

**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 Cambodia**

**Reviewers :Juergen Blaser and Suree Lakanavichian  
(on behalf of a total of 7 TAP reviewers)**

**Date of first review : February 7, 2011**

**Date of TAP Review on the REVISED R-PP: March 7, 2011**

## Summary assessment

### TAP Assessment Feb.7, 2011:

Overall, the R-PP presentation is excellent, the text is well written and it is stated in a logical order. The R-PP is well composed, illustrative and informative and addresses most of the key issues requested by the FCPF for each of the six components. Each element is generally well elaborated and documented and the annexes are very detailed. The flowcharts of RL and MRV presented in the annexes are exceptionally clear. The presented Draft R-PP largely or partially meets the Component Standards for most of the components. The TAP review team has made observations and suggestions that are noted in each component. Addressing these topics would make the R-PP more comprehensive and it should readily be able to meet the standard. Following is a summary of the key issues related to each component and the TAP comments.

In Cambodia, the Ministries in charge of forestry and the environment have taken the lead in the REDD+ process and for the preparation of the R-PP. This leadership is commendable and important for a future success of REDD+ in the country. Nonetheless, the TAP is of the opinion that – considering the particular situation of forest conservation, forest land use and forest management in Cambodia - there is a need for a wider responsibility in dealing with REDD+, beyond the two ministries traditionally in charge of forests. The entire document is colored by the fact that the R-PP mainly refers to those forests only that are under the direct mandate of the two lead agencies. Large tracts of what is forest today and that are under responsibility of other entities seem somewhat excluded from the proposed approach. Thus, as a major recommendation, the TAP proposes that the Cambodian government consider enlarging the mandate to all types of forest use, including also cross-sectoral activities that directly affect forests, deforestation and forest degradation throughout all forest ownership categories in the country.

Detailed observations made by the TAP are presented beneath under each standard. The main recommendations are as follows:

- While it is important that one or a small consortium of agencies is responsible for the implementation of the R-PP, reflect further the management arrangements for the R-PP implementation to reach a more inclusive approach of REDD+ in the country.
- Demonstrate that REDD+ is fully integrated into the wider land-use context in Cambodia and consider a more “cross-sectoral” approach in the REDD+ strategy
- Reflect on the inclusion of production forests and other forest and deforested areas in the REDD+ strategy, RL and MRV
- Strengthen local capacity building at all levels (national, regional, local, technical, field-based) in all the R-PP components
- Reflect further on the governance and law enforcement measures that are needed for the development and implementation of a viable REDD+ strategy
- Develop further the approach for SESA and provide training to interested parties
- Strengthen monitoring of co-benefits, including sector governance monitoring
- A minor but important suggestion relates to the summary provided in the R-PP; this should be rewritten in a way that it gives an overview of the R-PP as a whole and not only on some sub-components.

The TAP concluded that Standard 1a has not been met and that the standards 1c, 2b, 2d and 4a have been partially met. All other standards have been largely met.

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

The presented Revised R-PP of March 4, 2011 is a perfectly well elaborated document. The agency has carefully analyzed the comments and recommendations made by the TAP and also provided to the TAP a written statement on some of the TAP's comments and observations made. This statement, in addition to the discussion in the conference call between the executing agency and the TAP and the Revised R-PP submitted here, allowed the TAP to review some of its comments and to reconsider some of its statements, comments and recommendations made in its review of February 7, 2011.

The TAP recognizes the enormous efforts made by the GoC to introduce REDD+ in the country and to conduct an open and transparent consultation process on REDD+ which has been widely recognized by most of the in-country stakeholders to be "best ever" in terms of involving a wide range of local people, communities and NGOs. Clearly, the Revised R-PP also shows the complementarities of the R-PP activities in respect to the work undertaken at national level and with other donor agencies in the wider field of forestry, biodiversity and climate change.

