

**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.

Update of the Review of COLOMBIA's R-PP (v.3 of June, 2011)

Reviewer (fill in): Germany, Spain, AFD (France), Mexico

Date of review : 08.06.2011

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

General comments

The reviewers consider the Draft R-PP presented by Colombia already considerably advanced and would like to commend the country for a comprehensive and very well elaborated document. Key strengths include an apparently well organized and (compared to the Draft character of the document) broad consultation process, a well-structured assessment of the status quo regarding deforestation and a very participatory approach to the monitoring of non-carbon benefits, SESA

and ESMF. The reviewers would also like to highlight positively the fact that initiatives underway together with other development partners are an integral part of the R-PP.

Although practically all chapters lay out a seemingly consistent roadmap to implementation, more detailed information is needed in several chapters on content. This is particularly relevant for the chapters that are developed with high contributions from other development partners, such as 2, 3 or 4 (but also 6), where it is important to have more clarity on the complementarity of contributions. Given the apparently high relevance of other development partners' contributions, we recommend including a short description of the respective projects at least in the annex of the R-PP.

The document talks about "REDD projects" and "REDD activities", but it is not always clear what it is referring to.

The PC reviewers also would like to highlight that Colombia plans to include forest degradation into the establishment of reference levels and the monitoring of emissions. High amounts of funding are allocated to this activity. Given the lack of data, we recommend giving more explicit information on how degradation is going to be tackled.

Overall the R-PP has improved, and many of the suggestions and comments raised by the May PC review have been taken into account.

Maps are very much welcomed throughout the document. But most of their legends should be improved so as to be readable.

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:

A comprehensive list of acronyms has been provided in this version and names are used systematically throughout the document.

Colombia is planning the setting up of the Sistema Nacional de Cambio Climatico (SNCC) which will be including all the national ministries and has high-level political support by the President. In that respect it seems that a cross sectoral design of the national readiness management arrangements is realized. The relationship between the three priority strategies "Low Carbon Development Strategy", "REDD+ Strategy" and "National Climate Change Adaption Plan", has been further clarified (p. 13).

This version does not clarify which of the Sub-Commissions of the CONACC the working group Mesa de Trabajo REDD+ (MT REDD+) will belong to or whether it will have an inter-commissional character. Earlier versions referred to the Territorial Sub-Commission, not the Sectoral Sub-Commission which would be responsible for sectoral mitigation strategies. It would be helpful to clarify how the MT REDD+, lead by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, will achieve cross-sectoral coordination, including with the Ministry of mining and energy and others not represented in it and considering that it will convene possibly only twice a year. Mentioning of the Intersectorial Working Group (p. 49) should be considered.

Very positively, civil society groups and private sector are directly represented + and have voting rights within the MT REDD+ which is convened at least twice a year. However, given such a small number of meetings, it appears that the main work is being carried out by more than ten technical, thematical and regional consultative groups whose members and number of meetings per year remain unclear.

The definition of the profile of the participants in the MT REDD+ and its consultative groups is important. If Colombia sets a high profile for the participants, there could be problems to agree on times and dates to meet, given the vast number of participants and there are risks in the communication of key messages to the people that actually will have to implement the decisions. If they set the profile too low, they could slow down the decision-making process. There is a need to find a good balance of people that have the power of compromising and that can communicate more directly with the implementing team.

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:

This component as well as component 1c have improved a lot and provide exhaustive information. The consultation process as it is presented suggests to be a very good one. Still mechanisms to incorporate feedbacks and to consider grievance need to be defined and precisely outlined.

An exercise to identify key stakeholders in the forest sector and beyond has taken place. From our point of view all relevant stakeholders are listed with some few exceptions.

Since June 2010 different awareness raising and information activities took place as well as capacity building activities for indigenous and afro communities and the private sector. Not only have those events been used to transmit information but as well to gather feedback of the participants which in turn fed into the elaboration of the R-PP. Though there have been activities on the ground with communities, it looks as if the key national institutions have been involved in the process only recently (April-June 2011). For the future process, more emphasis on interministerial consultations and consultations with the private sector seems to be necessary.

