-PP recognizes the need to undertake further and deeper work with the consultation process, including in SESA issues, during the R-PP process, or its earlier stages of implementation. It identifies the future target groups for further consultation, providing already some of the main objectives to be sought after to each group.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- Within the list of entities to be consulted in the future, besides the inclusion of Protected Areas managers, it is advisable to include ANAC (Administração Nacional das Áreas de Conservação – the new entity that from January 2012 will start overseeing the management of Mozambique's Protected Areas). This entity should be included not only in the consultation process, but take a greater involvement role within the REDD Working Group.
- There is no mention of mechanisms for conflict-resolution or for addressing grievances regarding consultations/ participation in the REDD process. It is recommended to include a plan in the R-PP how to establish such a mechanism during the strategy development process.
- The issue of accessing accurate data from government agencies and other stakeholders must be addressed.
- Consultation plan seems comprehensive but it would be useful to provide information about how the inputs have been incorporated into on-going planning and also provide ways to access accurate data from government agencies and other stakeholders.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 1c: includes a comprehensive plan for moving forward with the consultations in the R-PP implementation phase, additions made in the current draft are useful and address, at least partly, the comments made by the TAP

Component 2a:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- This section summarizes well the state of forestry issues, and provides an excellent SWOT analysis of the key policies and legislation. The assessment of governance in under the five World Bank pillars is also comprehensive. There is a very good summary of the drivers of deforestation and degradation and a useful chart of the indirect drivers on page 61. The R-PP provides information and data regarding the current land use trends in the country, making use of tables with figures and maps. This is a very good basis, nevertheless it could be further revised and improved.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- There is very limited information and data on the impacts of shift of settlement patterns, and growth of population. It could provide further data such as for example the rate of population growth in Mozambique, and which Provinces/districts have registered, in the past years the fastest population growth and how it may constitute a potential risk for further Deforestation and Degradation.
- It would be useful to provide additional data and information about illegal mining and timber trade occurring in the country. Ongoing studies would help provide additional data on these components.
- Coverage of policies in sectors other than forestry are critical for understanding the DD components. Typically, the policies in energy, agricultural and tourism sectors can play an important role in slowing and arresting DD.
- Be more clear on impacts of tenure insecurity to deforestation, in one hand how local farmers have their land rights secured, and on other how the state guarantees security to land tenures (e.g. clearing for agricultural lands into State Forest Reserves are clearly occurring and cannot be controlled by relevant authorities – how to address this?).
- The analysis of DD drivers is very brief, with little analysis of their relative contribution to forest cover change, their actors and their motivations (why do they deforest/degrade, incl. underlying causes). Agriculture is not mentioned at all, although it is a key driver as also identified by Mozambique's R-PIN.
- Compilation of all available work done will minimize the cost and enrich future assessment works. For instance, no mention was found of any successfully implemented PAM in the past.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 2a: excellent analysis which contains a huge amount of interesting information well presented. Good additions and explanations made, in particular new Table 15. Budget still need to be prepared. Although not comprehensively, most of the major comments of the TAP have been addressed

Component 2b:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- This section deals with the interventions needed for addressing drivers of deforestation and degradation - the chart on page 64 is helpful. A summary table of activities is presented that is a good start on what needs to be done. The distribution of pilot areas for testing models and systems for REDD+ delivery covers the main driver issues. The R-PP provides reference to some of the national strategies and plans for reducing poverty and addressing agriculture development issues, and lists some options for addressing direct and indirect drivers.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- This section requires much further work. The R-PP does not make any reference to the existing draft REDD+ National Strategy and its alignment with the identified drivers.
- This section mentions several interventions to address DD drivers. However, this is done very briefly.

Additional information is needed on how the adoption/implementation of these interventions would be actually achieved/incentivized (given that past policies have reportedly been characterized by little consequent enforcement).

- There is no proposal/mention of how to estimate costs and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy (i.e. who bears the costs of REDD? who would be winners and losers of REDD). It is suggested to plan for this and build this exercise on the results of the analysis of DD drivers to identify priorities. So derived information on costs and benefits of alternative options to address these drivers will be relevant for the ultimate choice and design of adequate REDD interventions and incentives, including the B/S mechanism.
- There is no analysis of synergies or inconsistencies of relevant country sector strategies. It is suggested to plan for this activity, which could for example be similar to the SWOT analysis presented in component 2a, in the readiness phase.
- There is no discussion on how to assess the risk of domestic leakage although the topic is discussed upon in component 3 (reference levels).
- Geographic distribution of pilot areas seems sensible, but more detail on these would be helpful – are they fully REDD+ focused or remaining from previous studies?

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

Component 2b: as the TAP mentioned in its report, this section requires much further work. The R-PP does not make any reference to the existing draft REDD+ National Strategy and its alignment with the identified drivers. A number of recommendations have been met by the TAP to improve this chapter. They still need to be addressed.

Component 2c:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- The analysis of financing for REDD+ is reasonable, but there are few details on monitoring performance and managing conflict. The R-PP makes reference to one of the outcomes of the initial consultation processes referred to in standard 1, being the drafting of a background paper on the possible increase in linkages between carbon rights and customary land tenure. This is quite positive as it illustrates the feedbacks of those consultation workshops into the R-PP development process. It suggests the implementation of REDD + in a diversity of forest types, including Protected Areas. As such, it reinforces the comments provided in standards 1.a and 1.c, of inclusion of MITUR and ANAC as one of the main stakeholders in this process, since they are responsible for the management of Protected Areas in the country (including finding funding mechanisms). It identifies Zambézia Province as a pilot area for mapping, carbon stock determination, assessment of extractive industries and impacts on land use. This is also positive as it shows alignment with the main issues highlighted in standard 2.a, where Zambézia appeared as one of the main areas of concern.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- This section needs to be improved, providing a more detailed proposed work plan that clarifies what activities will be undertaken to further elaborate the institutional arrangements and issues.
- Issues to be further discussed could include how REDD+ revenues will be managed at sub-national levels, how to motivate private sector and communities for REDD+ implementation, and redesign financing mechanisms to ensure that benefit to communities can be delivered through higher priority REDD+ interventions.
- Currently the section has few details on monitoring performance and managing conflict. Additional information on these topics would improve its viability.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 2c: some useful additional information is given (e.g. on intervention areas), but main comments by the TAP still need to be addressed.