Nonetheless, considering the rapid loss of forested areas throughout the country and the enormous economic pressure on forest land by actors outside the forest sector, in particular through agribusiness and mining, the TAP is still concerned if the proposed approach for Readiness is inclusive enough to comprehensively tackle the problems of deforestation and forest degradation in the country. The TAP still questions if the REDD+ Taskforce (under the lead of the forestry agencies) will be able to create the needed convening power to counteract the rapid loss of forests in favor of development-driven economic land concessions. In the view of the TAP, the R-PP still needs to demonstrate that REDD+ is fully integrated into the wider land-use context in Cambodia and that it is able to address a more "cross-sectoral" approach in the REDD+ strategy (e.g. avoidance of giving away forested areas for agribusiness, mining and other non-forest uses). The focus of the proposed REDD+ strategy to closely link to the implementation of the national forest programme is fully understood and endorsed by the TAP, but it might not suffice to curb deforestation in the country.

Having said that, the TAP recognizes that the R-PP proposal of Cambodia is well written and complete, and that the additional information given in the revised R-PP further strengthens an already well elaborated R-PP.

***Overall, the TAP assesses the Revised R-PP as follows :***

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements: **partially met** (before: not met)

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

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process: **met** (before: partially met)

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

Standard 2b: REDD-plus strategy Options: **largely met** (before partially met)

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

Standard 2d: Social and Environmental Impacts: **largely met** (provided other arrangements)

Standard 3: Reference Level: **met**

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

Standard 4b: MRV Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts, and Governance: **met**

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements: **met**

Standard 6: Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: **largely met**

## 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:

##### TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:

The Cambodia REDD+ Roadmap has provided a firm basis for development of the R-PP. It appears that in principle, the right ministries are involved, and the division into Technical Teams, Advisory Group, and Consultation Group logically follows from the work to be done.

While a comprehensive institutional framework is proposed and well described (see Figure 4), the TAP questions if the management arrangements in terms of inclusiveness are sufficient to tackle REDD+ in the country that lead to the expected output of emission reductions and sustainable development.

The TAP seeks more clarification about the relationships of the various actors in REDD+. The report says on page 13 that "whilst the legal framework for management of forest resources is clear, the national coordination and regulation framework with respect to REDD+ is not yet fully developed". REDD+ is primarily concerned with forest management which explains the dominance of the Forest Administration, Fisheries Administration and the Ministry of Environment in the REDD+ task force (all REDD decisions "are made on a consensus basis by FA, MOE and FIA"). However, as noted in Table 1, over 60% of carbon stocks are contained in forests that are managed by entities other than FA, FIA and MOE – 30% in forest concessions, 12% in economic land concessions and 19% in "other forests". It is also apparent that most of the deforestation pressure comes from other development sectors – energy, mining, the military, infrastructure, agriculture and tree-crops – that are not currently represented on the REDD+ Task Force.

The National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) provides senior level coordination to Cambodia's climate change programs. It is chaired by the MOE Minister, has Deputy Chairs from MAFF, MOWRAM, MOC and members from 20 line agencies. It provides the major mechanism for cross-sectoral integration and coordination in all aspects of climate change including REDD+. For this reason, it is difficult to understand Figure 4 which implies that the only connection between the NCCC and the REDD+ Task Force will be "reports from the Taskforce to the NCCC"; e.g. that the NCCC has no direct coordination function in relation to REDD+.

Thus, the TAP questions if the current REDD+ management arrangements is adequate to effectively address the problem of DD in Cambodia. Cambodia might want to reflect to position the REDD+ Task Force under the overall coordination of the NCCC. It should also reflect on its membership and might want to consider expanding it to include all of those government agencies that are responsible for regulating activities that pose a risk of forest loss and degradation throughout the

forest estate of Cambodia.

The TAP also feels that it is necessary to take particular care that the Consultation Group is fully integrated (in whatever form) in the REDD+ taskforce. Lessons from other countries sometimes show that these groups are formed but in fact are not used, leading to disaffection with the process.

***Recommendations:***

- Reflect on the positioning and the membership of the REDD+ Taskforce (to include all those that are responsible for forest carbon)
- Assure that Consultation Group have a clear mandate and feel integrated in the REDD+ development process

→ ***The standard has not been met*** (considering the importance of DD outside the jurisdiction of those line agencies that are now proposed to conduct REDD+)

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

The TAP had been informed by the submitting agency of the R-PP that there has been a fundamental misunderstanding by the TAP of the information presented in Table 1 of the R-PP. Thus, the submitting agency made it clear that all forests are regulated by the forest authorities (FA, GDANCP/MoE, or FiA). Depending upon the designation of the forest it may be managed by a local protected area authority, or local communities, etc, under contract to and regulated by the FA, GDANCP or FiA, as appropriate. Also it has been underlined by the submitting agency that representatives of non-government actors engaged in forest management are fully included in the REDD+ Readiness process through the Consultation Group.

