

**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): Mozambique - v. August 2011**

**Reviewer (fill in):** Canada, Norway, and Nepal (lead)

**Date of review (fill in):** October 16<sup>th</sup> 2011

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

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

**Component 1. Organize and Consult**

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

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

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

- *It could seem the biggest challenge for the Mozambiquean REDD+ process is to have sufficient national ownership to the process. For example, the national REDD+ strategy should perhaps ideally be an integral part of a national development strategy. National ownership is crucial to succeed with REDD+ at scale; then REDD activities must be anchored in nationally defined policies. According to the table on p. 16, external institutions FAS and IIED have had the main responsibility to develop the national REDD+ strategy thus far. The two national governmental bodies - to some extent the Ministry of Environment (MICOA) and in particular the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG), both represented at lower level (by directorates), have seemingly had relatively passive roles so far, at least when it comes to strategy and content in the process.*
- *Experiences drawn from the Brazilian foundation FAS could potentially be very useful to Mozambique's REDD+ process. It is still important to underline that Mozambique needs to assess in what ways these experiences can be used in the most relevant manner in its national REDD strategy.*
- *Concrete REDD action would contribute to demonstrating the potential benefits of REDD+ to Mozambique, which potentially are not limited to environmental benefits, and this could in turn contribute to lifting REDD+ out of the "environmental protection" box (ref. p. 14) and into a broader agenda. The new and broad UT-REDD could be a good first step. However, commitment and involvement and at a higher level, also in the Ministry of Agriculture, as highlighted on p. 18, will be essential.*
- *The external entities have so far contributed to a job which appears to have been very important, laying a solid ground for further REDD+ work in Mozambique. However, it will in the coming process be important to strike a good balance between national ownership and technical expertise.*
- *Moving forward, engagement must be fostered at a broader range of governmental institutions; at higher level; and through a broader range of stakeholders: In this respect, the plans to identify national structures to bring the national (UT-REDD) and sub-national REDD+ process forward seem well thought through, and they seem to highlight relevant challenges.*
- *It seems the private sector has played a very limited role so far and it seems unclear how this sector will be engaged in the REDD+ planning process.*

*Recommendation 1A = Standard partially met.*

*Overall: It is good to see that the communication with stakeholders involved in the consultation is two-way; i.e. that there is an effort to raise awareness and also consider their input into the process. It is not entirely clear how some of these bodies interact--could have more explanation on the relationship between the COMDES, the National REDD Working Group and the National Council and Tech Council, as well as with the UT and existing community management committees. There are many diagrams showing the internal hierarchy of these individual organizations, but insufficient explanation of how these individual bodies interact with each other. Are capacity-building activities planned for this component, especially for areas where considerable external assistance has been provided to date?*

*Role of the provincial-level could be expanded on page 17 and 24 and sub-national UT identified on pg 25? This body and it's TOR would seem critical given the decentralized nature of Mozambique identified earlier in the R-PP.*

*Participation of community management communities in decision making process is lacking. More clarity on community participation in decision making at various levels would be useful.*

*Page 18, first paragraph. What is the plan for assembling a qualified team and building their capacity?*

*Page 18 Second paragraph. How will CONDES ensure good governance in the management of resources and in the implementation of environmental and social safeguards?.*

*Page 19: the composition and roles of apex body are not clear.*

*Page 25. In addition to listing the responsible entity for each of the tasks/actions described, could the table also include a column listing other participating organizations/institutions that have committed their support to each of these actions? This could improve the expression of existing commitment to the implementation of REDD+ readiness*

*Diagram presented in page 25 could be elaborated.*

*Page 26. The budget table is incomplete. While there is a disclaimer at the beginning of the R-PP (p. 9) explaining that there will not be a detailed budget, the future iterations of the R-PP that will include budgets should ensure that the budget line items align with the main interventions that immediately precede the budget.*

*Coordination with agriculture, mining and energy ministries is not clear Would be helpful to know what approach will be taken to increase engagement with the Ministry of Ag (responsible for forests), given that the R-PP self-identifies that this has been a challenge to date. Would these efforts link to those identified on page 22?*