Component 2d:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- SESA and ESMF are addressed, with recognition that additional expertise will be needed. A short outline of how the SESA process will be followed is presented, as well as list of the institutions that should play a role. This all makes sense, but some more thought and detail is required here to ensure that there is a full understanding of the process.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- The R-PP makes reference to existing standards on SESA and EIAs in the country, but it would be useful for the section to distill lessons learned from these past experiences to prepare a better informed REDD proposal.
- Inclusion of a proposed work program to develop the SESA would also strengthen its implementation potential.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 2d: It is still recommended to add some information on lessons learned from these past experiences to prepare a better informed REDD proposal and to include work program to develop the SESA

Component 3:

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- This is a good analysis of the work that has been done on inventories and other measurements, and there is an understanding of the importance of studies at a subnational level. Specific data needs have been identified, and a variety of REDD+ options at the subnational level are listed. There is also a useful section on human capacity needs. The principal interventions needed by the end of 2012 are presented, and these make sense in general.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- Clear TORs are lacking, and there needs to be a work plan and budget with identified interim performance indicators and ways to address them. Using the general list of activities, the first task here is to develop a flow chart with a timeline and list of outcomes. The workflow plans developed for the neighboring countries of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda would be useful to examine for relevance to Mozambique. The Mozambique-Brazil cooperation sponsored by Norway could be a good source of expertise and advice. Also, a good example of interim performance indicators for both reference level and MRV has been prepared by Guyana as part of the agreement for the Guyana-Norway REDD+ Investment Fund (GRIF).
- It is very important to include policy and governance variables in the setting up of scenarios. Changes in these two items can drastically alter future DD scenarios from climbing emissions values to declining ones. Both should be noted in the text and included the scenario assessments.
- The draft is not clear about who will be responsible for conducting the analysis. This should be

explicitly mentioned in the text.

- The draft R-PP identifies capacity-building needs (for data and information collection and processing) especially at provincial level. To avoid shortcomings, it is recommended to conduct a needs assessment (what is required) not only in terms of quality (technical knowledge), but also in terms of quantity (how many people) at national and sub-national level so as to avoid any capacity shortcomings later on.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 3: Useful additions in respect to the inputs made by the Japanese grant complements the information set, but major comments made by the TAP yet not addressed.

Component 4a

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 submission:

- The R-PP provides a proposal and work plan 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.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- There is no overall discussion of a TOR for MRV, how the MRV will be designed, how it will operate, and how it will deliver what is required for Mozambique to enter REDD+. The general statements need to be accompanied by specific TORs and a strategy for implementation - a work plan with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties - as well as a budget for the various implementing components. The workflow plans developed for the neighboring countries of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda would be useful to examine for relevance to Mozambique.
- Work plan for initial design (stepwise basis) of MRV is not provided. It is suggested to orient work plan for the design of the MRV system on results of the analysis of DD drivers as only the latter will reveal for what activities MRV is needed (e.g. it will be different for monitoring degradation versus deforestation etc.), and possibly on which areas in the country MRV needs to focus on.
- Transparency of MRV system, participatory approaches, and independent review are topics that are not discussed in the current document and should be addressed in the next version.
- Excellent analysis of the causes of forest cover change (could be moved to Component 2 if more appropriate there), and informative list of the technical capacity of various institutions. Needs a road map and interim performance indicators for MRV – see neighboring countries and what has been done by Guyana, particularly for the Guyana REDD Investment Fund (GRIF). Brazil can help here, as in Component 3.

Component 4b:

- The R-PP refers to other national census programs with which the MRV should align itself. This is good practice, strengthening the need for intersectoral coordination. Such data could be considered in assessing co-benefits of REDD+.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- It states the importance of determining multiple benefits, but it is not clear on the strategy it will be

used to deliver this. What activities are proposed for integrating multiple benefits, impacts and governance issues within the monitoring system?

- Considering proposing some initial indicators (that could be organized into Environmental, Socio-Economic and Governance).
- Is there data on migration? The R-PP had identified in previous component the influence of migration (including from neighboring countries) in deforestation – possibly a useful indicator of deforestation pressure?
- How to monitor Governance issues? Consider expanding the work in this, taking advantage of the good description on governance issues done in component 2.a.
- Present a clear work plan for designing the Monitoring System, taking into account the national level monitoring, sub-national and local
- A budget needs to be developed. Needs more detail and a work plan

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission:

- Components 4, 5 and 6 have not yet been revised by the submitting agency.

