

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

**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: Honduras**

**Reviewers: Gisela Ulloa and James Baker**

**coordinating a TAP Review Team of total 4 members**

**Date of review: October, 2012**

**Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

**Introduction**

The TAP team completed an initial review of the informal draft of the Honduras R-PP, submitted to the FCPF for consideration of FCPF Participant Committee at PC13 in Brazzaville, and provided TAP comments to the R-PP development team in mid-September, 2012. The Honduras RPP has taken into consideration of TAP's recommendations and suggestions from February, 2012 and September, 2012 and has submitted another revised version of the R-PP. This revised version of the R-PP submitted at PC13 shows a clear improvement and better communicates the Honduran government and stakeholder's vision on how the REDD+ strategy will be developed in Honduras,

Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5 R-PP Review Template

therefore we recognize the great work done by the RPP team since last submission of the R-PP.

The Honduras TAP review process applies a classification scheme as follows:

- **Standard Met** (no further work needed to describe the actions proposed under this standard)
- **Standard Largely Met** (proposed work is acceptable, but can be enhanced with additional information)
- **Standard Partially Met** (some additional information is required before the proposed strategy fulfills the terms of the standard)
- **Standard Not Met** (information is incomplete and does not fulfill the terms of the standard)

The findings from the initial Honduras TAP reviews are summarized in the table below:

Standard	Informal R-PP January 25, 2012	Informal R-PP September, 2012	Informal R-PP October, 2012
1a. National Readiness Management Arrangements	Standard Partially Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
1b. Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Standard Largely Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
1c. Consultation and Participation Process	Standard Largely Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
2a. Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met	Standard Met
2b. REDD+ Strategy Options	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met
2c. Implementation Framework	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met
2d. Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Standard Not Met	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met
3. Reference Level	Standard Partially Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
4a. Monitoring - Emissions and Removals	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
4b. Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Standard Not Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
5. Schedule and Budget	Standard Not Met	Standard Largely Met	Standard Largely Met
6. Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Standard Not Met	Standard Largely Met	Standard Largely Met

Specific comments pertaining to each standard are included in the body of the TAP review, along

with concise summaries of the principal comments, observations, and requests made in the previous TAP review documents.

**Standards to be Met by R-PP Components**

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

**Component 1. Organize and Consult**

**Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:**

*The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process.*

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

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

The R-PP identifies a large number of stakeholders engaged in the development of the REDD strategy and presents an organizational design that aims to achieve greater participation in the preparation of the REDD strategy, explains clearly how the IPs will participate in the process and are part of the insitutiona arrangements. A smaller structure is developed to ensure decision making; It is also useful the decentralized structured that is aimed to reach local comunnities and local stakeholders.

- In order to facilitate decision-making process a Board of Directors is created consisting of eleven members: three from government, two from civil society, two from agroforestry organizations, two from private business sector and two from indigenous sector.
- The CICC, CTICC internal regulations and rules of procedure are included in Annex 2b.
- The CONPAH representatives are now part of the team that developed the RPP’s October version

**Conclusion: Standard Met**

**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:**

A very thorough consultation and information-sharing process appears to have been carried out in the preparation of the R-PP.

A dialogue with key stakeholders is initiated, mainly the indigenous sector represented by the MICC. It has established a roadmap to improve the dialogue and participation process.

The "Indigenous National Bureau of Climate Change" has been created and agreed, to coordinate with the REDD+ Subcommittee.

The current process is on a critical path of Political and technical dialogue between the Government and Indigenous and Afro-Honduran People, coordinated through the REDD+ Subcommittee and MNICC.

Initial capacity building needs were identified in the field of forest governance and transparency of REDD+ with indigenous sector and afrohondureño people. The training will cover the nine (9) identified indigenous peoples or nationalities in the country (one per village) and selected areas of the 16 regions of the country (with a maximum of eight areas), for a total of 17 workshops annually.

A institutional strengthening and training in the subregions of the country is proposed through the participation of the Regional Technical Units, existing regional and municipal authorities on key issues such as climate change management, sustainable management of forest resources, development projects and training tools.