### **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:**

*October 2011: Much improved section based on initial PC comments. Good to see pilot areas identified and to now see answers to the frequently asked questions on pp 41-43. Grouping stakeholders by rank (primary, secondary, service providers) is a good approach and well explained in the R-PP.*

*Recommendation = Standard largely met*

*The R-PP describes past activities well (Table 4, Figure 7) however the future training/awareness raising at local-level (Table 5) could be given more attention/explanation. More specific timelines and communities/stakeholders to be engaged? Table 7 begins this in Section 1c, however not operationalized.*

*In page 38 it is mentioned about creating more reserve for forest carbon enhancement. Social safeguards assessment needs to be carried out before crating more reserves.*

*In table 5, the capacity need assessment need to be done before designing training materials.*

*Not clear how consultations are going to be determined by site-specific drivers under a common framework; this requires further explanation.*

*Budget table incomplete.*

### **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

---

<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

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:**

*October 2011: Some progress has been made in this latest draft, however several key issues remain unaddressed. Good progress on targeting the communications plan.*

*Recommendation = Standard partially met.*

*Overall: Much of this information on 'who' comprises each of the groups would be better served in a more detailed section of 1b. The objectives for consultation with each group should remain here with associated interventions/activities that are planned. Overall the text of section 1c seems to be underdeveloped compared to that of 1a and 1b.*

*Good to see the identification of the objectives of consultation. Unclear regarding the timing for \*early\* consultation as most activities are planned to occur in late 2012 and up to 2013/2014*

*The extent of ownership within government and the national stakeholder community does not appear to be explained. Is this covered in another section (1a or 1b)?*

*A process for considering expressed concerns, grievances and recommendations does not appear to be described. No mechanism for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD+ process, for conflict resolution or redress of grievances.*

*Is there some central contact point person or agency to respond to queries following dissemination of information campaigns, etc.? How are expressed concerns catalogued and addressed and by whom?.*

*The budget has not been prepared.*

**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:**

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).

*October 2011: Some progress has been made in this latest draft, however several key issues remain unaddressed. Interesting existing arrangement where forest communities get percentage of timber revenue; could provide for important 'lessons learned' in the development of REDD benefit sharing mechanisms*

*Recommendation = Standard partially met.*

*Overall: Interesting existing arrangement where forest communities get percentage of timber revenue; could provide for important 'lessons learned' in the development of REDD benefit sharing mechanisms*

*It would be useful to have a comprehensive table listing the total area of each of the different forest cover types and categories. Another table could include all of the areas under different categories of actual land use. If there is data on land use capacity, then this could also be presented so that 100% of the country's territory can be broken down by actual and potential land use.*

**Table 12 needs to specify the units of measurement used (m3?)**

*Mining and infrastructure sections are underdeveloped: more intervention including landuse profile is required. These land-uses are also not addressed later in section 2a with regards to methods to address these drivers.*

*What were the recommendations of the review of policy provisions? Will there be any need to harmonize or consolidate some of these to facilitate implementation of REDD+?*

*What policies or measures has the government implemented in the past to try to address these weaknesses in forest governance and the drivers of deforestation and degradation -- which were successful/why, and which failed/why?*

*Use of fire for land clearing and shifting cultivation is identified as a major driver and it has also mentioned that the present policy failed to address this problem. It would be better to mention the strategy for controlling this problem.*

*In order to increase production under small stakeholders, it is mentioned that more clearing of forest land is required. How REDD activities ensure permanence and additionality if more forest areas are converted to other land use purpose?*

*What plans does the government have for addressing each of the identified challenges and causes of deforestation and degradation and how would these be funded and/or addressed through governance bodies identified in Section 1a?*

*What is the average size of each fire or the average total area burned each year? Number of fires per year and peak season now identified on p. 61 but not average size or total area burned each year. Strategy options should be developed for degradation and fire.*

*Law enforcement is not the only solution for controlling deforestation and forest degradation. There should be other options as well.*