The submitting agency also noted that all forestry concessions in Cambodia have been suspended since 2002 (as outlined on page 34). Therefore, there are no logging concessions currently in operation in the country, and the vast majority of companies have left or do not longer exist. In the absence of the concessionaires, these areas are currently managed directly by the FA. This, however, will not automatically mean that forest degradation is not happening in these areas, and the TAP still seeks some clarification about the situation of cutting permits and law enforcement in the former concession areas.

Cambodia further clarified that for Economic Land Concession, FA is responsible for law enforcement when there is a standing forest, however when all forest were cut, it is not anymore in the mandate of the FA. The question of what is forest and what is not forest is thus an important one. In the view of the TAP, the “grey area” of land-use needs specific consideration and needs to be fully addressed in the R-PP (including the way how the Readiness process should be organized).

From the Revised R-PP, the TAP noted that the Ministry of Industry, Mines and Energy (MIME) is now listed as a member of the REDD+ Taskforce. It also noted that other important extra-sectoral members of the REDD+ Taskforce comprise the Ministry of Interior (responsible for decentralisation and law enforcement); the MAFF/ELC Technical Secretariat which deals with Economic Land Concessions; the Ministry of Land Management also dealing with Land Concessions; and the Ministry of Rural Development in charge of Rural Infrastructure.

While the TAP recognizes and applauds the details and precision given in the Revised R-PP on the composition of the REDD+ Taskforce, it still has concerns in respect to the importance of DD outside the

jurisdiction of the line agencies (in particular FA) that is primarily in charge to conduct REDD+. E.g. it would be important to give some ideas on how the REDD+ strategy will be able to address large scale economic concessions that are threatening the integrity of forests (the TAP notices that in 2010 alone nearly 1.3 million hectares of land have been handed out to economic concessions), on how the REDD+ strategy is able to address the conservation of high-conservation value forests (such as the Prey Long forest area which is currently prominently debated in the NGO world).

The revised R-PP gives more precision on the delivery mechanism of the R-PP implementation through the Programme Executive Board (PEB) of UN-REDD. The PEB is responsible for overall oversight of progress, and approving annual workplans and budgets of the R-PP grant, administered by UNDP under the Multiple Delivery Partners modality of the FCPF. The PEB will be chaired by the REDD+ Taskforce Chair from the Forestry Administration, as the lead implementing agency and co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator in Cambodia or his/her designate.

➔ ***The standard has been partially met***

More information should be given on the way on how land-use conflicts (REDD+ against economic conversion) will be taken under a new national arrangement of REDD+. The core question for the TAP is if the REDD+ Taskforce under the leadership of the Forest Agencies can create the needed convening power to address the crucial cross-sectoral issues adequately.

**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:**

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

The R-PP clearly identified the full range of key stakeholders, including vulnerable groups (the annex shows a comprehensive list of organizations and groups to be consulted) and there are a variety of reasonable plans for raising awareness of the concepts of REDD+. Key stakeholders were invited and actively took part in the consultation, except representatives from logging concessions (private sector) who somewhat were contacted individually and selectively.

There is recognition in the process of the importance of explaining the SESA to all involved stakeholders (see Component 2d). Transparency will be helped by the further development of the Cambodia REDD+ website. The proposed phased approach is good, as is the recognition that networks will develop at their own paces.

There is a good list of lessons learned in Box 1, page 23; but the question remains how these lessons will be utilized in the development and implementation of the plan. It may be that the Oddar Meanchey REDD project (where the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries (MAFF) has approved 13 community forestry sites) will be the key in showing how this can be done.

The TAP asks for some clarification on how the process attempted to reach ethnic communities has

been conducted, given that REDD+ initiatives might significantly impact positively and negatively their livelihoods. E.g. (i) Have any materials made available in ethnic languages or in poster form for those groups that don't have a written language? (ii) How widely-representative were the ethnic group participants and what was their requirement to report to their communities? The TAP is of the opinion that such information sharing and consultation should be conducted. If this has not been done in the preparation of the R-PP, it should be integrated in the initial stage of its implementation.

