

**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 (fill in country name): Papua New Guinea**

Reviewer (fill in): Australia, Indonesia, Germany, United States and Japan(lead)

Date of review (fill in): 18<sup>th</sup> October 2012

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

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

**This is a good first draft, PNG has made obvious and commendable progress in its REDD+ Readiness process and this is evident through the range of REDD+ activities already undertaken by PNG. It is especially encouraging to see that the governance arrangements for REDD+ are becoming clearer in PNG at the Central Government**

level. While this is undoubtedly a good first draft of an R-PP, significant work remains to be done, particularly on components 5 and 6 and aspects of 1 and 2. Some general recommendation to improve the quality of the R-PP are outlined below:

**Recommendations:**

- Overall, the description of what was done, not yet done and/or will be done seem to be mixed up and confusing. Further work to sort out the relevant information is needed. The improvements of the information in terms of quantity and quality are appreciated and commendable.
- Described results were done in collaboration of many institutions, e.g. University of PNG (UPNG), PNG Forest Research Institute (FRI), Australian Universities, FAO, JICA, and others. The need for updates is expressed.
- Since there are so many tasks and activities are listed and PNG has received various external funding already, it may be useful to have a brief section explicit about focused leverage points specific to FCPF funding. For example, 1) Capacity development of the central governments (OCCD, PNGFA, DLPP) and provincial governments (in particular where REDD+ pilot projects are advanced or envisaged), 3) implementation of National Forest Inventory after expiration of UN-REDD/FAO assistance.
- The contents of some proposed activities, such as sub-national level capacity building, are not clear and duplicative. Further thinking on how to manage capacity issues at lower levels of government would be helpful.
- Sequencing could be improved - in some cases activities are designed to test approaches, while simultaneously these approaches are to be implemented - this needs to be more carefully considered.
- Budget tables are often incomplete and will also need to be updated.
- The total estimated cost, \$8,960,000, for FCPF is too huge. There is a strong need to identify feasible activities to be undertaken using FCPF's limited budget by fully taking into account the priority for each proposed activity, recognizing that capacity to deliver on a range of activities simultaneously may be a problem. Therefore, above mentioned "*description of what was done, not yet done and/or will be done*" become important also for that purpose.
- A possible way to address prioritization of activities may be 1) list all available funding resources (from UNREDD, PNG Government, EU, JICA, GIZ, and Australia) for each activities, 2) compare those and necessary amount of financial resource, and 3) confirm request.
- The M&E framework in the R-PP seems to be copied straight from the UN-REDD document, and does not match some of the activities proposed in the R-PP, this will need to be updated.
- A better explanation of how the work of the UN-REDD will complement the R-PP would be useful.
- In tables of activities and budget, it would be useful to have who are involved in and responsible for. Only few table, i.e.. Table 6, has such description.
- The total amount of the text (*body of R-PP to 75 pages, and the total length of the document (including annex) to a maximum of 150 pages*) should be limited. Some background information should be summarized after annexing detailed information.

**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:

**Standard partially met**

This component has good detail on the governance structures for REDD+ in PNG. It is obvious that some good thinking has been done about how best to manage REDD+ activities within the Central Government and it is encouraging that the respective roles of the OCCD and PNGFA are becoming clearer. The lack of work at the lower levels of Government is acknowledged as a problem, but further explanation as to how this will be addressed would be useful, the R-PP mentions that the "PNGFA has commenced by demonstrating the will to start with four Provinces" - it would be useful to elaborate on this point.