For other non-indigenous sectors like agriculture the formalization of partnerships is raised to ensure full consultation and participation in the REDD + process.

Conflict resolution has been further addressed, and interaction with local governments and civil society organizations is further discussed in the revised version.

**Conclusion: Standard Met**

**Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process**

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

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

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

The current consultative process has succeeded in mobilizing the support of indigenous people, municipalities, civil society, government agencies and international cooperation. The legitimacy of the REDD Readiness Preparation Proposal appears to be fully recognized by all stakeholders.

The Conflict Resolution process described in the last version of the R-PP requires more clarification on which Governmental Institution will be responsible to carry out this process.

**Conclusion:** Standard Met

## Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

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

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

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

#### Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis

This R-PP evaluates the principal land uses and factors that trigger deforestation and forest degradation in key geographic areas that will affect the REDD + strategy.

The R-PP appropriately recognizes the key governance problems, including limitations and failures in implementing forest policies; agrarian reforms that have resulted in deforestation; and the weaknesses of the legal and institutional framework. The R-PP also acknowledges the lack of basic information necessary to accurately assess deforestation and degradation drivers, such as the national cadastre, and identifies opportunities to mitigate these constraints.

The R-PP identifies and includes data on deforestation rates and the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, including the inefficiency in forest policies; inter-sectoral conflict that negatively impact the forest sector; lack of legal framework to facilitate wider understanding and enforcement of existing policies; conflicts in land tenure; illegal logging; and insufficient human and material resources to support policy mandates, among other factors.

The R-PP describes these limitations in great detail, as well as the challenges to address REDD.

For this component, the TAP requested a regional-level analysis, and a prioritization of causes and drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in relation to other regional and national development priorities for Honduras.

For all of component 2, the revised R-PP has considerable new material, but it is more general than specific. There is very little mention how the major problems of illegal logging and governance are to be met in the real world of conflicts among private and public interests. There is not much here about previous or on-going cooperative ventures that have either failed or are not progressing; for example, the on-going discussions with the European Union about a Voluntary Partnership Agreement that has been under discussion since 2010, or the work on how to improve governance and transparency of the Honduran forest sector and to implement more effective control missions (see the joint report on Independent Forest Monitoring in Honduras, May 2006,

from CONADEH and Global Witness). It would be useful and enlightening to have an analysis of these and others so that one could see if the problems seen earlier are being addressed with new solutions.

For component 2a, the revised R-PP carefully lays out the causes and drivers as requested. The discussion of deforestation rate is flawed, in that it tend to focus on a long period of history over which various drivers will have changed dramatically. The fact is that in order to extrapolate into the future, one must focus on the recent past, not an average over the past 44 years (see p. 78). It is unlikely that there is a “normal” rate of forest loss. Forest loss depends critically on economic and social drivers which are changing rapidly in countries like Honduras. The deforestation and forest degradation rate over the past 5 years is probably the best basis for projecting future loss, and even those numbers will have to be continually updated. The bottom line numbers on the budget seem reasonable, but each of the budget items is not very specific. Without knowing exactly what will be done, it is difficult to say that this budget will be adequate. That said, there is enough material in this section for the government to develop a detailed budget.

A full discussion of the EU VPA is now included in a broader analysis of FLEGT. It is also helpful to have the description of the MOSEF project. The results of these program, particularly as they impact governance, must be taken into account as Honduras develops its REDD+ program. The new figure showing the current scheme of ICF Interconnections under the SNIF platform is very helpful in illustrating regional connections. Since most of the issues have been addressed here, the remaining work on section 2a is to become more specific. This could be done in the next stage, and therefore, component 2a meets the standard, within the context noted above.

**Conclusion: Standard Met**

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

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

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

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

For this component, the TAP noted that the R-PP could be strengthened by including more information on anticipated impacts and benefits of the strategy on the rural population, and specific examples to show how the strategy would contribute to biodiversity conservation and development issues. The drivers lacked a sufficient analysis of market conditions, incentives, and dis-incentives. More description of how emission reductions would be verified and measures to be

used were requested - these should be included in REL and MRV sections of the proposal. Leakage needed further explanation. There should be more discussion of synergies and inconsistencies with other sector strategies such as agriculture and transport.

