

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism  
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**  
(interim, January 12, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

**Review of R-PP of (*fill in country name*): Vanuatu**

**Reviewer: Stephen Cobb and four other TAP reviewers**

**Date of review (of Revised 1<sup>st</sup> Draft R-PP): 2 October 2012**

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

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

**Assessment summary:**

Vanuatu submitted a first draft R-PP on 6 August 2012 for informal consideration at PC 13 (October 2012). A TAP Team consisting of 5 members reviewed the draft R-PP, and Vanuatu revised the draft R-PP based on comments from TAP, submitting a revised R-PP on 28 September 2012 for informal consideration at PC 13. TAP has updated the draft synthesis review to reflect changes in the revised draft R-PP.

**Original comments (14 September 2012):**

Some progress has been made with the help of consultants in technical areas of the R-PP, particularly Components 3 and 4a, but the document as a whole is essentially an early draft. Unfortunately the technical contributions have been added to the body of the text of the R-PP in their entirety without really using the contributions to answer the questions, under respective sections, that are clearly required under the R-PP guidelines. For this reason it is not yet appropriate to evaluate them as to their significance as the sections in themselves do not address the objectives of the R-PP. This being said, the submitting authority - The Department of Forestry, could readily draw material from these submissions to substantially improve their submission to FCPF.

R-PP should include plans for how capacity among Vanuatu nationals, particularly government agencies and key civil society partners would be developed, so that consultation, participation and take-up of key activities can be accomplished. The social realities of a small island nation, including the widespread importance of customary land tenure, must be recognized and integrated into the planning framework.

Indeed, a successful submission from Vanuatu would represent the opportunity to obtain a model for implementation of REDD+ in a Pacific Melanesian, archipelagic nation where customary ownership of land and forest resources is more important than government ownership and authorities and where the country is comprised of geographically and socially distinct sub-national entities. The relationship between these entities (islands) and administrative sub-national entities (states or provinces) really needs to be clarified in the context of the R-PP.

The authors may also want to see how other countries have dealt with particular components in the R-PP. For this, they could refer to the FCPF website where they will find all the R-PPs submitted to date (the link: <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/node/257>)

**Comments on revised text:**

Additional material has been provided by Vanuatu for components 1a and 1b (although not for 1c). There are minor changes in 2a, and it appears that for 2b they have simply dropped in the outputs of the June 2011 National Planning Meeting of the SPC/GIZ project ("Climate protection through forest conservation in Pacific island countries") on p. 37-39. There is some interesting material on scoping a jurisdictional and

nested approach on p. 41-55, but no new material for 2c or 2d. The new material is useful, especially the discussion about pilot sites, but still very incomplete. There is no additional material in any of the other sections of the R-PP text.

As presented, this is yet to be put in a digested format that makes a coherent R-PP. It is still what is called a "placeholder" (see p. 21), partly finished but with much work to be done. Vanuatu are clearly aware of this deficiency, having drafted a "R-PP Formulation Roadmap" and appear to be on track for submission of the fully written R-PP for consideration at PC14. This interpretation is consistent with statements made on the teleconference with the government and their consultants.

Vanuatu should be encouraged to get all components completed before they submit another version. Each component depends on the others, so it is essential to make progress on all components, and then see how the components interact.

### Overall recommendations:

1. Vanuatu should be congratulated on its development of Components 3 and 4a, and its start on the development of Components 1 and 2, and should be encouraged to complete Components 4b, 5 and 6 as a priority. Components 1 and 2 are particularly important.
2. The competent authorities in the Government of Vanuatu need to show that they have the required degree of control over the process of conceiving and developing this R-PP process, both through the engagement with different arms of the Administration and the dialogue with all stakeholders; and through coherent control of the editorial process.
3. Budget estimates for all Components should be scrutinized, developed and adequately justified so that donor funding can be effectively mobilized.