**Recommendations:**

- Stakeholder identification is good. The government is making an effort to disclose information, but the process is not yet working well. Not all relevant stakeholders receive the information, invitations often go out very late, meetings on the other hand are canceled on very short notice.
- Institutional setup is rather good. Climate Change Policy and Law are finally being drafted, the establishment of OCCD as a government authority will give it more legitimacy. PNG Forest Authority (PNGFA) is building up its capacities recognizably; the communication with OCCD is close. However, the two institutions are still struggling for competencies and division of tasks in REDD+. Often one institution is not well enough informed about the activities and plans of the other institution. The division of tasks and the communication process have to be formalized. The R-PP is not clearly reflecting the superior importance of OCCD and PNGFA alike in the management of the REDD+ process.
- The proposal describes an adequate arrangement of government institutions to embark on a REDD Readiness process. Due consideration is given to national, sub-national agencies and District and LLG offices. The anticipated role of the OCCD and the various implementing agencies is generally clear, however, responsibility for implementing REDD+ is not entirely clear. If it is the case that PNGFA is the lead agency for implementing REDD+ (in coordination with the other agencies listed) this should be stated clearly upfront.
- 
- The REDD+ TWG gets different sectors and active NGOs to the table. Through broad participation in the PNG delegation to the UNFCCC conference in Durban, the interest was raised, but it is clear that many sectors don't contribute - they observe. Competing with the resource boom in the country, REDD+ will struggle to gain attention. The other sectors have to be addressed more specifically about where their gains in REDD+ are.
- Capacity building activities are being undertaken in irregular intervals. A coherent planning is missing that can integrate 3 levels: (i) specifically targeted training for people in different sectors, (ii) information for people who need to be able to deal with requests, but don't need deep knowledge, and (iii) awareness for the broad public.
- Further consideration should be given to what capacity building might be needed in key agencies (eg OCCD, NFS), and what budget implications this might have.
- The budget should indicate how much money is needed to maintain OCCD and how it will be funded in future.
- P.11 mentions the 'five REDD+ pilot initiatives' this should be elaborated further in this section (some references in other sections but good to combine all references). How were these initiatives selected and how and when will they be implemented? Will these pilot initiatives be scaled up if successful?
- P.11, Clarification is needed on the statement "PNG has also accepted a position as co-chair of

- the interim REDD+ Partnership Secretariat”, as this appears to be out of date information.
- Department of Environment and Conservation might be able to play some role on SESA.
  - Role of other government bodies such as need to be further clarified such as agriculture, lands, mining, petroleum related departments.
  - *Component 1a P17, paragraph 6 “Within PNGFA, the National Forest Service has the legislative responsibility to monitor and assess logging operations, but has neither the staff nor the capacity to do this”*: TAP review comment (p.5, Component 1a. Detail #26) seems not to be addressed in the R-PP version 9. The issue is not about whether the sentence has reference source. It is understood that the existence of this particular sentence strongly implies that PNG R-PP has to have effective inter departmental/ agency consultation and confirmation from competent institutions. Necessary elaboration is of course required, if any, before the formal submission.
  - *Component 1a P17, paragraph 6 “In addition, the PNG Forest Research Institute(PNGFRI) is the research arm of PNGFA and will be the main implementing agency for PNG’s national multi-purpose forest inventory in collaboration with JICA”*: This sentence seems to have some mistaken facts. It is understood that the existence of this particular sentence strongly implies that PNG R-PP has to have effective inter departmental/ agency consultation and confirmation from competent institutions. Necessary elaboration is of course required, if any, before the formal submission.
  - P18, “Private Sector Organizations” & “NGO and CBO” need to be independent section like “PNG Forest Authority (PNGFA) “in P17 and need to have more detail description, because they are one of the key stakeholders, at least departments mentioned in TAP suggested institution arrangements.
  - P.18 - More analysis on the interaction between National REDD+ policies and Provincial and District Governments would be useful. Do these Governments have development work-plans that REDD+ could be incorporated into? - This section mentions ‘capacity building such as on technical and managerial skills at the sub-national level will be a major funding activity’ - but this is not reflected in Table 1 on P.20
  - P. 20 Table One cites an ‘initial study on the appropriate restructures for REDD+ at the Provincial Level’ - Should this activity be prior to the “technical support for any provincial restructure”? It seems more logical to conduct the study prior to providing technical support, yet the technical support is being funded from 2012 whereas the study will not commence until 2013.