In Summary,

R-PP Components	Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission	Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission
Component 1 a)	Standard partially met	Standard largely met though text could be shortened and streamlined considerably. This might need to be done when preparing the final R-PP
Component 1 b)	Standard partially met	Standard met; again, also because of the EPs request, the text became more lengthy. It is recommendable to streamline the text as much as possible
Component 1 c)	Standard partially met	Standard partially met, remains so, as the budget and some other missing elements need to be added
Component 2 a)	Standard partially met	Standard largely met. Budget missing
Component 2 b)	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 2 c)	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 2 d)	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 3	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 4	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 5	Standard not met	Standard not met
Component 6	Standard not met	Standard not 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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission :

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

with The R-PP builds on the RPPIN that Mozambique had submitted in March, 2008 with support from the Norwegian government. In Southern Africa, Mozambique is one of the few countries besides Zambia and Angola substantial forest cover and would do well to participate in the REDD Process. It also the largest portion along the East Africa Coast, of East Africa's Coastal Forests, which are quite unique in their high levels of endemic species and the largest populations of the highly endangered African Blackwood (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*).

Comment: Overall, this section is well prepared and the proposed REDD+ structure has most of the members that would constitute a complete group. It is encouraging to note that the ministries include those of agriculture, energy, finance, and science and technology among several others. As the R-PP notes in a later section deforestation and degradation results in part because of differences in policies and programs of energy and forestry, and agriculture and forestry ministries. Regular coordination among ministry officials of these and other ministries with overlapping mandates will help in establishing laws and practices to overcome the differences. It also draws a diagram on the articulation between the different stakeholders, including with high political levels. This is useful to show how the flow of decision making will occur. It sets out a structure for creating a Technical Unit for REDD+ (UT-REDD), which will also be represented at sub-national levels. The South-South Collaboration with a Brazilian institution presents a promising initiative for learning and knowledge sharing.

Overall, the proposed set up looks very promising and is likely to effective in managing the REDD+ program. There are several specific issues noted by the reviewers, and described below, that will help improve the proposed management structure.

- The existing structure must be strengthened to integrate REDD instead of creating a new one. For instance the MICOA mandate is to coordinate all issues related to environment, MINAG among other items has responsibility to allocate land and forest to communities, private sector and individuals, CONDES can continue playing their consultative role, and academia can play the role on training, research and monitoring. Most important is each intervenient must be clear about how REDD will be integrated on the existing structure, the role each one will play, and coordination mechanism will be established.
- Since CONDES was established in 2000, it should be possible to know more about its performance over the past 10 years. So derived lessons learned could then inform whether any adjustments are needed for more effective cross-sectoral policy-making for REDD in practice.
- The R-PP states that "CONDES as the overarching body will also ensure that good governance in management of resources as well as environmental and social safeguards are implemented". Over the past years there has been some criticisms regarding the actual effectiveness and influence of this consultative body. It would be good to include examples of important strategic decisions that this body has already made and/or influenced, and how to ensure that when the time comes for hard/important decisions regarding REDD+, it will act with promptness and robustness.
- It states (pg 17) that the UT-REDD+ will replace the current REDD Working Group. However, both in the organigramme in pg 18, as well as in the text in pg 19, it states that the intent is for the REDD Working Group to be formalized into a Technical Review Committee. This needs to be clarified. Will

the UT-REDD+ temporarily replace the Working Group just for the preparedness implementation phase, until the Technical Review Committee is formalized? If so, how will it guarantee the engagement of cross sector, multi stakeholder nature that currently exists in the Working Group within that phase?

- Not clear how reports or recommendations from the National REDD+ Council will influence or guide decisions on the ground. For example, if there is a recommendation from the National REDD+ Council regarding a change in land-use plan to facilitate a REDD+ initiative in a certain district, who will take the responsibility of acting in that regard? The Ministers that sit in CONDES? Which one? Will it flow to Provincial level and from there to District level? Who will be responsible for it? Who guarantees that the decision transforms into action? The UT-REDD+?
- Not clear how the UT-REDD+ will articulate with the Technical Review Committee.
- Given (i) the required technical capacity proposed for the Technical REDD Unit, and (ii) the legal/political authority and technical capacity of MINAG over various REDD relevant themes (agriculture, biofuels, forestry, tenure/DUATs, forest inventory - as well capacities needed for REDD MRV, see also component 4), the rationale for allocating this Unit under MICOA's instead of MINAGs authority is not clear.
- The draft R-PP reports limited commitment by other invited institutions (not specified) to engage in the REDD process. A clarification why involvement was limited (lacking interest?, excessive workload?, perceived political competition?, too last minute scheduling of meetings?) could help define strategies for greater involvement and commitment from other key sectors and actors.
- The current REDD Working Group (consisting of national and external actors) is proposed to be formalized as Technical Review Committee. External expertise (as currently present in the REDD Working Group) can be beneficial. Yet in the long run, to ensure national ownership, it may be useful to engage more national expertise (national research institutions, NGOs, think tanks) in such a Committee.
- The proposed constellation of the Technical REDD Unit (UT-REDD+) could benefit from at least one environmental economist (to assist in the design/implementation of incentive mechanisms).

This sub-section 1a partially meets the standard. Addressing the aforementioned questions and comments will help it to meet the standard.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission:

- Very detailed review and updating of component 1 a, based on the TAPs' recommendations.

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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

The planning for and the implementation of the consultation process seems to have been comprehensive, there has been a useful dialogue, and there is a useful list of the results, frequent questions, and pilot areas for focus. The process of identification of stakeholders has been ongoing since 2008, which allowed building a list of main stakeholders and identifying primary and secondary actors as well as service providers. It lists the main principles that were adopted for the consultation process, providing examples of some initiatives that were undertaken to involve regional level participants, from Government, to NGOs and private sector. - An engagement of sub-national stakeholders, especially local communities, seems to have occurred

relatively early on in the REDD process. Although 1-2 days workshops are probably too short for effective consultations, this effort is positive considering that accessibility of the hinterland of Mozambique is difficult and costly. This is a good start.