**Recommendations:**

- Clarify or deepen some of the information sharing aspects mentioned above

→ ***The standard has largely been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

More information has been given on the few consultations undertaken with economic operators in the timber business. The Chairman of the Cambodia Timber Industry Association (CTIA) attended the multi-stakeholder consultations. The TAP was informed that given that logging concessions are unlikely to be reactivated in their current form this consulting them is somehow redundant. Nonetheless, in other sectors of the R-PP there is mention on the creation of large areas for sustainable (certified) forest management. How will that happen if economic actors in the timber business are absent from the debate?

Further details were given in the Revised R-PP on reaching ethnic communities. Representatives from grassroots civil society and indigenous peoples were invited to all three multi-stakeholder meetings (two national consultations and the validation meeting), and signed the minutes of the validation meeting. In addition, a separate meeting for 60 civil society and indigenous peoples representatives was organised in September, 2010. This meeting was attended by representatives of all the major civil society groups and networks, and the three national indigenous peoples umbrella groups: Indigenous Rights Active Member (IRAM), Indigenous Community Support Organisation (ICSO) and Cambodia Indigenous Youth Association (CIYA). The same groups were invited to informal roundtables throughout the process.

→ **Given the additional information provided, *the standard has been 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

---

<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

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:**

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

The consultation part is well elaborated and the participation process seems overall reasonable. Table 4 on page 27 gives a comprehensive overview on the Principles for Stakeholder Consultation and Participation during the R-PP Implementation.

The TAP discussed to some extent the consultation plans which might perhaps be too ambitious and complex for practical implementation.

What is missing is a reference to a mechanism for conflict resolution or addressing grievance (as requested in the standard).

The TAP expressed also some concerns in respect to the obviously limited capacity and knowledge on REDD+ of civil society and local stakeholders. The consultation and participation process should be accompanied by good information sharing and knowledge transfer allowing those stakeholders to develop at their own pace and allowing them the time to make informed inputs.

***Recommendations:***

- Reflect on the feasibility of the consultation and participation planning and reflect on the particular issues relating to the participation of civil society and local stakeholders
- Add some reflections on conflict mechanism

➔ ***The standard has partially been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

The TAP noted that besides the R-PP, Cambodia also prepares a REDD Readiness Roadmap. A thorough consultation process is taking place, which many observers describe as “collaborative” and the “best ever” in terms of involving a wide range of NGOs and community representatives. Capacity building for civil society stakeholders and communities has been taken into account in the revised R-PP, as well as a notion on conflict resolution mechanism.

➔ ***The standard has been 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

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).



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:**

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

Cambodia's forests are characterized by a greater ecological diversity than other countries in the Mekong region. Each forest type is different in its composition and in its ability to store carbon and also at the level of vulnerability against deforestation and degradation. Considering this fact, the present section of the R-PP should have a better breakdown of forest cover because specific treed communities will have very different carbon footprints and very different vulnerabilities to deforestation and degradation, and thus different opportunities for prioritizing REDD+ strategies.

The TAP recommends to give more attention to the nearly 4 million hectares of production forests and potential concession areas. This could include a short analysis on the situation of securing forest extent under the formerly used large-scale concession management and the system of timber license contracts used today in a scattered form over a wide area of production forests. With the cancellation of the forest concessions and with no alternative protection designation put in place, the conversion pressure on these forests will undoubtedly increase. It is a widespread perception in Cambodia that "forest land not currently under management is traditionally seen as an open-access resource that can be claimed by whoever clears the forest". The "tenure vacuum", the lack of any credible land use planning process, and poor law enforcement may mean a shift from forest depletion/degradation to uncontrolled and large-scale deforestation in the near future.

Having noted these critical elements in respect to the production forest area, the TAP observed that the discussion of the section on deforestation and forest degradation in the R-PP is very thorough, and illustrates quite comprehensively the various governance failures that exist in the country in respect to forest conservation and management. Nonetheless, the TAP also underlines that to reach an effective REDD+ strategy, there is a need to implement a certain level of functional governance (laws, policies and planning) that should be clearly at a higher level than in the recent past.