### Assessment Table:

The findings of the preliminary TAP review and how that got changed due to revised R-PP are summarized in the table below:

Components	Draft R-PP submitted for PC13 (August 2012)	Revised Draft R-PP submitted for PC13 (September 2012)
1a	Standard not met	<b>Standard partially met</b>
1b	Standard not met	<b>Standard partially met</b>
1c	Standard not met	Standard not met
2a	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
2b	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
2c	Standard not met	Standard not met
2d	Standard not met	Standard not met
3	<b>Standard largely met</b>	<b>Standard largely met</b>
4a	<b>Standard largely met</b>	<b>Standard largely met</b>
4b	Standard not met	Standard not met
5	Standard not met	Standard not met
6	Standard not met	Standard not met

### Component 1. Organize and Consult

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

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

**TAP’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

This revised Readiness Preparation Proposal (RPP) for Vanuatu provides a “Roadmap” and description of initial steps to be taken during October - December 2012 to complete the drafting of the R-PP. This process will include the development of governance arrangements.

As requested by the TAP, some details have now been given of the structure of the National REDD+ Programme. Although there is still no clear detail on which government ministries or departments are involved in the National Advisory Body (NAB) on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (formerly NACCC), the composition, and roles and responsibilities, of the newly appointed REDD+ Steering Committee is outlined. The National REDD+ Coordinator is to be located within the Department of Forestry, although full justification for this location, or consideration of alternatives, is not provided. Some description of linkages with other REDD+ implementing agencies is now provided, but there is room for greater clarity. This section now provides a better description of how the Readiness activities will be coordinated and how an approach to environmental and social risks mitigation will be drafted.

It is noted that a Grievance Redress mechanism will be developed, with a draft Dispute Resolution Framework outlined in Annex 1c. There is, as yet, no mention of a Capacity Development Plan.

The budget is unchanged from the earlier version, and has no text for justification of cost estimates.

**Recommendations:**

1. The REDD+ Roadmap should be followed and extended. It will require the ongoing funding of the work of the governance structure, and secretariat support, and the budget should be more clearly justified.

**Conclusions:**

This section was revised and improved and, although it is not yet complete, it shows encouraging signs that the process of development is underway. At present it partially meets the Standard.

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

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

**TAP’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

The information provided in this section is now more thorough, with the inclusion of text outlining stakeholder analysis from the June 2011 National Planning Meeting of the SPC/GIZ project (“Climate protection through forest conservation in Pacific island countries”). A brief description is provided of pre-consultation activities undertaken by the NACCC, multi-stakeholder consultation workshops leading up to the submission of the Vanuatu R-PIN in 2007 and 2008, and there is mention of a National REDD+ Planning Workshop held in July 2011, without much detail as to how these activities have contributed to a national readiness statement. However a National REDD+ Policy Workshop was held in September 2012 as a training and consultation exercise to inform the development of the Vanuatu R-PP, and plans are outlined for taking the process forward.

Budget estimates are still not made, suggesting that detailed thought has not yet gone into how the vital

process of information sharing might be developed into the future with support from FCPF.

**Recommendations:**

1. Plans are now outlined for an approach to properly detail, as per R-PP requirements, the actions and amounts required to better facilitate information sharing and early dialogue with key stakeholder groups. These plans need to be taken forward.

**Conclusions:**

The Standard is partially 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<sup>3</sup> (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.*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

As noted in the original review, there has been some consultation as part of an international REDD+ process through the SPC/GIZ regional project, but little commentary on lessons learned from this exercise or its ongoing activities; it is intended to run from 2009 to 2012. There is still no evidence of government budget commitment to this process to date. Very little new text has been added to this section.

The full consultation and participation plan remains very sketchy, suggesting that much thought is still required, including how it might be implemented and by whom. There is still work to be done to identify the stakeholders nor to put them into some kind of context. The comments from the original report still stand: in a country as small as Vanuatu, with a social structure dominated by islands, clans and chiefs this should not be difficult to do. It is particularly important to note that customary landowner representative groups should be included in any process to develop the R-PP in Vanuatu.