Comments:

- The R-PP shows the past experience of the country in conducting consultation initiatives when developing new programs, projects or regulations, but it also recognizes some shortfalls in that process, especially regarding type and format of the information disseminated, as well as time allocated to discussions. This is a good short analysis of the concerns of the consultation process; however it is not clear how the R-PP has taken those learnt lessons into its consultation process.
- The process of consultation included workshops, interviews and meetings. A total of five regional workshops were conducted in the country, where participation from Government (central, provincial and district levels) as well as private sector, NGOs, and in some cases community representation. However, the R-PP does not include a list with the names of the main organizations that attended the workshops, nor it gives an indication to the number of participants in the workshops. Where possible include a table or list of the main organizations that attended the workshops, with the number of participants.
- The R-PP lists the main questions and inputs received from stakeholders during the consultation process, and it will be important for the R-PP to show how this will be addressed or taken into account in further consultation and participation processes.
- From the results and issues that derived from the consultations it seems that it did include discussion of issues resulted with SESA, however the R-PP is not clear in this regard, making only a definition of what SESA is in section 1.c. Clarify if during the consultation process, the importance of the SESA was explained to all involved stakeholders.
- The R-PP also states that awareness raising and training was conducted in the provinces to build the basic necessary knowledge to help move the REDD+ process forward. However, it does not include a list of the provinces where this took place, who participated, and the topics addressed. An inclusion of such information would provide greater evidence on the efforts that have so far been undertaken in the consultation and awareness process.
- It also seems that no or very limited promotional materials were produced in this stage, as only in component 1.c. it makes reference to the need in future to develop such materials. This supports the recognition in component 1.c. for greater efforts on the consultation process, if not in the preparation of the R-PP; it should be integrated in the initial stages of its implementation.
- Training and capacity building programs proposed in pg 37 needs to be aligned with the capacity building proposed in component 1.a pg 25.
- The development of conflict resolution mechanism is not addressed at this stage, and it is expected to be addressed during the development of the R-PP. Possibly reflect on the inclusion of conflict resolution mechanisms at different levels (local vs. national).
- Consultations information sharing must be part of the existing governance channel and mechanisms including different levels plans. For instance government officials at local and provincial level, NGOs local represented, private sector and community representatives must be trained to propagate information as part of their plans and routine as already happening with HIV. Experiences must be learn from other programs and initiatives campaigns ;
- Documentaries are very important vehicle to disseminate information and awareness at community level because this kind of event attract almost everyone including ages, gender and socio-economic status;
- District Administrators, and key government department local represented must be aware and lead the process taking in account that the district is the Development Nucleus.
- This section finishes with a table of "Interventions" on page 37 that lists activities, responsibility, location and time target - all very helpful, but needs fleshing out, as does the budget on page 38 that is labeled "to be further developed."

This sub-section 1b partially meets the standard. Addressing the aforementioned questions and comments will help it to meet the standard.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Under component 1 b, all important elements that had been requested by the TAP to be improved have been addressed.

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

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission

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

A comprehensive plan for moving forward with consultations, with target groups and objectives, is presented here together with a more detailed table of activities, responsibilities, locations, and time frame. The R-PP recognizes the need to undertake further and deeper work with the consultation process, including in SESA issues, during the R-PP process, or its earlier stages of implementation. It identifies the future target groups for further consultation, providing already some of the main objectives to be sought after to each group.

Comments:

- Within the list of entities to be consulted in the future, besides the inclusion of Protected Areas managers, it is advisable to include ANAC (Administração Nacional das Áreas de Conservação - the new entity that from January 2012 will start overseeing the management of Mozambique's Protected Areas). This entity should be included not only in the consultation process, but take a greater involvement role within the REDD Working Group.
- It is not clear how the process will consider the feedback or issues arising from the consultations, as well as ensuring accountability during awareness-building and consultations.
- The ownership of the R-PP among other stakeholders is not so clear in the document and it could be made more evident than it seems
- The draft R-PP provides an extensive list of stakeholder to be consulted during the readiness phase. It may be more effective to target the consultations to key stakeholders identified from an analysis of priority areas for REDD+ interventions. In other words, rather than consulting with everyone

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).

(which entails the risk of becoming counterproductive at some point), it is suggested to invest in a thorough analysis to identify adequate REDD+ interventions (based on an analysis of DD drivers and underlying causes) and then target the consultations to the associated stakeholders.

- As the process moves forward, it is suggested to also reach out to the general public (e.g. through public lectures/events, via newspaper articles and other media channels such as Internet). So far, there is little-to-absent public information or debate on the topic. A greater media debate on the subject has the potential to increase interest and associated (private) efforts of capacity-building and engagement (e.g. other NGOs, business associations, research groups).
- There is no mention of mechanisms for conflict-resolution or for addressing grievances regarding consultations/ participation in the REDD process. It is recommended to include a plan in the R-PP how to establish such a mechanism during the strategy development process.
- The issue of accessing *accurate data* from government agencies and other stakeholders must be addressed.

The budget table is still under development, so for this section the standard is partially met.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 1c: includes a comprehensive plan for moving forward with the consultations in the R-PP implementation phase, additions made in the current draft are useful and address, at least partly, the comments made by the TAP

Component 2. Prepare the REDD 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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

This section summarizes well the state of forestry issues, and provides an excellent SWOT analysis of the key policies and legislation. The assessment of governance in under the five World Bank pillars is also comprehensive. There is a very good summary of the drivers of deforestation and degradation and a useful chart of the indirect drivers on page 61. The R-PP provides information and data regarding the current land use trends in the country, making use of tables with figures and maps. This is a very good basis, nevertheless it could be further revised and improved.