**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:**

**Standard partially met**

A range of key stakeholders have been well identified, and some awareness raising has commenced with these groups. At this stage, information sharing has largely been at

the national level, within the PNG Government, other donor's and with NGO's. It is stated that consultations on climate change have occurred in 11 provinces to date, with consultation with a further 9 provinces planned.

**Recommendations:**

- It is not clear how REDD has fitted into the early stakeholder dialogue and information sharing on climate change; results and evidence of effectiveness of the early consultations are missing. Regarding REDD-specific information dissemination, a more detailed narrative outline on plans would help to see which levels and groups are targeted and how much time/effort will be put in it.
- The proposal states that there have been initial consultations in 11 of the 22 provinces, but other than that, evidence of past or ongoing consultations (i.e. early dialogue) is weak. However, the proposal does present a detailed plan for beginning a comprehensive consultation process that will be broad and incorporate vulnerable groups and will use churches and civil society to penetrate into all levels of society.
- Details about the inclusiveness of ongoing consultations: How are critical voices being heard, and which documents have been drafted with stakeholder participation?
- By further analyzing results of consultations, it is possible to develop concrete work plan such as activity 1b.2 & 1b.3. Thus, further analysis should be mentioned.
- P18, "Private Sector Organizations" & "NGO and CBO" need to be independent section like "PNG Forest Authority (PNGFA) " in P17 and need to have more detail description, because they are one of the key stakeholders.
- P.24 - the Budget mentions 'initial climate change consultations in 9 Provinces, why those nine? How have they been selected? Will they be the same as the 11 referred to on page 22?
- There is little evidence in this section that the voices of communities and vulnerable groups have been considered to date, this area needs further detail, some of which is supplied in section 1C
- This section generally needs from greater detail, including further information on how key stakeholders have been identified and on what work has already been undertaken in raising awareness of REDD+ amongst key stakeholders.
- A communication strategy should be developed, leading to quicker updates of the climate change website, sufficiently prior notifications and information to decisive meetings, reduction of cancelling meetings short time before the appointments.

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

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far<sup>3</sup> (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP

<sup>3</sup> 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).

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:**

**Standard partially met**

This section gives a broad overview of the consultation process in PNG to date, and the proposed process going forward. The dissemination of information is not functional yet, e.g. the draft R-PP hasn’t been circulated or made known to a broad number of stakeholders. This component rightly points out that ‘the government at this point cannot risk raising expectation to levels on which it cannot deliver’, but it would be useful to have some explanation of how the needs, concerns and opinions of local governments, CSO’s and communities will be heard within the national REDD+ readiness process in PNG.

**Recommendations:**

- This section could benefit from greater detail in all areas, it is unclear how consultations have and will be managed
- The description of five REDD+ pilot sites and explanation of their objectives are useful to clarify what issues to be addressed through piloting.
- The existing functional deficits of the process need to be included and an outline of measures made: outline how capacitation deficits will be overcome and participation potential of civil society will be leveraged in order to provide effective coordination and make use of participation will. How are donors, CSOs, NGOs being integrated?
- P.25 - It would be good to get further details on the existing consultation process, how often will each activity occur? Where? Who will undertake this consultation?
- P26- It is not clear how OCCD can play a critical coordinating role in ensuring all REDD+ pilot initiatives despite the fact that OCCD is currently lack of capacity. Coordination mechanism needs more elaboration.
- Include development of a Consultation and Participation Plan into the Activity Table;
- How do Activity 1c1 and 1c2 reflect in the Activity table (improve structure, numbering)? More detail on how the consultation actions will be managed, where they will take place, with which stakeholders and how results will be taken up in adapting the management of the R-PP program are needed.

**Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy**

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

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

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

**Standard partially met**

This component provides a comprehensive overview of forest law and governance and a good first assessment of land use trends. It presents a strong outline of the underlying governance issues affecting the preservation of forests in PNG. However, this section is quite dense and does not include enough analysis on the link to REDD+ implementation. We recommend making this section more concise, and providing more detail on how land tenure issues may directly impact REDD+ implementation in PNG

#### Recommendations:

- The proposal demonstrates that PNG has assessed land use, forest law, policy and governance in order to gain an understanding of the drivers of deforestation in the most relevant sectors. It demonstrates an understanding of the complexity of issues such as land tenure and logging concessions and how effective implementation of REDD+ will require political will and a shift in priorities.
- In fact, the work plan calls for more assessments of these issues, but perhaps further assessments should be done as part of identifying options and developing recommendations, because stand-alone assessments of problems that are already well understood will not be impactful. Overall, the chapter misses to establish a link between the described legal framework and the development of a REDD+ strategy. There is no cause-effect analysis. The resulting workplan is generic and does not clarify which issues particularly shall be addressed during the Readiness Phase, nor is the involvement of existing institutions outlined.
- .
- In the table 3, Area of Primary forest and Total Forest Area are mixed up and thus figures do not agree with original FAO publication. Redrafting of the Table and relevant texts in the section is necessary. Special attention should be paid to the use and relevance of ambiguous words, namely deforestation and degradation.
- P37. *“The monitoring and reporting component of field activities need serious funding support in terms of enhancing existing staff and recruiting new staff since annual government funding is insufficient”*; This sentence may raise a concern about sustainability of the impact and outcome of the activities funded by FCPF. The FCPF funding cannot sustain insufficient funding by the Government of PNG. In this part of the R-PP, the consolidated view of the responsible Government of PNG should be stated.
- The RPP recognizes from the outset that insufficient analysis of drivers of deforestation is a major gap in PNG’s readiness process. This critical gap makes it difficult to adequately address many of the subsequent issues in this section
- Information is provided on the forestry sector, however almost no analysis is provided on other drivers of deforestation
- We recommend more information be provided on past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.
- Drivers are not assessed- large scale planned deforestation is mentioned but neither is the planning process explained, nor implications for a REDD+ strategy discussed. Other drivers are only mentioned but no indication to impact or underlying causes.
- The role of various institutions in the governance process remains unclear (e.g. role of Timber Authority) quoted numbers for timber extraction are not qualified
- Useful information is provided on PNG’s legal framework and policies for REDD. Some of the challenges and gaps in implementing REDD+ are covered, however opportunities to address REDD+ are not adequately covered; we recommend further work be done on this analysis.
- P.41 mentions that ITTO concluded that PNG ‘had many solid acts and laws in place, but the implementation are problematic due primarily to administrative and governance constraints’.

In light of this, would it make more sense to focus on these constraints, rather than a “review of existing forestry law and regulations’ as outlined on P.46?

- Include information:
  - The Forestry Act is planned to be revised soon.
  - Carbon rights and law reform study is currently being carried out by GIZ
- Detailed description of existing legal framework- but purely descriptive without reference to relevant issues for REDD+ and the potential implications for the development of a REDD+ strategy
- There is no assessment of the effectiveness or impact of existing forest and land use laws. Consequently, existing gaps are not clearly identified
- We would appreciate further information on what is meant by “the establishment of financial autonomy will significantly assist capacity development of the PNGFA’s role under the objectives of the Forestry Act”.
- P.45 - This section mentions that ‘periods of decentralization have not really improved service delivery at the provincial and district level’ - how large an impact is this likely to have on the capacity of PNG to deliver on the REDD+ agenda? How could this issue be resolved?
- On the work plan, it would be useful to explain the aim of the study on major forms of land use, including ILGs.
- We recommend including NARI and SABL in the list of abbreviations.