Given that the absence of consultation is ascribed to a lack of funds, it is disappointing that the R-PP does not offer any details of the budgeted amounts required to better facilitate consultation and participation activities (Table 1c).

**Recommendations:**

1. As a high priority, efforts should be made immediately to properly detail, as per R-PP requirements, the amounts required for consultation and participation activities (Table 1c).
2. As a first order priority, urgent efforts must be undertaken to ensure that the development of the R-PP is consultative and involves participation across all key stakeholder groups, which must be defined (since these remain undefined at present in the report). Once governance arrangements are further detailed (see

---

<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).

Recommendation under 1a above) the governance structure needs to determine as soon as possible an appropriate and budgeted consultation and participation plan. Further development of the R-PP can follow once this essential step is undertaken.

**Conclusions:**

This Standard is not 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-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.*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

There is very little new, revised text in this section. Work has begun on a draft Policy Framework for REDD+ modelled on the Pacific Regional Policy Framework on REDD+. Version 1 of the Vanuatu Policy Framework for REDD+ is presented in Annex 2a.

An initial discussion of the drivers of deforestation and degradation is a good start, although it suffers from the lack of a reasoned logical structure and the absence of detail. The reference to the Vanuatu Carbon Credits Project and mapping of the 1990-2000 deforestation suggest that something of substance is available, but this should have been provided in a quantitative form and best broken down among the islands where forest loss could be related to population and land use trends and also to governance and enforcement.

There is no real description of the forest except in relation to its administrative definition and it would have been useful to see some interpretation of why this definition exists and is being used, because it is different from the FAO definition and also that used by other major tropical forested countries. This needs explanation.

The discussion of forest law and policy covers the main points, noting that Vanuatu's Forestry Act does not explicitly cover climate change but that its Forest Policy Act does cover integrated climate change mitigation issues. However, insufficient attention is given to the fact that the overwhelming majority of rural land in Vanuatu is held by customary landowners and thus all forest and carbon rights must be negotiated with customary landowner groups (as detailed in the Constitution, the 16 pieces of land reform legislation and the Forestry Act). The failure of the report to adequately address the current legislative arrangements around forest management and land use needs to be urgently addressed. How does the arrangement in Vanuatu relate to the conditions in the Solomon Islands, PNG and Fiji for example, and are there special problems or opportunities for Vanuatu compared to other Melanesian countries?

Planning for a R-PP process must consider adequately the legal arrangements in which any future REDD + scheme would be located. An analysis of land use patterns and current leasing arrangements is also required. The recent Justice Blong Evriwan data and reports of lease patterns across Vanuatu may be useful in this respect.

There is a summary of governance issues, but more detail is needed. Discussion of governance begins by acknowledging the authority of customary owners but then provides pages of information about government and their agencies which ascribe authorities that they could not implement. The emphasis on explaining government compared to explaining "custom" is unbalanced considering reality and fails to convey what is very interesting to international discussion about the implementation of REDD, viz., how to do it in an archipelagic nation with a small population of mainly customary owners who are engaged in rural livelihoods. The discussion notes that more information is still to come. How gaps and capacity constraints

will be met is lacking.

It is not clear what follow up activities or studies might be needed. One would have expected, after 5 years of prior project support, that a clearer presentation of gaps in understanding could have been presented. This is the essence of what the FCPF might support.

There is international interest in how to deal with “leakage” which makes the question of national vs. sub-national (states) versus geographical entities very important.

Mention is made of NGOs but the relevant ones are not identified. There is no broader discussion of the role of civil society, including educational and religious institutions and their importance in Melanesian society.

No budget estimates are provided.