- On pg 46, the R-PP says that there are 167 timber concessionaires, and on pg 55 it refers to 179 forest concessions - is there a need to revise the numbers or do they refer to different types of concessions?
- On pg 55 in pillar "Coherence of forest legislation and rule of law", line 7, it makes reference to a table below that will illustrate that only 106 of 179 forest concessionaires have the requisite necessary. However, the table presented below, in pg 56, provides an indication of licensed volume of timber extracted with Forest Concessions and Simple Licenses versus the Allowable Annual Cut. Nevertheless, this is an interesting table that provides evidence that the annual extraction reaches only a third of the annual allowable cut, and would probably deserve a reference in the text.
- On pg 45, the R-PP indicates that there are about 54.8 million ha of Forest and Wooded land in the country, however table in pg 56, indicates a number of 48.9 million ha in 2002. The numbers are provided from the same source (i.e. Marzoli, 2007). Is 54.8 million referring to 2007? Was it a projection for 2011, made in that study? If so, does it mean an average annual growth of about 600

thousand ha of forest and wooded land in the past 10 years? But the same table in pg 56 indicates a decrease of forest and wooded land from 1990 to 2002. This requires a revision, either in the numbers, or, if the numbers are correct, in the text/table.

- The R-PP makes a very good analysis of the conventions, policies and legislation and its potential impact in the implementation of the REDD+ in the country. It includes some earlier identification of gaps and issues that will require attention and this should be summarized in a table format to make it easier to draft an action plan to address them.
- The main drivers seem to be identified, however additional depth should be given to the analysis of the causes, manifestation and trends. Possibly separate into two sections the direct and indirect drivers for Deforestation from Degradation, to facilitate the understanding of causes and trends of each.
- The R-PP refers to the two main forest covers in Mozambique as being Miombo and Mopani woodlands. Are the drivers/causes for Deforestation and Degradation the same for Miombo and Mopani? Or could there be more specific drivers that affect each?
- There is very limited information and data on the impacts of shift of settlement patterns, and growth of population. It could provide further data such as for example the rate of population growth in Mozambique, and which Provinces/districts have registered, in the past years the fastest population growth and how it may constitute a potential risk for further Deforestation and Degradation.
- What about uncontrolled expansion of small-scale and illegal mining as a driver? Does it not contribute to deforestation and degradation of land? (E.g. see areas in the buffer of Gorongosa National Park, in Chimanimani National Reserve, in Niassa National Reserve, in Chipange Chetu Community Area)?
- It makes reference to some illegal timber trade occurring in the country, however, if possible it should try and provide further data on this. For example, there is an ongoing study on illegal timber trade between Mozambique and Tanzania, by Traffic and WWF.
- Are there any past lessons that could provide inputs on management of forests and wooded land in the country to help reduce D&D?
- Organize the additional studies/assessments that are suggested within the different sections of the text into a single section at the end, which may guide drafting the future activities for the project.
- The R-PP does slightly address some extrasectoral issues, however it probably deserves to be more stressed in this component, as for example it is very much probable that one of the main causes of the problem of deforestation is not just unsustainable harvesting of trees for firewood and charcoal, but a link with the impacts of policies of other sectors (e.g. energy). Pg 54 makes a short reference to this.
- The R-PP should try to mention and analyze if there is any already existing conflict resolution mechanisms or structures that are used in the forest sector. (e.g. in component 1b, pg 32, it makes reference to conflicts in Niassa province that were identified during a workshop in April 2010.).
- The R-PP mentions the experience of the 20% revenues as one of the benefit sharing mechanisms in place, with the provision of some of the values been received and issues. However, there has been a recent study commissioned to look at the 20% in the country, and it would be advisable to make reference to some of the main issues. It could also provide indication of other experiences of benefit sharing regimes already existent in the forest and natural resources sector (e.g. Nhambita Project).
- The list of main interventions limits to mapping exercises and land, research and dissemination of technologies. There needs to be well articulated set of activities that will address the gaps identified and be able to better understand the impacts of the key drivers of Deforestation and Degradation and help to facilitate the implementation of REDD+ in the country.
- Be more clear on impacts of tenure insecurity to deforestation, in one hand how local farmers have their land rights secured, and on other how the state guarantees security to land tenures (e.g. clearing for agricultural lands into State Forest Reserves are clearly occurring and cannot be controlled by relevant authorities - how to address this?).
- Land use trends: With only two data points (def rates 1972-1990, 1990-2002), the quantitative information base on forest cover change is rather weak. To improve the information base on current land use/ cover, as well as on trends (change), it is recommended to plan (in the readiness phase) for obtaining higher resolution data from remote sensing analysis (incl. of past up to 10 years), at

least for areas/districts where DD activity is assumed highest.