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

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

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

**Standard not met**

This component provides a number of seemingly sensible options for reducing emissions from forests. The idea to conduct a study on co-benefits is a good suggestion, especially the proposed study on alternative livelihood options. There are concerns about the analysis behind emissions reductions and abatement costs, particularly as previous sections of the R- PP indicated limited data on the drivers and rates of deforestation in PNG.

#### **Recommendations:**

- 
- The proposal identifies some strategy options for addressing deforestation and forest degradations, but more work still can be done. For examples, more coherent strategy options

for REDD+ need to be outlined -the linkage to general policy goals should be established, the clarification of reference to an Action plan or implementation steps to achieve quoted policy goals (Long term and medium term development policy).

- Relationship among major strategies such as Vision 2050, DSP 2010-2030 and MTD, and its implication need further elaboration in the context of REDD. In addition, Forest and Climate Change Framework for Action should be described considering its importance.
- The source and underlying data for the displayed emissions reductions potential and the abatement curve are unclear.
- The described abatement measures are not (clearly) linked to the PNG context - at other places the lack of underlying data is mentioned further raising questions as to the methodology and data used to derive numbers for emissions reductions potential for different measures in the forestry sector
- Analysis behind the abatement costs presented (USD5.6 per tCO<sub>2</sub>e) is unclear and we recommend providing information on how these costs have been calculated (or provide a reference if using external analysis).
- Figure 10 has critical information but is difficult to read; we recommend making the table clearer.
- Given the recognized deficiency in analysis of drivers of deforestation in PNG, the data in the section on abatement measures lacks rigour; we recommend that any figures on abatement potential need to stem from a thorough analysis of drivers of deforestation in PNG.
- A number of measures are listed for tackling deforestation and degradation; however we recommend adding some initial information on how these measures might be carried out.
- Insufficient information is provided on the plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD+ strategy; we recommend this be addressed.
- Workplan: role of mentioned SABL review process is unclear - content not explained. Other steps mentioned generic, and are not reconciled with potentially existing information and adapted to specific PNG context
- Apart from co-benefits (to be explored in the studies mentioned), how will costs and feasibility of the strategy options be estimated?
- No plan of how to assess domestic leakage is given; we recommend this be addressed.
- We recommend re-working the point on stopping deforestation from agricultural leases, which is unclear.
- In the workplan, we recommend that a clearer distinction be made between the objectives of output 1.3 and output 3.1. Given that no additional information on the scholarship proposed in output 1.2 is given elsewhere in the document, we recommend that further information be provided on the objectives of these scholarships.
- In the table 3, Area of Primary forest and Total Forest Area are mixed up and thus figures do not agree with original FAO publication. Redrafting of the Table and relevant texts in the section is necessary. Special attention should be paid to the use and relevance of ambiguous words, namely deforestation and degradation.
- The potential study on alternative livelihood for forest dependent communities should be prioritized as it is crucial to the success of REDD+ in PNG, perhaps a TOR for this activity could be attached?

#### **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:

**Standard partially met**

This section presents good early thinking on REDD+ implementation but could be improved with a more detailed analysis of the key issues involved in REDD+ implementation in PNG