Furthermore, it does not become clear how the conclusions of this process will be integrated in the discussions of the national coordinating entity Mesa de Trabajo REDD+ (not to be mixed up with the Mesa REDD, formed by several environmental NGOs).

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be

assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP; (v) and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

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

Several consultations with indigenous peoples in the Amazon Basin and afro-Colombian communities in the Pacific Region have taken place. Different mechanisms for consultation have been used so far, such as roundtables, publication of the R-PP on the ministry website etc., and seem to be adequate. Early concerns of different groups of stakeholders are well reported and given consideration.

It seems that sectoral ministries have only recently been intensively consulted, but intensive coordination has started. The newly established intersectorial roundtables should be more clearly linked or integrated into the national Readiness management arrangement.

The consultation and participation process is well explained (eg. by using a timetable), and covers all the main issues to be discussed with the stakeholders. As mentioned in 1.b., the process of including the results of consultation and participation process in the definition and implementation of REDD+ strategy should be further explained. The mechanisms for conflict resolution and grievance redress during national Readiness Preparation are not explained (reference is made only to ongoing voluntary market project grievances).

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:

Major land use trends are sufficiently identified in the R-PP. Land tenure and resource rights are basically covered, and a summary table on forested area and forest type per land tenure is highly appreciated.

³ Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Program Steering Committee).

The direct drivers of deforestation are mentioned but not further described, quantified or attributed to the different regions. Although this is planned to be done during the implementation phase as part of complementary studies, some preliminary information should already be available. Singling out areas of illegal plantations and small scale agriculture gives a rather biased view. Indirect drivers and underlying factors are well presented and will be studied in detail later on.

The section contains little information about degradation processes and the proposal for further assessment work does not include degradation neither.

A preliminary documentation of successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation is still missing.

Standard 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.

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

This component has slightly improved since the last version but still does not meet the standard. The new table aligning drivers of deforestation and a timetable of possible policy options is very much welcomed. Focus on the next steps to be taken is welcomed. However, implementation of promising options (see column 4, including territorial planning, agricultural intensification and use of silvopastoral systems, fuelwood substitution, forest fire monitoring system) should not be displaced until 2020.

No information is provided on existing programs to address deforestation (eg. Familias Guardabosques), potential synergies or inconsistencies with country sector strategies in forest, agriculture and transport are not addressed.

Some missing requirements of the component are going to be dealt with at a later stage, which seems reasonable (eg. plan to estimate costs and benefits of strategy options, consideration on socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, plan to address leakage). However the budget apparently does not provide for all of them.

Since components 2b and 2c are merged, further work is needed in defining eg. what the financial mechanism/architecture should look like, how governance would be strengthened at the different levels, etc. A work plan of how to get to the Readiness Package within the proposed timeframe of 4 years should be provided.

Please also name the unspecified development partner in the last budget line (largest contributor).

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:

This section has been merged with section 2b.

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:

We appreciated the effort made by Colombia to highlight changes & new inputs in most of the sections of the R-PP. To make the update easier it would have been nice to proceed like that throughout the document including in this section 2d (p89-92).

For a second draft this section is promising. However it still needs some elaboration on the institutional set-up, i.e. which entities are going to be responsible to carry out SESA consultations and management arrangements of the ESMF. Linkage to as the national Readiness management set-up and/or existing governmental entities involved with environmental and social impact assessments, as well as linkage to other components of the RPP (component 1) and monitoring of non-carbon impacts (Component 4b) should be explained.

Some first ideas of pressing environmental and social issues, eg. results of the consultations carried out so far, are given in Component 1b and c. Nevertheless no preliminary statement is made as to which of the WB safeguards are likely to be triggered based on these first ideas (likely Indigenous Peoples). That would give a starting point for developing this component and for further planning the workshops.

On page 88/89 reference is made to existing proposals for national principles and criteria for REDD+ (Ortega/Ruiz 2011). The annex provides an extensive list of these principles and criteria, but does not explain their origin and status in the national context.