- Direct and indirect drivers of DD in most relevant sectors: The analysis of DD drivers is very brief, with little analysis of their relative contribution to forest cover change, their actors and their motivations (why do they deforest/degrade, incl. underlying causes). Agriculture is not mentioned at all, although it is a key driver as also identified by Mozambique's R-PIN. Later in the draft R-PP, cross-border drivers of DD are mentioned (in the context of leakage) yet these remain absent in the discussion here. The spatial disaggregation of relevant information is limited to the province level. To allow for more targeted design of REDD policies and measures, a more detailed (spatially explicit) analysis of DD drivers and underlying causes is recommended. Such an analysis would also include how some drivers are working together, in tandem or in succession (such as mentioned for the case of logging roads and subsequent entry of fuel wood collectors).
- Tenure and rights: Little analysis was found on the aspect of tenure and rights (beyond the SWOT analysis), although additional information is provided under 2c. For the design and choice of adequate REDD policies, it will be necessary to have a clear idea of what types of rights exist de-jure (by law) and de-facto (applied in practice). For example, if rights are still largely leniently enforced (such as suggested in the SWOT analysis), PES-type carbon payments (such as also suggested) may not necessarily be the appropriate policy choice in the short run.
- Past success/failure of PAMs addressing DD: There seems to exist an implicit assumption that the majority of existing policies and strategies are sufficient to address DD if consequently enforced. At the same time, no mention was found of any successfully implemented PAM in the past. To identify avenues (incl. possibly more effective policy measures) to address the challenge of 'weak policy implementation/enforcement', it may be useful determine to which extent lenient enforcement is due to 'lacking capacity' versus 'lacking willingness' and the reasons therefore.
- Identify gaps/challenges/opportunities: The SWOT analysis provides useful information on challenges and opportunities for mainly community-based natural resource use. For a more comprehensive overview, it may be good to expand this analysis to include other sector policies (agriculture, energy, and mining) and a 'gap'-analysis.
- There is no mention of studies already done such as forest inventories under forest concessions, forest inventories under GERFFA program, and vegetation and soil assessments under existing REDD/carbon sequestration projects. Compilation of all available work done will minimize the cost and enrich future assessment works;

Once a budget table has been completed, the standard will be met, but for now, the standard is only partially met.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

Component 2a: excellent analysis which contains a huge amount of interesting information well presented. Good additions and explanations made, in particular new Table 15. Budget still need to be prepared. Although not comprehensively, most of the major comments of the TAP have been addressed.

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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission

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

This section deals with the interventions needed for addressing drivers of deforestation and degradation - the chart on page 64 is helpful. A summary table of activities is presented that is a good start on what needs to be done. The distribution of pilot areas for testing models and systems for REDD+ delivery covers the main driver issues. The R-PP provides reference to some of the national strategies and plans for reducing poverty and addressing agriculture development issues, and lists some options for addressing direct and indirect drivers.

- This section, however, requires much further work. The R-PP does not make any reference to the existing draft REDD+ National Strategy and its alignment with the identified drivers.
- Is the development of performance indicators in pg 66 aligned with the identification of performance indicators in component 1.c, pg 43?
- It should be able to provide with clarity what strategy options it will use to develop a REDD+ Strategy, with a summary of each option, and the links between the strategy option and the causes/drivers of Deforestation and Degradation, and possibly even an inclusion of a roadmap towards the development of the final version of Mozambique's REDD+ Strategy.
- Revise language (one term in pg 63 was still in Portuguese)
- Uniform the document with regards to foreseen operationality and responsibility of the UT-REDD. In pg 37, most responsibility is deposited in REDD Working Group has it is assumed that UT-REDD will still not be in full operation. However, in pg 43, it proposes certain responsibilities under the UT-REDD (i.e. for sub-national issues), and in pg 66 majority of responsibilities are given to the UT-REDD.
- This section mentions several interventions to address DD drivers. However, this is done very briefly and there is little information on how the adoption/implementation of these interventions would be actually achieved/incentivized (given that past policies have reportedly been characterized by little consequent enforcement).
- There is no proposal/mention of how to estimate costs and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy (i.e. who bears the costs of REDD? who would be winners and losers of REDD). It is suggested to plan for this and build this exercise on the results of the analysis of DD drivers to identify priorities. So derived information on costs and benefits of alternative options to address these drivers will be relevant for the ultimate choice and design of adequate REDD interventions and incentives, including the B/S mechanism.
- There is no analysis of synergies or inconsistencies of relevant country sector strategies. It is suggested to plan for this activity, which could for example be similar to the SWOT analysis presented in component 2a, in the readiness phase.
- There is no discussion on how to assess the risk of domestic leakage although the topic is discussed upon in component 3 (reference levels).

The budget table is yet to be developed, as in the earlier sections. The Standard for 2b is partially met. Additional information should be collected and put together to address the above questions and comments to the extent data are available.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

Component 2b: as the TAP mentioned in its report, this section requires much further work. The R-PP does not make any reference to the existing draft REDD+ National Strategy and its alignment with the identified drivers. A number of recommendations have been met by the TAP to improve this chapter. They still need to be addressed.

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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

The analysis of financing for REDD+ is reasonable, but there are few details on monitoring performance and managing conflict. The R-PP makes reference to one of the outcomes of the initial consultation processes referred to in standard 1, being the drafting of a background paper on the possible increase in linkages between carbon rights and customary land tenure. This is quite positive as it illustrates the feedbacks of those consultation workshops into the R-PP development process. It suggests the implementation of REDD + in a diversity of forest types, including Protected Areas. As such, it reinforces the comments provided in standards 1.a and 1.c, of inclusion of MITUR and ANAC as one of the main stakeholders in this process, since they are responsible for the management of Protected Areas in the country (including finding funding mechanisms). It identifies Zambézia Province as a pilot area for mapping, carbon stock determination, assessment of extractive industries and impacts on land use. This is also positive as it shows alignment with the main issues highlighted in standard 2.a, where Zambézia appeared as one of the main areas of concern.