**Recommendations**

- The proposal identifies key issues that must be addressed for REDD implementation and provides a work plan to address the issues. The proposal demonstrates that PNG has initiated pilot projects in representative topographies and sectoral industries. Again, the work plan calls for more assessments of these issues, but perhaps further assessments should be done as part of identifying options and developing recommendations, because stand-alone assessments of problems that are already well understood will not be impactful.
- We recommend that more detailed analysis be provided on the key issues involved in REDD+ implementation in PNG.
- We recommend that further information be provided on how relevant PNG agencies will coordinate to implement REDD+.
- Coordination between actors is not yet functional and relies mostly on the motivation of the actors themselves. How will this problem be tackled?
- Capacity building is ongoing but not targeted. A systematic communication strategy would be helpful to describe the different levels for training: specific on-the-job training for key persons in different sectors that use that training in their daily work, training specifically for stakeholder groups, and a way to enhance broad awareness. So far, the training structure is not efficient.
- Ongoing carbon rights study is not yet considered in the text.
- P.62, “*There are two types of pilot initiatives - sectoral and geographical* “ : The PNG R-PP does not seem to have any descriptions about geographical pilot projects as the TAP review comment (p.12, Component 2c. Comment and Assessment) seems not to be fully addressed in the R-PP version 9. If the Geographical pilot projects do not exist, please simply delete this sentence.
- We recommend that section 5 on bilateral and multilateral support be updated to reflect recent developments.
- The work by GIZ is described insufficiently; yet, it is expected that GIZ comments on this will be included in the next R-PP version. The missing activities include a carbon rights and law reform study, supporting the implementation of demonstration activities in Central Suau/Milne Bay Province and further ad-hoc support in different issues.

**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:

**Standard partially met**

- This section is a good start and describes PNGs intention to utilize the SESA process to evaluate social and environmental impacts. But could do with some more detail, especially on the interaction of studies with existing demonstration projects and pilot provinces.

**Recommendations:**

- P.72, It says that "OCCD will provide recommendations for institutional arrangements and policy, legal and regulatory reform, if necessary, -----", however, who will be involved in this process and in what way will all the necessary activities be carried out are not clear.
- P.72, It could be better if the draft provides further details on the contents of safeguard criteria developed by REDD+TWG as well as its implication and contribution to the proposed activities.
- P.72 - How will the 'studies to propose mechanisms for the following components of a regulatory framework' interact with pilot province demonstration activities and other REDD+ activities, such as the WCS project in Manus island? These pilot projects will be testing benefit sharing mechanisms and testing FPIC, so it would be good to get some comments on how these trials will feed into design processes.
- This section in general needs further detail.
- Table 2.d, implementation activities:
- Sub-activities need to be further divided in order to provide a better connection towards the budgets required. E.g., the social and environmental impact assessment includes consultations; how does this relate to the "consultations" (on what?) foreseen for 2015? ToRs for SESA need to be developed including participation/consultation!
- The planned SESA consultations need to be included. In general, consultations need to be treated as a more integral part of the SESA/ESMF process instead of just consulting once in the final development stage.
- Include time line for finalization of REDD+ project guidelines

**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:**

**Standard partially met**

This section contains good detail on early thinking by PNG on the approach and methods to establish an RL/REL. More detail would be useful on PNG's specific national requirements and sequenced interaction with the UN-REDD Programme.

However, we see this part explains only the preliminary ideas at this stage. In that sense, necessary contents and how to apply a step-by-step approach is relatively well described. It is important that concrete details on RELL/RL along with whole MRV system be discussed further by the Technical Working Group. Through such a process we believe the role and responsibility of each organization will be well clarified and shared.

**Recommendations:**

- The proposal discusses/identifies how the REL will be established. The proposal effectively demonstrates that PNG has assessed the need for a REL, and a monitoring system, and how these to tasks are synergistic.
- Greater detail on how this process interacts with the UN-REDD Programme in PNG (and does not duplicate) is needed. It isn't clear how activities are sequenced or complement each other. For example, activities 3.2 to 3.6 in the draft R-PP appear to overlap with activities under outcome 3.1 of the UN-REDD Programme document (in particular: test and refine MRV methodology, review REL and develop REL).
- More work could be done to identify PNG's specific data requirements (e.g. which existing satellite data does it have access to / require access to?) current capacity and capacity building requirements.
- More work is needed to clearly describe the linkages with components 2a and 2b. This element is missing at present.
- While there is good recognition of the interaction between the REL and MRV system, we recommend further analysis on what data, gathering methods and processing techniques will need to be the same/as similar as possible for the RL/REL and MRV system and which, if any, can be different. These components will work closely together and early identification of required common data sets will improve the likelihood of a functioning REDD+ framework in PNG.
- Structure of the chapter makes for difficult read
- Only description of generic steps needed - almost complete lack of PNG specific context and reference to existing data. Some reference to studies but not clarified which and no inclusion of (preliminary) results
- 5 REDD+ pilot activities mentioned - inclusion and integration in strategy development unclear
- Unclear to what extent forest cover maps exist and what the underlying data is (especially inventory data) - again, studies are mentioned but only results of one biomass study displayed but not discussed
- Potential criteria for national circumstances mentioned but not qualified