### **Recommendations:**

The development of the R-PP needs, in particular, to include:

- The key recommended features for the design of a REDD+ pilot project in Vanuatu, based on land tenure arrangements.
- A more substantial presentation and discussion of the drivers of deforestation and degradation, that can serve as a basis for the strategies to counter them, that will be outlined in the next section, 2b
- More specifically, this should include: an analysis of land and property laws of relevance to REDD+ in Vanuatu; an analysis of forestry laws of relevance to REDD+ in Vanuatu and an analysis of laws concerning ‘incorporation’ or other legal structure relevant to the establishment of a community based governance arrangement to manage a REDD+ project.

### **Conclusions:**

The Standard is only partially met.

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

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

### **TAP’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

A brief summary of REDD+ strategy options is provided; these have been derived from the VCCP Project Phase 1, but detail is lacking with much remaining to be done. In this revised version, there is a new section of text which is simply dropped in the outputs of the June 2011 National Planning Meeting of the SPC/GIZ project (“Climate protection through forest conservation in Pacific island countries”) on p. 37-39, but this is not particularly relevant to an analysis of REDD+ strategy options.

The Vanuatu government has developed a Vanuatu Carbon Credits Project (VCCP) with international technical advisors, which has focused on identification of capacity building requirements, national forest area change assessment mapping, identification and opportunities to address deforestation and degradation drivers, and potential incentive mechanisms for REDD-plus implementation. Its completion in 2008 led to

setting up priorities for capacity building and seeking international support. Currently, it intends to follow the Pacific Regional Policy Framework for REDD+.

The revised report contains useful information on the current forested land in Vanuatu. An improved data set to assess the current level of forest resources is still needed before further planning on the R-PP can be undertaken. While there is some historical evidence of pressure on forestry resources, information presented in the R-PP seems to indicate that deforestation pressures from commercial logging are limited in Vanuatu. More analysis is needed to ascertain whether deforestation is still a major threat in the context of Vanuatu. This text is probably more appropriate to the previous component, 2a, however.

There is an improved discussion on scoping a jurisdictional and nested approach on p. 41-55. However, a number of sections of text remain incomplete.

No associated budget requirements have been addressed.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Capacity building would be very important to ensure that bulk of the work ultimately gets done by Vanuatu staff.
2. Another option would be to examine the work done by PNG (see the PNG R-PP available on the FCPF website) on making projections to 2030 and 2050 to examine the approaches to reducing emissions that are worth pursuing. Vanuatu could benefit from that type of exercise to evaluate whether the PNG approaches may be suitable for its use.
3. Serious attention is given to the development of improved data sets for mapping forestry resources (see also Standard 3).
4. Assumptions that commercial logging will provide a future threat to forestry resources should be properly analysed and not just taken for granted, in future iterations of the R-PP.
5. More serious consideration should be given to the threats caused by degradation and deforestation due to large scale agricultural production and also current sub-leasing in Vanuatu.

### **Conclusions:**

The Standard is only 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.*

### **TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

The text in this section is proposed as a draft material for this component, and is simply a list of the elements that will be used to develop the implementation framework. It represents a start in that it identifies the main issues and activities to be undertaken and funded during R-PP implementation; now this list needs to be put into a proper plan that shows convincingly how this will be done. As is the case with many other R-PPs it would also benefit from the work done in Standard 2b once Vanuatu personnel have completed that assignment.

The list of potential baseline accounting research suggests that no relevant work has ever been done in Vanuatu, which is doubtful considering the long standing interest of AusAID and Australian forestry agencies and universities through the Forestry sector. If the data are so poor, some indication could be obtained by identifying proxy data taken from other similar locations, such as PNG, the Solomons or Fiji, or from North Queensland.

No budget estimates are made.

**Recommendations:**

1. The outline that is provided in this text should be expanded into a realistic plan to develop the implementation framework.
2. Work to describe a potential capacity building programme for Vanuatu personnel, should be completed to allow development of the implementation framework.

**Conclusions:**

Standard not 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.*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

No details provided in this section, so no comments are possible.