Comments:

- Since there are issues that are cross-sectoral as referred the R-PP refers to in previous standards (e.g. with energy sector), it is vital for the framework to show how it will address inter-sectoral coordination and resolution of potential conflicts.
- It presents a few scenarios in regards to benefit sharing, but recognizes the need for further and deeper discussions during the preparedness phase. It shows a diagram of funding being channeled to the UT-REDD+, however, pg 35 states that the Ministry of Finance will be the entity managing the REDD+ funding at national level, and the District Consultative Councils and district level. During the further discussions that will be held, the roles of each stakeholder regarding the revenues and funding management needs to be clarified.
- This section needs to be improved, providing a more detailed proposed work plan that clarifies what activities will be undertaken to further elaborate the institutional arrangements and issues.
- Issues to be further discussed could also include how REDD+ revenues will be managed at sub-national levels. Standard 1a. pointed to three possible options for sub-national representation, which will most probably address issue this as well.
- Align the activities proposed with the ones in component 1.c., with regards to private sector role, analysis of legislation, benefit sharing.
- The financing mechanism seems to suggest that communities will be the key target group for REDD incentives. It is suggested to revisit the design and orientation of the financing mechanism (as well as the proposed %-financing streams) upon a detailed analysis of DD drivers and underlying causes needed to identify priority REDD interventions.
- Identified key issues include: rights, financing, performance payments. However, the discussion excludes the governance challenges of actual implementation. For example, a proposal how carbon rights could be defined is presented, but it falls short to discuss the problem of lenient implementation/ enforcement of land rights (as for example identified as persistent problem in the SWOT analysis under 2a). This component could benefit from including such an assessment.
- Maybe polemic but to motivate private sector and communities to implement REDD+ they must have benefits. I think to achieve the goals must be done trough business as usual. On the other words private or community enterprise has to pay tax or royalty to government as timber tax paid by loggers and all profits generated shared with local community according to effort/level of involvement. Part of the tax/royalty paid to government must be oriented to strengthen law

enforcement teams, extension services, MRV, technology and other needs.

The activity chart is a good start, but the budget table is yet to be developed. Standard partially met.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 2c: some useful additional information is given (e.g. on intervention areas), but main comments by the TAP still need to be addressed.

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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

SESA and ESMF are addressed, with recognition that additional expertise will be needed. A short outline of how the SESA process will be followed is presented, as well as list of the institutions that should play a role. This all makes sense, but some more thought and detail is required here to ensure that there is a full understanding of the process.

Comments:

- Although the R-PP recognizes the need to further develop the section, it makes reference to existing standards on SESA and EIAs in the country, and could thus include a brief indication of the main standards it is required to comply with. It could also distill lessons learned from these past experiences to thus develop more informed proposals for the context of REDD.
- It could also include a proposed work program to develop the SESA.
- Pg 73 states that WWF is "responsible for the establishment and management of protected areas". Possibly correct this statement, providing a clearer indication of the support WWF has provided for the establishment and management of some protected areas in the country. The establishment of Protected Areas in Mozambique is the sole responsibility of the Council of Ministers.
- Align the activities proposed on the undertaking of SESA with the ones in component 1.a, pg 25, and component 1.c, pg 44

A very short activities table is presented, along with a budget table that needs to be developed. Standard partially met.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- **Component 2d: It is still recommended to add some information on lessons learned from these past experiences to prepare a better informed REDD proposal and to include work program to develop the SESA**

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.)

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

This is a good analysis of the work that has been done on inventories and other measurements, and there is an understanding of the importance of studies at a subnational level. Specific data needs have been identified, and a variety of REDD+ options at the subnational level are listed. There is also a useful section on human capacity needs. The principal interventions needed by the end of 2012 are presented, and these make sense in general.

Existing forest inventories at national and subnational level exist but are viewed too coarse for REDD. There is no comprehensive inventory of biomass or forest carbon stocks. In turn, the draft R-PP suggests to initially use IPCC emission factors to estimate carbon stocks for different forest types, and move to Tier 2 methods once data on carbon stocks for Mozambique are more developed. This approach sounds reasonable.

The draft R-PP seems to suggest a projected baseline. Although more complex in terms of required scenario building, the approach may indeed be adequate for Mozambique's country context characterized (i) by few data points and (ii) in which the use of historical baselines would be misleading (probably underestimating DD rates) in the face of almost 30 years of civil conflict (until 1992) and only recent recovery.

Data needs: The draft R-PP identifies data needs which could be complemented by (i) time-series remote sensing data to complement the currently only two data points on forest cover change and (ii) targeted identification of variables (socio-economic and bio-physical) for scenario building for the development of projected reference levels.

Linkage with 2a, 2b and 4: in reference to the existing of cross-border drivers of forest cover change (although not mentioned in section 2a), the draft R-PP suggests explicit accounting for cross-border leakage and suggests leakage assessments during the readiness phase which make sense.

Comments:

- Clear TORs are lacking, and there needs to be a work plan and budget with identified interim performance indicators and ways to address them. Using the general list of activities, the first task here is to develop a flow chart with a timeline and list of outcomes. The workflow plans developed for the neighboring countries of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda would be useful to examine for relevance to Mozambique. The Mozambique-Brazil cooperation sponsored by Norway could be a good source of expertise and advice. Also, a good example of interim performance indicators for both reference level and MRV has been prepared by Guyana as part of the agreement for the Guyana-Norway REDD+ Investment Fund (GRIF).
- Is the historical data from 1970 to 1990 sufficient or is there a need to deepener and expand this assessment to include further analysis with other years (e.g. 1995, 2000, 2005). If so, what software/tools would be required, and products expected (e.g. national map of past deforestation

and degradation between the various periods for the various types of forest covers and woodlands).