Further on, there seems to be some confusion between SESA and ESMF. It should be explained that SESA is a process leading to the ESMF, which will be a stand-alone product. The outline of Environmental and Social Impact Assessments seems to be well thought and comprehensive, but it does not become clear who is going to carry them out at what level (project, regional/national level) and how the results will feed into the design of the ESMF. Link to the table would be helpful, eg. adding a column of who is the responsible coordinating entity. Finally, a work plan for public disclosure of the ESMF and meaningful consultation should be added.

The budget allocation should be also worked out. Here is important to consider that at least two countries have had their first SESA workshop (Costa Rica and Mexico) and could be useful to have their costs as reference for planning the budget allocation for this (costs are very high).

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:

Although this component needs to be further elaborated, it does identify important issues such as: the importance of consistency among scales, the creation of a national REDD+ registry to avoid double counting, the need to have a "guarantee fund".

Colombia has taken the decision to work at the subnational level but should elaborate on how the transition to a national reference level is going to be addressed, and how long this would take.

The information provided on data availability and requirements is very heterogeneous. While issues related to reconstructing past trends of deforestation and related to remote sensing and GIS are well treated, there is no information about the econometrical models that are considered to project future trends, the institution or the organization that will be in charge of designing them, the inputs of these models, the quality of the data available but also the possible gaps in data availability. In fact, there is an important budget of 800 000 dollars for field data recollection, that doesn't seem to be backed up by a previous data gap analysis. Without this information, it is difficult to assess whether or not such models are in line with the drivers of deforestation highlighted in 2a.

How will early action and ongoing policies be included in the reference scenario?

It would be helpful to provide a short summary of the collaboration with the Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation in the annex of the R-PP, given that it seems to be the main co-funder of this component.

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:

The R-PP only lists the elements of the monitoring system not covered by the IDEAM program (Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation) without further elaborating on them. Since these missing elements include data on degradation and the institutional set-up of the monitoring system, including reporting requirements, the R-PP remains rather vague on MRV.

More information should be given on data requirements for estimation and monitoring of degradation, as well as on how displacement of emissions will be monitored in those regions that will be incorporated later to the REDD+ system.

The institutional set-up of the MRV is not yet defined and will be subject to consultations by the national working group Mesa de Trabajo REDD+. Although a stepwise approach is perfectly justified, preliminary ideas on the scope of the monitoring system would be welcomed. This should also address monitoring of the impacts of the envisaged REDD+ strategy in the forest sector, the potential for participatory approaches to MRV, transparency, data access, independent monitoring and review, how to involve forest dependent people or civil society and feed back mechanisms for the overall improvement of REDD+ implementation. Capacities requirements for all these aspects should be assessed and integrated into the budget.

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:

We appreciated the effort made by Colombia to highlight changes & new inputs in most of the sections of the R-PP. To make the update easier it would have been nice to proceed like that in the whole document including in this section 4b.

Some preliminary environmental, socio-economic or governance indicators are suggested, but more importantly we welcome the process of their development by academic and civil society institutions. It appears the same institutions involved in developing the indicators will also be the ones to monitor and assess them and will play a major role in SESA and ESMF. It is not clear how this is going to feed-back into the national Readiness Management arrangements and whether governmental entities will have ownership of the the proposed indicator system.

Potential synergies with ongoing national biodiversity monitoring activities are explained. However synergies in data collection for Components 3 and 4a are not addressed. In order to prevent duplication of data collection, biodiversity aspects could be integrated into the estimation and monitoring of emissions.

We appreciate the link that this section has made to SESA and its timeframe.

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:

All budget components should include the name of other funding sources, listed as “Other development partner”. Capacity development activities, though mentioned in the previous chapters, are not always part of the budgets. We strongly recommend to adjust the tables accordingly.

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:

There is no description of indicators to monitor the program performance, both concerning results and management issues. Colombia only lists the roadmap of how to develop the program monitoring and evaluation framework but does not outline indicators that may be employed. To meet the standard, some indicators at least by way of an example, should be provided.