For component 2b, the revised R-PP does address many of the points noted. Figure 8 on page 96 provides an excellent summary of causes, actions, and strategies to be followed. Starting on p. 89, section 2b.1 provides a good framework for dealing with illegal logging, protection, reforestation, etc., and Section 2b.2 provides specific actions (e.g., eliminate subsidized loans, promote subsidies for recovery, etc.) and an interagency commission that could make final rulings. The note on transaction costs on p. 95 is important. But recommendations like this have been made before, and it has been difficult for the government to implement them. What is different now? Page 87 lists several different policies, programs, tools and strategies, but there is not yet a plan that shows how these can be brought together in a coherent way. There is not much here about market conditions or incentives - this is yet to be completed. A discussion of synergies and inconsistencies with other sector strategies such as agriculture and transport is still missing. Although there seems to be a good idea of the general direction to be followed, there is not a good analysis of what had been tried before and had not worked, so it is not clear how the new strategy proposed will be successful.

Further explanation of market conditions and incentives, and synergies and inconsistencies with other sector strategies is needed. Also an analysis of what has impeded the implementation of similar policies in the past and how those impediments are now to be overcome. On the basis of what has been presented here, the standard is partially met.

The R-PP re-emphasizes the National Forestry Programme (PRONAFOR). This is a comprehensive planning tool, but the proposal still lacks the specifics called above. Regionalization using administrative boundaries and watershed management may be a good framework for REDD+ programs on a sub-national scale, but this point is not developed further. An analysis of market conditions and incentives is needed - or at least a plan for carrying out that analysis. The discussion of synergies and inconsistencies with other sector strategies is not yet provided.

**Conclusion:**

**Standard Partially Met**

**Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:**

*Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.*

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

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

The R-PP describes the existence of a national, regional and local framework for REDD + implementation under existing regulations, and ensures that property rights and access to forest resources through community-based management contracts are secure. Institutional and governance reforms are not expected to be required. Unanticipated conflicts are

foreseen between the proposed implementation framework and potential obligations under a possible REDD+ mechanism under the UNFCCC.

For purposes of strategic development, Honduras is divided into six regions based on the six major watersheds in the country. Each region will have its own Regional Development Council, ensuring the representativeness of the main sectors and organizational structure of each Regional Development Board, as previously determined by law.

The existence of a legal implementation framework for a national REDD+ strategy constitutes an institutional advantage and should facilitate a decentralized execution of the REDD+ strategy, with greater stakeholder participation. The R-PP can build on this advantage by including a concise table to highlight the specific activities to be developed for the effective REDD+ implementation plan, and show how these activities are linked to the current institutional state and legal scheme. The implementation strategy can also be subdivided into separate components. Each sub-component could reference specific legal, institutional and financial mechanisms that can ensure that social and environmental benefits reach prioritized sectors based on the diagnosis and objectives defined.

The R-PP can also be strengthened by including a logical framework and at least the Terms of Reference (TOR) for an Action Plan for the implementation of the strategy, including a description of conflict resolution and contingency management measures as identified in 2.a.

The Action Plan can allow visibility to the REDD+ implementation feasibility, and take into account the potential and actual constraints, strengths and weaknesses that exist at the social, economic, political and environmental level for REDD+ implementation. The Action Plan can also help to identify the obstacles to national, regional or local level implementation, and identify preventive or corrective measures to overcome these limitations. It is also necessary to identify potential strategic alliances with different social and political sectors.

#### Assessment and Recommendations:

For this component, the TAP noted that it may be important for the R-PP to acknowledge that some REDD activities occur outside the forest sector, and provisions to ensure rights for these other users should be incorporated in the R-PP. The R-PP should also identify funds to build capacity for local or regional institutions to monitor implementation actions. Finally, the R-PP could be further clarified by including a concise logical framework and Action Plan in table format to show the implementation road map for the strategy.