There is a good table of drivers provided. It would be useful at some point to put the assessment in the broader context of a comprehensive representation of the Upper Mekong forest biome.

The TAP further noted that a good summary of current and past policy issues is provided. An important point is the fact that community forestry was recognized only in 2006, so it will take time to fully implement a community aspect to REDD-plus. The plan should recognize this timing constraint.

***Recommendations:***

- Further describe the change from forest concessions to annual cutting permits and the consequences which this has on the production forest area.
- Develop some arguments on how the level of governance quality and law enforcement which are necessary for REDD+ to succeed will be raised, compared with the situation in the past.

➔ ***The standard has largely been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

The TAP noted that additional references have been made to the national forest programme and the

plans on how former concession areas might be brought into new types of forest management, including 2 million hectares of Community Forests, re-gazetting former production forests into protection forests and bring up to 2.6 million hectares of production forests under SFM, including certification (page 43). References have been made on how forest governance quality and law enforcement are addressed in the wider framework of the National Strategic Development Plan 2009-13 and other activities that address in particular anti-corruption efforts. Nonetheless, no arguments are presented on how specific forest-sector related governance issues will be addressed under REDD+, compared with the situation in the past.

➔ ***The standard has largely been met***

Some precision could be given on addressing forest governance and forest law enforcement issues under the REDD+ scenario.

**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:**

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

In general terms, the TAP concluded that the summary of the strategy and the proposed work is reasonable.

Taking the nested approach is a good way to start. Using Oddar Meanchey as an example of a sub-national project that could be nested into a national framework is a good idea. From what is presented, it appears that the assessments proposed will lead to the elaboration of more elaborated REDD+ strategy during the implementation of the R-PP.

The document states "development of Cambodia's REDD+ strategy will build on previous experiences and already existing management strategies, rather than initiating new policies, legal structures or governance arrangements". However, the TAP is of the view that what already exists in the overall context of the forest sector is not sufficient for introducing a viable REDD+ strategy, and that there will have to be some significant changes in the way how forests are governed in order to change the current D and D patterns (legislation, law enforcement, policies, and certainly to planning and implementation programs).

The distinction into two sections made in the document is important: (1) strategies to address drivers inside the forest sector, and (2) strategies to address drivers from outside the forest sector.

The TAP observed that the strategies proposed in Section 1 result in a relatively large list of activities for which FA, MOE and FIA are responsible in their regular mandate and that at least in parts are already supported by considerable outside support by bilateral and multilateral donors.

Here, a close collaboration between the involved parties is needed to avoid unnecessary duplication. Thus, this section needs to be reconsidered in order to separate additive strategies and activities directly related to REDD+ from those that constitute an increment of the three agencies' "normal" responsibilities.

The TAP is of the opinion that the strategies proposed in section 2 do not address the entire extent of the problems described in Standard 2.a. The strategies seem to be somewhat limited to activities intended to be carried out, or led, by FA, MOE and FIA. The TAP proposes that this section consider "cross-cutting processes" through interagency consensus and cooperation. As said before, the proponents might reflect on the possibility to expand the REDD+ Task Force in order to include those agencies that control or regulate activities responsible for forest degradation and deforestation outside the forest sector.

The TAP therefore proposes that more interagency consultations be held to develop the REDD+ strategy with the aim

- (1) to confirm the analysis of "drivers" in Standard 2.a;
- (2) to develop an interagency consensus on the integrated and cross-cutting strategies required under REDD+ to deal with these outside drivers; and
- (3) to establish clear roles and responsibilities for implementation.

The TAP further noted that local forest protection contracts will be important for communities. Considering the huge area of production forests (and former concession land), the TAP suggests that some thinking should be undertaken if communities could also take responsibility in multi-use forest management, including the production of timber (and not only for forest conservation).

In this context, it might also be of use to study further the role of concession forests in a REDD+ strategy. Ensuring sustainable wood supplies through sustainable forest management and carbon sinks enhancement are important elements for a REDD+ strategy. This aspect has been left out in the preliminary analysis. The proponents might want to reflect on how natural forest management (both, concession level and community level) could be integrated as a valuable REDD+ approach, in particular in those forests which integrity is threatened by the fact that they are today considered as open access land and thus been subject to uncontrolled clearance or depletion.