#### **Component 4. Design a Monitoring System**

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

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

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

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

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

**Standard partially met**

**As with component 3, this section contains good detail on early thinking by PNG on the approach and methods to establish an MRV system. More detail would be useful on PNG's specific national requirements and sequenced interaction with the UN-REDD Programme (at present there appears to be some overlap).**

**Sub-section on 'Quality Control, Quality Analysis and Quality Assurance' including figure 16 could be thoroughly examined and redrafted according to IPCC terminology.**

##### **Recommendations:**

- The proposal provides a description of a plan for a MRV system development. However, the level of detail regarding the technologies proposed and stakeholder involvement is not fleshed out. Since heavy reliance on optical sensor satellite in terms of Activity Data detection/ collection is implied, it could mention possibility for exploring use of radar sensor satellite data for MRV of a tropical (thus cloud prone) conditions.
- The proposal does present a staged approach for attaining an MRV system and provides a plan for data security. The terminologies used in the subsection on 'QC, Quality Analysis and QA' are however completely different from that of IPCC. It should be useful to consult with IPCC 2006 GL Volume 1, Chapter 6, page 6.5 about the definition of QA, QC and verification in IPCC context. It is strongly recommended to harmonize domestic use and IPCC terminology at the earliest stage otherwise myriad of misunderstanding and miscommunication occur later. 'Validation' and 'Accreditation' are commonly used for project scale activities and should not be mixed up for national scale MRV development unless their implications are fully taken account. This difficulty might suggest where PNG needs capacity development. In this case, the subsection in question could be shortened significantly and summarize capacity development needs.
- Generic description of MRV system - there is no explanation of existing capacities and a lack of gap analysis taking account of UN-REDD and other external aides.
- Diagrams displayed are not referenced and it remains unclear to what extent they have been adapted to the PNG context (e.g. stratification of forest types: done by whom and with what

- underlying data?) even though they are meant to be illustrative exhibition only.
- Short description of institutions without clarification of roles on MRV system and respective responsibilities - no explanation of cross-sectoral work and coordination between institutions. Description on nearly-irrelevant organizations can be omitted so that inter-institution works are explained. In this regard, it may be useful to draw more simplified and clear concept figure of future All-PNG-Governments MRV system for institutional setting. Noting that the majority of PNG's MRV system development is included under the UN-REDD funds, it would be useful to identify what the specific additional, complementary elements are to be funded under the FCPF and where exactly they fit with the broader MRV system development. Some work has been done in this regard, but further clarity is required.
  - The R-PP contains some specific detail on what the MRV system will do, but there is little sense of how this fits with PNG's specific national circumstances, requirements and available data and capacity including, for example, cloud prone climate/areas, inaccessibility almost anywhere, customary land ownership and exclusive right of land-use by landowners, incredible diversity of tree species. We suggest that the R-PP would benefit from greater detail on: work that has been done under the four MRV system components to date (noting three-year timeframe and already one year in); how the four components will be tailored to meet PNG's specific national circumstances; and the work that has been carried out to date (or rather to be carried out up to the end of 2013) to identify PNG's specific national requirements and a description of these requirements.
  - The R-PP recognises the need for capacity building generally, but there is very limited analysis of the current level of capacity and capacity building that is still required. We recommend an initial process to identify specific capacities PNG has, specific areas where capacity is needed, and which specific institutions need them.
  - The RPP should include a discussion of the sustainability of the MRV program in the long -term.
  - Workplan: Generic presentation of tasks - no roles assigned, no specific needs identified, no reference to existing capacities or data
  - No reference to NFI methodology which is currently being developed and should be ready before the end of 2012 and 2013 likely (driven by PNGFA, UN-REDD, JICA)
  - Redrafting to keep consistency of terminology will be highly appreciated (ex. SLMS in texts and SLRS in figures) for next submission.