**Recommendations:**

**Conclusions:**

Standard not 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.)*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

In contrast to the previous components, component 3 has been developed in some detail. Drivers have been identified and a methodological framework presented, using the UNFCCC approach to setting up Forest Reference Emission Levels and Forest Reference Levels. Data requirements and availability have been thought through, and an initial set of available data has been identified. It plans to use the IPCC 2006 approach on emissions and removals. It will also rely on JNRI compliance which will be validated by UNFCCC and VCS accredited certifier(s). Key activities have been laid out and put into a work plan (provided in the appendices) that seems sensible. An institutional framework identifies the key institutions. A summary budget has been carefully worked out with adequate detail, and seems sensible and realistic. There is a

comprehensive set of references.

With the addition of some detail about how institutions will actually carry out the proposed work, this component could meet the standard. However, given the fact that so little analysis has been done for the policy components 1 and 2, approval of component 3 should wait until there is a coherent and integrated proposal. Otherwise there may be gaps or overlaps in the data needs for the reference level to meet the policy requirements which will be laid out in components 1 and 2.

The additional problem is that the consultant's report has been inserted in one section under this component with no attempt to place its offerings into the many sub-sections provided for guidance; instead these sections are left completely blank.

There is a significant budget proposal presented here, but it is neither interpreted nor justified.

**Recommendations:**

1. Additional detail is required on how institutions will actually carry out the proposed work.
2. Significant progress on Standards 1 and 2 should precede work on this Standard.
3. The text sections should be completed properly, with engagement and ownership demonstrated by the Vanuatu government (and not just the consultant authors of the various reports).

**Conclusions:**

Standard largely met, although in the absence of components 1 and 2, there are still improvements to be made, that are dependent on their adequate completion.

**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.*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

There has been strong progress in component 4 compared to components 1 and 2. The guiding principles are reasonable, using the tools and approaches laid out by JNRI/VCS and GOF-C-GOLD among others, and there is a good summary table of the key elements that must be addressed by Vanuatu's MRV system. There appears to be an excellent recognition of the needs of a small country spread over many islands, and of what elements must be part of an appropriate MRV system. The summary of monitoring activities and budget is a good fit with the details of the monitoring system that have been provided in the appendix - even a plot design is proposed. As with component 3, there is a timeline for the necessary work to be done. All of the budget numbers are carefully justified. Overall, the discussion for this component is one of the better ones seen for any country.

Table 4.1 appears to be a proposal for future funding within this MRV element but, as with previous Components, it is not interpreted and justified in any way.

As noted for component 3, before Component 4 can be said to meet the standard, components 1 and 2 need to be developed to the same level. As noted, the proposal must show integration of policy and monitoring. And as noted for Component 3, the material in this Component gives the impression of being copied from the consultants' report without any analysis and without appropriate placing under the many sub-sections which are included in the FCPF template to provide guidance. Once these things are done, then this component will be a strong one.

**Recommendations:**

1. This component will need a measure of integration with Components 1 and 2, after they have been properly developed.

**Conclusions:**

Standard largely 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.)*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

Still no details provided in this section, so no comments possible.

**Recommendations:**

1. Work on this component must be undertaken.

**Conclusions:**

Standard not 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.*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

Still no details provided in this section so, no comments possible. The proponents seek clarification on what is required for this element, as it appears to them to duplicate other elements.

**Recommendations:**

1. The schedule and budget should spell out and provide information about each of the sub-sections. The authors should examine the Budget and Schedule of other, already approved, R-PPs, for guidance in this regard.

**Conclusions:**

Standard not 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.*

**TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard:**

No meaningful details provided in this section so no comments are possible. The proponents state that they are in discussions with Det Norske Veritas (DNV), an international service provider, for the determination of possible Monitoring and Evaluation Framework elements but they provide no details of proposed actions or budget. This may, in the event, be more appropriate to Component 4 (which is about technical monitoring of forest carbon changes), than here in Component 6, which is about the M and E process of the eventual RPP project.

**Recommendations:**

1. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework must be developed.

**Conclusions:**

Standard not met.