***Recommendations:***

- Apply a stepwise approach to develop and implement a REDD+ strategy. Outline what the main activities are and define them further according to their importance and a time line.
- Demonstrate how existing and planned donor programmes in the forest sector contribute to the development of the REDD+ strategy of the country. It is important to show that there are no duplications between ongoing programmes and the planned REDD+ strategy
- Consider expanding the REDD+ strategic approaches under section 2 to include more cross-cutting issues and drivers of DD from outside the forest sector
- Consider further the role of sustainable management of production forests and enhancement of sinks in the REDD+ strategy

➔ ***The standard has partially been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

The TAP noted the revised R-PP refers to the complementarities of the REDD+ strategy to other sector programmes, in particular the NFP (national forest programme). The RPP explicitly builds upon the National Forestry Programme (adopted in 2010) and the new PA Law (2008, but not yet implemented) as the main forest management strategies. The NFP was developed through a 2-year process supported by multiple donors. It is widely considered as a comprehensive framework for reforming Cambodia's forest sector. During the consultation process with in-country stakeholders, it was requested that REDD+ should focus on supporting implementation of the program on policy and management reform outlined in the NFP. The elements included in the R-PP specifically focus on areas relevant to REDD+ that stakeholders felt were not covered in sufficient detail in the National Forest Programme so far.

The revised R-PP indicates that there is no duplication with existing donor programs, but that areas of intervention have been planned in a complementary way. The specific activities identified under Section 1 are those relevant to REDD+ for which other donors had not foreseen any major investment or to which they want to contribute within the R-PP. A comprehensive annex has been provided indicating existing and planned donor programs in the forest/land-use/REDD sector in Cambodia. Important REDD+ relevant activities such as FLEGT and community forestry are covered by existing donor programs. The GoC also noted that, in general terms, the forestry and environment sector is not well supported in Cambodia, and therefore it is to be expected that Readiness will require some core institutional strengthening for the three agencies that are mainly in charge for the implementation of the R-PP.

In respect to the third recommendation made by the TAP, it will be important to see how the other sectors will effectively contribute to the preparation of the REDD+ strategy. This will imply to take into account a wider land-use planning framework and the recognition of REDD+ as a valuable and economically feasible alternative to deforestation and economic concessions. In this regard, simply focusing on the implementation of the NFP targets might not suffice.

The fourth recommendation of the TAP was taken into account by further describing the NFP. The NFP prioritises sustainable forestry management and community forestry and thus these approaches are taken into account in the REDD+ strategy.

➔ ***The standard has largely been met.***

The Strategy should consider how larger land-use aspects could be taken into account in the REDD+ strategy.

**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:**

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

Cambodia's REDD+ Implementation Framework needs to recognize the different roles and responsibilities of the various government authorities that have jurisdictional authority over forest resources in the country. Implementation of REDD+ is therefore expected to follow Government agency jurisdictions, with different Government agencies developing REDD+ implementation strategies for the different forest areas, based on the existing laws and policies of the RGC.

For this section, the R-PP provides a summary of issues, and the annex goes into more details on a set of goals, strategy, and responsible agencies and departments. As the TAP made some proposals of more interagency coordination for the elaboration of the REDD+ strategy, corresponding changes would need to be made under this section as well.

The TAP further observed that there are emerging carbon offset programmes through bilateral partnerships evolving in the country, besides small-scale carbon programmes that are already taken place. Potential outcomes from such emerging carbon projects should be incorporated.

What is lacking are the TORs or the work plan (beyond the summary in Component 6) to further elaborate the institutional arrangements and addressing the issues. The R-PP needs to develop such a work plan with specific milestones and what is to be accomplished, as well as identify the responsible parties. Good examples of outcome chains/work flow for the REL and MRV components diagrams are provided in the Annex pp. 127 and 135. Those elements from the diagrams that are particularly important in the context of the implementation of the Cambodia R-PP could be shortly described and brought into this section of the R-PP.

***Recommendations:***

- Incorporate all ongoing carbon initiatives in the country
- Prepare a short work plan for REDD+ implementation, based on the steps outlined on pages 127 and 135 in the annex

➔ ***The standard has largely been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

The TAP noted that the already well elaborated implementation framework has been further clarified and complemented.