- It makes reference that the historical rates will be adjusted to estimate current rates, based on knowledge of sectoral plans and their location to determine impact on forest cover. What tools and techniques' are used in this process? Will it make use of satellite imagery? What type of imagery, analyzed by what software? Will it include other variables such as estimating carbon pools, aboveground biomass carbon stocks, etc?
- How were the variables for projecting deforestation identified?
- Since the R-PP mentions the presidential campaign of one "pupil, one tree", and "one leader, one forest", should it not consider the inclusion of a variable such as policy and governance, as one with potential to impact on the success or failure in achieving the objectives of avoided deforestation and degradation? A new industrial policy can bring about sudden and significant change to rates of deforestation.
- The R-PP indicates that studies will be done in sub-national areas; this is a good approach, making a linkage with components 2.a., as drivers of deforestation and degradation are not homogenous in the country.
- However, the document could further elaborate the steps it will take to develop reference level in both national and sub-national levels and with it the required capacity to achieve each step.
- The reference of inclusion of REDD+ impacts in the national economic development scenarios and statistics is very good, and in line with the need for inter-sectoral coordination, as referred in previous components.
- Not clear who will be responsible to conducting the analysis. It makes reference to provincial staff from the National Directorate of Land and Forestry, with possible involvement of academic and research institutions. Who will be responsible to coordinate and make sure this activity will occur according to the necessary standards? The UT-REDD+? The REDD Working Group?
- Current capacity and capacity needs: The draft R-PP identifies capacity-building needs (for data and information collection and processing) especially at provincial level. To avoid shortcomings, it is recommended to conduct a needs assessment (what is required) not only in terms of quality (technical knowledge), but also in terms of quantity (how many people) as to avoid any capacity shortcomings later on. Such a needs assessment would also include technical material (computers, GIS systems etc.) at national and subnational level.
- Some figures need to be revised and/or carefully interpreted such as figures from Envirotrade/Plan Vivo project mentioned wrongly on the document. On the other hand they have used in some cases tc and on the other tCO2 which is not the same thing.

The proposal partially meets the standard set for Component 3. Addressing the above topics will help it to meet the standard set for this component.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

- Component 3: Useful additions in respect to the inputs made by the Japanese grant complements the information set, but major comments made by the TAP yet not addressed.

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:

The R-PP provides a proposal and work plan 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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

There is a good analysis of change of forest cover in various provinces here, as well as general discussions of sampling, monitoring periodicity, and monitoring, reporting, and verification issues. The R-PP describes the main objectives for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification and provides four very broad steps for its development. The list on page 88 and following of the causes of change of forest cover is valuable, and the table on page 95 is a useful summary of the technical capacity of various institutions. The Brazil-Mozambique cooperation could be very helpful for the MRV system design.

Comments:

- There is no overall discussion of a TOR for MRV, how the MRV will be designed, how it will operate, and how it will deliver what is required for Mozambique to enter REDD+. The general statements need to be accompanied by specific TORs and a strategy for implementation - a work plan with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties - as well as a budget for the various implementing components. The workflow plans developed for the neighboring countries of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda would be useful to examine for relevance to Mozambique.
- The four main R-PP objectives for MRV could be much further detailed, with indication of the necessary steps to deliver such a system.
- The R-PP recognizes the need to establish criteria to develop indicators for both national and sub-national levels, but it could further detail how this will be achieved (i.e. a strategy and work plan to deliver).
- It makes reference to current articles and reports on Carbon, the reviewer suggests also for the R-PP to look at the recent article by Shirima et al (2011)⁴, which provides some interesting estimates of carbon storage in Miombo woodlands using aboveground biomass and carbon storage of trees.
- The document makes a good summary of the existing capacity within the main stakeholders of the process, but it is not clear how the required capacity building will be developed. And since low qualifications and capacity, was identified as an indirect driver (pg 67), the R-PP should emphasize the capacity building element in the establishment of both the monitoring system as well as the reference levels.
- Work plan for initial design (stepwise basis) of MRV: not provided. It is suggested to orient work plan for the design of the MRV system on results of the analysis of DD drivers as only the latter will reveal

⁴ Shirima, D., et al. (2011). Carbon storage, structure and composition of miombo woodlands in Tanzania's Eastern Arc Mountains. African Journal of Ecology, 49:332-342.

for what activities MRV is needed (e.g. it will be different for monitoring degradation versus deforestation etc.), and possibly on which areas in the country MRV needs to focus on.

- Transparency of MRV system, participatory approaches, and independent review are topics that are not discussed in the current document and should be addressed in the next version.

At this point, the standard is only partially met.

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

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.)

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

- The R-PP refers to other national census programs with which the MRV should align itself. This is good practice, strengthening the need for intersectoral coordination. Such data could be considered in assessing co-benefits of REDD+.

Areas that still need to be improved:

- It states the importance of determining multiple benefits, but it is not clear on the strategy it will be used to deliver this. What activities are proposed for integrating multiple benefits, impacts and governance issues within the monitoring system?
- Considering proposing some initial indicators (that could be organized into Environmental, Socio-Economic and Governance).
- Is there data on migration? The R-PP had identified in previous component the influence of migration (including from neighboring countries) in deforestation - possibly a useful indicator of deforestation pressure?
- How to monitor Governance issues? Consider expanding the work in this, taking advantage of the good description on governance issues done in component 2.a.
- Present a clear work plan for designing the Monitoring System, taking into account the national level monitoring, sub-national and local
- A budget needs to be developed. Needs more detail and a work plan

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission:

- Components 4, 5 and 6 have not yet been revised by the submitting agency.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission:

Component 4 has not yet been revised by the submitting agency.

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, as well as from other international sources (e.g., UN-REDD or 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 readiness activities identified in the R-PP, or gaps in funding are clearly noted.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

Summary budget only - needs fleshing out to fully reflect the work proposed in previous sections.

Standard is thus not met.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

Component 5 has not yet been revised by the submitting agency.

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.

Initial TAP assessment of August 2011 R-PP submission:

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

This section has not been completed - this is work still in progress.

Standard is thus not met.

Final TAP assessment of September 2011 revised R-PP submission

Component 6 has not yet been revised by the submitting agency.