*How could tree planting be a direct driver of deforestation?*

*Detailed budget has not been prepared.*

*Good that foreign land ownership driver was addressed: Brazil purchasing land for*

*soy production and the potential conflicting policy objectives re: development of ag sector infrastructure, including roads vs. reducing deforestation/degradation. Any proposed legislation/policy changes planned for Table 18 based on SWOT Table 16?*

*Land tenure and natural resource ownership not mentioned in this section.*

**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:**

**October 2011: Nothing has been changed in this section from the previous draft and no new information provided. Therefore all previous comments remain unaddressed in the latest version.**

*Recommendation = Standard not met.*

*Overall: Applicant should review for clarity and include additional details. No detailed discussion of options. Could have included fire suppression efforts, fuelwood replacement options. Additionally, agricultural intensification should be included given the importance of this sector to 70% of the population. Overall the options don't seem well-linked to each of the individual drivers and are mostly focused on improved governance and enforcement.*

*Biodiversity, cost/benefits, political feasibility and the other criteria are completely unaddressed.*

*Could the strategy be presented in a results based format?*

*It may be more useful to list each of the drivers of deforestation and degradation separately and to then show the various interventions being considered to address each of these (in a table).*

*Is there a detailed plan with a time line and assigned responsibilities for implementing those listed in Table 20? The activities could be presented in the form of a Gantt chart showing the start and end of activities.*

*Strategic options for each driver of deforestation and forest degradation are not provided. A plan for developing these options is not mentioned.*

*The budget has not been completed.*

**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:**

**October 2011: Few changes in this section from the previous draft and very little new information provided. Therefore all of previous comments remain unaddressed in the latest version.**

*Recommendation = Standard partially met.*

*Overall: This section is not clear and does not address key issues such as further elaborating institutional arrangements. From reading this section it could appear as Mozambique is taking mainly a "project"-oriented, "CDM-like" approach to REDD+. It seems an integrated, national approach is less present.*

*The activities in Table 22 could be better described. Each of these critical activities should have some supporting text describing the plan for that activity, institutional lead, and desired outcomes for that activity (as per template criteria above for 2c).*

*Need for further work on indicators beyond the conceptual; will be particularly important for development of MRV system*

*The budget has not been completed*

*The plan for subnational pilots in Zambezia could be further developed or described; what analysis underpins this?*

**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:**

**October 2011: Nothing has been changed in this section from the previous draft and no new information provided. Therefore all previous comments remain in the latest version**

*Recommendation = Standard not met.*

*Overall: this section is still in development and general; recognizes need for some form of 'minimum standards' but not clear what this means. Would recommend*



*referring to successful R-PPs to examine what has been approved in the past.*

*SESA process has not yet been defined. No workplan, only a list of two activities with 2011 and 2012 identified as the timeline. Needs to be fully developed.*

*Plans for SESA pilot are identified on page 85 but no supporting information. Specific mitigation measures not outlined/addressed.*

### **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:**

**October 2011: Little change in this section from the previous draft and very little new information provided. Therefore all previous comments remain in the latest version.**

*Recommendation = Standard partially met*

*Overall: This section is not very clear in terms of describing how the reference levels will be established.*

*It was good to have NFIs from 1970, 1990, and 2004, as well as some sub-national data, but no comprehensive data on biomass or C-stocks (apart from IPCC default values). This is a constraint for the R-PP as little info on different forest types/species--means that default values are likely not very accurate*

*Some description of studies providing estimates of C-sequestration by different activity, but mostly descriptive and not exhaustive*

*Brief general discussion of three reference level options: historic, adjusted historic, and projected, but no indication of analysis evaluating these options, nor a plan to conduct this analysis*

*There was identification of concerns over international leakage to Malawi; this will need further detailed assessment, but no plan nor cost estimates provided*

*Good to see data needs and human capacity needs outlined, but a strategy detailing the timing, anticipated costs, and existing/required capacities will need to be developed (see comments re: workplan and budget)*

*No explanation of why proceeding with a sub-national projected RL in one province--has some analysis already been done?*

*Consider alternative to introduced exotic species like eucalyptus? If plantations will be a major component, safeguards are very important.*