For component 2c, the revised R-PP has provided some material that expands on what was provided before. But it is more general than specific, along the lines of the kinds of actions that will be taken, without adequate consideration of the practical difficulties. For example, the statement (p. 105) is made that under ICF, failures or fraud will not occur. We all know that failures and fraud can occur even under the best governance. The point is to have established procedures that can deal with such difficulties. It's those kinds of procedures that need to be outlined here. The budget as written may be incorporating funds for building capacity for monitoring implementation, but it's not clearly spelled out. Finally, there is no logical framework



or Action Plan discussed here - such a framework and Action Plan could easily be created from the material that is presented.

The report on “Legal Framework Analysis and Institutional current carbon ownership and land tenure for REDD+ and other compensation mechanisms in Honduras” that has been initiated and will be ready in December 2012 will be useful input for the necessary legal and regulatory framework for implementation of REDD+. It will be helpful in developing the logical framework and Action Plan requested earlier. At the least, Honduras needs to identify the elements and deliverables for the logical framework and Action Plan. Until that is done, the standard is only partially met for this component.

**Conclusion: Standard Partially Met**

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

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

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

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

The R-PP acknowledges the need to measure risks and social and environmental opportunities for indigenous peoples and local communities, and includes a matrix of objectives, outputs and activities for social and environmental impacts evaluation and monitoring. An Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) process is proposed as a tool to be applied in the implementation process, and the SESA will be linked to the proposed forest monitoring system. The R-PP also indicates that the achievement of objectives and milestones will be tracked in the measurement of social and environmental impacts.

For this component, the TAP noted that the R-PP could be further strengthened by adding information to explain how the SESA will incorporate an assessment of the drivers mentioned in 2a. The steps taken to prepare, implement, and review the SESA should be included in the logical framework and Action Plan recommended in 2c., above.

For component 2d, the revised R-PP has added a small amount of new material and refers back to component 1c for a consultation plan. Since there is no logical framework or Action Plan yet, the second recommendation of the TAP cannot yet be followed.

**Assessment and Recommendations:**

- The steps to be taken to prepare, implement, and review the SESA should be included in the logical framework and Action Plan recommended in 2c., above.

**Conclusion: Standard Partially Met**

### Component 3. Develop a Reference Level

#### Standard 3: Reference Level:

*Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design).*

*(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)*

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

##### Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis

The previous TAP review requested further information including an outcome chain for reference level development, on development of baseline carbon stock information, on details for national, subnational, and project level baselines, technical capacity development, and budget.

This revised version provides much new material both about the general issues that must be addressed in the reference level component, and is a useful mix of general guidance and specific plans. It addresses the TAP requests.

A regional approach is proposed with subscenarios, regions, and subregions. Although details are not provided, this is a very sensible idea and could provide the basis for development of a detailed work plan for this component as well as for components 4a and 4b. The current and future drivers of deforestation are identified. The elements of reference level development are correctly identified and listed here. Figure 3.3 is a good start on an implementation scheme, but could be improved by including some of the outcome chain details that have been provided for component 4a (see figure 16).

There is a clear recognition of the difficulties in establishing a baseline, and of the need for new statistics. The satellite data needs are identified, but could be made more detailed with specifics. The gap analysis is helpful as is the brief assessment of the problems with existing data sets. June 2013 is suggested as a near term deadline for information with new defined standards, but this may be too short a time - I would suggest pushing back this time to Dec 2013 to provide adequate time to complete the work.

For capacity building, the needs have been identified in general, but for next steps, it will be necessary to provide more details on exactly what training and what software and hardware will be required for GIS improvement, for example. The two stages for capacity building are appropriate, but it would make sense to try to put some of the work on prediction models into the first stage of strengthening national capacity.

There is a comprehensive list of institutions that will be involved in this component - those more familiar with Honduras will have to judge whether there are any others that should be included.

Table 28 on summary of activities and budget estimate correctly reflects the work that must be done, and the budget seems reasonable.  
 New material on availability of satellite data and the technical software and hardware requirements has been added which helps give the proposal more depth.  
 Given the new material that has been presented here, earlier TAP suggestions have been addressed, and that there is an adequate base of information for Honduras to proceed on developing a reference level scenario There is much work to be done, particularly in establishing the regional approach, but the standard has been met to go forward with this component.