**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:**

**Standard partially met**

This is a good early attempt at looking at ways to measure safeguards outcome, the proposal of building on the work of CSO's such as TNC and WCS is sound, and the idea to have reporting on safeguards through independent CSO's is commendable.

**Recommendations**

- The proposal includes a brief summary of how the national REDD program will address multiple

benefits (environmental and social) but there is not much detail about how an integrated monitoring system for these benefits will be implemented on the ground.

- Consideration should be given to collecting livelihood data as a measure of how REDD+ activities are affecting local communities
- Precise use of terminology necessary: Multiple benefit objectives and deriving criteria will have to be defined in the SESA process and monitored via indicators.
- More specific outline would be good - on how will be drawn from existing monitoring experience, indicators and processes/institutions (making links to specific institutions; are there any spatially explicit data bases that provide overview who is monitoring what with which indicators?)
- The link to the results of SESA, including studies conducted, could be made more explicit (risks and opportunities of the REDD strategy compared to the specific environmental and social objectives result in the definition of safeguards (criteria, indicators))
- Strategic assessment of existing safeguards systems (UN-REDD, REDD+SES etc.) would make more sense if conducted before or during the development of an own safeguards monitoring system
- Table 4a/b: overlap of the activities “support set-up of PNG Information System” and “develop and implement safeguards” and sub-activities? - how do they relate?
- Capacity Building for Monitoring and Evaluating Safeguards should be considered.

## 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:

#### **Standard not met**

The section includes a table that describes the schedule and budget without any details. Further details are available in individual components and should be consolidated into the Budget and Schedule section. The noticeable gap is in the details around support being provided by other donor’s, UN- REDD and the PNG Government itself, and also who will be responsible for each task. Table Six is one of the most detailed and includes outlining existing UN-REDD funding and the organizations involved in delivery, this should be the minimum standard for all budget tables.

#### Recommendations:

- Overall, the allocated budget numbers suffer from tasks which are not clear and operational - how the required funding is derived is not transparent and does seem like a rather crude estimate
- The proposal presents an estimate of costs for the 5 components through 2015
- This section needs to have a consolidated list of tables from previous components and also detail the funding being provided for these activities by other donors, UN-REDD and the PNG Government itself.

- Given the budget exceeds the amount available under the FCPF; we recommend either adjusting the budget to reflect priorities in the R-PP, or identifying other sources of funding.
- Funding is sought for 2012; however the R-PP will not be finalized in this time. We recommend reviewing this aspect of the budget.
- Specific tasks that are required due to PNG circumstances are not defined and gaps have not been clearly identified

#### **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:**

**Standard not met**

The M&E framework appears to be taken from the UNREDD-NJP, with indicators and baselines ranging from 2011 to 2013, they do not relate to the timeframe or activities described in the component work plans, which are up to 2015. The introduction to this component states that 'An existing programme M&E framework and risk management framework were designed as part of the formulation of PNG's R-PP and are presented below in Table 15 and Table 16' these table numbers do not correspond with the table.

**Recommendations:**

- The M & E framework needs to refer to the component number and its budget categories and be for the correct timeframe (2012-15)
- The proposal includes a matrix of indicators that will be used to monitor program performance. It also includes a matrix of risks (risk log) and proposed actions.
- The proposal does not articulate a plan to demonstrate the management of financial and other resources.