*Consider other degradation estimates? I.e. proximity to roads etc.?. Ref. REDD+ intervention no. 4: Converting any kind of natural forests to plantations is extremely hard to do without losing biodiversity, and should therefore probably not be a "first choice" option.*

*The table on page 89 states that a possible REDD+ intervention is the "conversion of natural forests with low carbon stocks into planted areas into high carbon stock forests". There is a very big chance that such a strategy will result in severe loss of biodiversity, and is therefore not advisable. If such activities are to be used, it is of crucial importance that biodiversity is mapped before the intervention and that high-conservation value ecosystems are protected. A possibility is to limit these actions to degraded, previously forested land.*

*The clear reference to IPCC guidelines on page 93 is very good.*

*More detailed information on how the development of sub-national reference levels will lead to the development of a national reference level would be helpful.*

*The JICA capacity building project looks very promising.*

#### **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:**

*October 2011: Little change in this section from the previous draft and very little new information provided. Therefore all previous comments remain in the latest version.*

*Recommendation = Standard not met.*

*IPCC Good Practice Guidelines are only being referred to indirectly. It should be included in the R-Plan that these guidelines should be followed for the MRV system.*

*It appears that the initial focus is on a subnational approach. More information is needed on how and when this initial approach will be scaled up to be able to add up to a national scale accounting system.*

*In the description of sampling, there is only a description on how different types of sampling can be carried out, not how this will be carried out in Mozambique. The method as a whole should be elaborated upon with much greater detail.*

*Positive that capacity building is being done in a south-south cooperation (with Brazil). Are there concrete plans for continuing this cooperation?. It is suggested that the MRV unit is organised as a part of UT-REDD+. Has a completely independent MRV institution been considered?*

*In the introduction the problems with definitions of forest, degradation etc. is addressed. This is important, but maybe a small paragraph could be included that stated that when international agreements on definitions are reached, these will also be used by Mozambique's MRV-system?*

*In the "sampling" section on page 99, it is suggested that permanent sampling plots are not to be used. We strongly recommend that Mozambique follow the most recent IPCC Good Practice Guidelines.*

*Cooperation on technical training with Brazil and Japan seems very promising. Information on causes of sub-national forest cover change would be useful to present in the drivers section above (2a). The interventions should be under 2b.*

*What are the 'options' being referred to in paragraph one of page 97?*

*A useful starting point for revisions to this section might be in addressing the four objectives/steps that are listed on pg 97. This could form the basis for preparing an improved section 4a that articulates the present status of each of these capacities, current weaknesses and a workplan with interventions/timelines to overcome this for each of the four objectives (assess carbon stocks, establish tracking of leakage etc, assess effectiveness of safeguards, data reporting/reporting).*

*Institutional responsibilities and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD+ implementation?*

#### **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:**

*October 2011: Little change in this section from the previous draft and very little new information provided. There is however a new Table 29 that shows a broad schedule for monitoring R-PP implementation. Nevertheless, this standard has not yet been met and the previous comments remain unaddressed in the latest version of the R-PP.*

*Recommendation = Standard not met.*

*Page numbering in this section needs to follow the previous section's numbering.*

*No plan or budget is presented.*

## **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:**

*October 2011: Although a disclaimer is present at the start of the R-PP, this section does not contain sufficient information in the current stage of development.*

*Recommendation = Standard not met.*

*Page numbering in this section needs to follow the previous section's numbering.*

*The budget could provide more details including description of main and sub-activities under each component and budget requirements per year for the implementation of the R-PP (as per template)*

*This section should also present each of the budget tables from the previous sections (including source of funds).*

*What funding support is requested specifically from FCPF and from other sources?*

## **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:**

*October 2011: Little change in this section from the previous draft and no new information provided. The annexes now provide a few references that were not previously included and where more information can be found. Previous comments remain unaddressed in the latest version.*

*Recommendation = Standard not met.*

*No information has been provided in the August or September drafts.*

*Page numbering in this section and the suggested annexes that follow, need to follow the previous section's numbering.*