**Conclusion: Standard Met**

**Component 4. Design a Monitoring System**

**Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:**

*The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD strategy in the forest sector.*

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

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

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

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

The previous TAP review requested further information on stakeholder participation, transparency, and an analysis of the budget for capacity building and data acquisition. As with component 3, this revised version for component 4 provides much new material and is a useful mix of general guidance and specific plans. It addresses the TAP requests.

There are some new useful explanatory figures and charts. The major issues and institutional actors have now all been identified - the next step will be to match country specifics - particularly as the regional approach is developed - to the general issues. The outcome chain chart (figure 16) and the integration of actors and institutions (figure 17) are valuable outlines of the process to be followed and show that there is a good understanding of what needs to be done. There is a useful list of indicators on page 144. All of this will provide a good base from which to implement specific regional activities.

The plan for the monitoring system builds on the reference level planning, which is a good strategy, and there is a clear chart that shows the elements of the outcome chain. The methodology proposed is sound. Institutional responsibilities have been identified and appear to be appropriate. For the definition of forest, it might be useful to compare what

is proposed here to the various other definitions now being used, so that as numerical goals for reduction of deforestation are set, there is a clear understanding both nationally and internationally what is being proposed. In terms of handling and providing information, the Geo Portal idea is a good one.

In terms of transparency, there is a comprehensive list of institutions involved and a clear discussion of the role of communities, indigenous peoples, academia, and the private sector in an inclusive “bottom-up” approach to monitoring. The specific needs for capacity building have been identified. The cooperation with Brazil and Taiwan will provide useful technical support.

Further information on forest monitoring has been added (ESNACIFOR/University Rey Juan Carlos (URJC)/AECI) and the budget has been updated

Given the new material that has been presented here, earlier suggestions made by the TAP have been addressed, and that there is an adequate base of information for Honduras to proceed on developing their national system for forest monitoring. As with component 3, there is much work to be done, particularly in establishing the regional approach, but the standard has been met to go forward with this component.

**Conclusion: Standard Met**

**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:**

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

The previous TAP review requested further information on the methodology to be used to explain how the impact and multiple benefits of the REDD+ strategy will be monitored.

As with components 3 and 4a, this revised version for component 4b provides much new material and is a useful mix of general guidance and specific plans. **It addresses the TAP request on methodology and in fact, is now one of the more comprehensive discussions of other multiple benefits that have been provided by any country.** The new material shows how experiences will be taken into account, provides a detailed list of activities and participants, and goes into some detail on safeguards. In each case, the lists are more general than will be needed for the regional approach that is planned; therefore the next step will be to make these points specific for that approach.

For social impact monitoring, there is a comprehensive list of general assessment items. The use of CZB is appropriate for monitoring biodiversity. The elements for SESA are identified - will there be any impact of the regional approach to be taken?

Table 35 on summary of activities and budget estimate correctly reflects the work to be

done, and the budget seems appropriate for the work proposed.

Given the new material that has been presented here, earlier suggestions made by the TAP have been addressed, and that there is an adequate base of information for Honduras to proceed on their plan for dealing with other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. As with components 3 and 4a, there is much work to be done, particularly in establishing the regional approach, but the standard has been met to go forward with this component.

**Conclusion: Standard 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:**

Assessment and Recommendations:

The budget provides an important step forward to advance the proposed REDD+ strategy. However, the budget may need to be revised to take into consideration additional TAP recommendations.

This section should be updated once the review points for component 2 have been met.

**Conclusion: Standard Largely Met**

**Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**

*Standard 6: The R-PP adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.*

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

**Assessment and Recommendations - Synopsis**

This section included a Logical Framework to monitor the performance of activities, nevertheless the means of verification needs to be reviewed in the light of changes in previous components and include the budget necessary to carry out this activity, if needed.

Describe the monitoring program explaining how the feedback process will be conducted and in which stages corrective measures can be taken in order to ensure the successful completion of the program objectives.

Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5 R-PP Review Template

There have been a few minor changes in this component focused on additional outreach through campaigns and workshops. The logical framework activity should be related to the needs in Component 2c.

**Conclusion: Standard Largely Met**