➔ **The standards have been met.**

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

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

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

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

Undertaking a strategic assessment of a policy development process to identify potential positive and negative impacts of implementation is a relatively new concept in Cambodia and will need to be undertaken slowly with appropriate steps to ensure national ownership and build capacity.

Cambodia has an existing framework for Environmental and Social Impact assessment, regulation, parks, sub-degree and laws applied for conservation and natural resource management projects; however, there is only little guidance with regards to the EIA process and implementation in terms of technical capacity and the wider enabling environment; this results in weak implementation of existing regulations.

Furthermore, it was brought to the attention of the TAP that the concept of SESA is not well understood in Cambodia and that training is needed for all involved stakeholders on all aspects of SESA.

This section as written was developed under the previous template, and the document states that it "needs revision." The revision should include a work plan for how the SESA process will be followed and for preparation of the ESMF. The budget also needs to be reconsidered. The TAP doubts if \$100K is adequate for dealing with the impacts, especially with the current strong emphasis on safeguards.

Overall, the technical recommendations relating to ESIA in this section seem sensible and consistent with World Bank environmental and social safeguard directives.

The TAP further discussed the idea of integrating the safeguard in a sort of a "umbrella framework" for all climate change activities which is overseen by the NCCC. As forests and REDD+ is a core element of Cambodia's overall climate change strategy, this option might be of certain interest.

***Recommendations:***

- Consider training activities for SESA
- Develop an adequate work plan for SESA that is equipped with a realistic budget

→ ***The standard has partially been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

The TAP has been informed that the implementation of the present R-PP will be done under a multiple partner arrangement and that the requirements for SESA will be further specified under such implementation arrangements. Training components have been integrated in the Revised R-PP, as proposed by the TAP. Further specification on the arrangements for SESA (workplan) still need to be made by the Bank or UN-REDD. In the view of the TAP, this standard has been largely met, provided further instruction on the SESA requirements under multiple delivery partner arrangements.

**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:**

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

This component, along with component 4, is well done - the issues are laid out clearly and the outcome chain charts provided in the text and in the annex give a clear indication of how the process should proceed.

The question of inclusiveness of forests remain however open. As proposed before, the TAP recommended considering a more inclusive way and integrating larger tracts of forests and lands in REDD+. If such a pathway is chosen, there would be a need to establish reference levels for a wider range of land and resource use scenarios than proposed in the R-PP, e.g. past and present natural forest management across all forest types, including production forests, commercial tree crop concessions, conversions to food production, and infrastructure/industrial, and energy development. Likewise it is important to understand the implications of the conversion of freshwater swamp forests to rice production on both carbon dioxide and methane emissions, given the significant impacts of swamp forest clearance on fish production. The proponents might want to reflect on such a wider "cross-cutting" view on forests and REDD+ for the RL.

Having said that, the TAP is of the opinion that generally the links back to components 2a and 2b are clearly established.

In the opinion of the TAP, the tier-2, approach-3 plan is the right way to start this process. The nested approach is also sensible, but will require a national framework in place first - which can be done following the outcome chain process.

The real question, however, is how will this excellent overall plan be executed. In the opinion of the TAP, there will have to be a well-balanced combination of national capacity building and outside consultation to ensure that full control is exercised nationally in a reasonable time frame.

What need to be established is a detailed work plan and timeline with specific dates, deliverables, and responsible parties for both, capacity building and RL establishment.

The proposed workshop with modelers to ensure input on different economic and development scenarios is a good way to start, but since this topic is closely linked with the assessment of national circumstances, it might also be useful to assign a person or small sub-group of the REDD-plus Taskforce to take on this issue in a continuous way and carry out capacity building over a longer period of time.

Since the Forestry Administration uses its GIS/RS unit to produce forest cover information, it will be important to ensure that the GIS software continues to be fully up to date. The TAP understood

that JICA has offered to provide funding to Cambodia for GIS software upgrades.

The TAP also commented that more work is required to differentiate flooded forest and mangrove areas (a problem that is not unique to Cambodia).

Also for soil carbon measurement (which is proposed to be investigated in the R-PP), it has to be said that this is expensive and might need to be considered as an associated separate project to the R-PP. However, soil carbon is most probably a significant component of the total carbon content and eventually will have to be included in the pool.

Finally, the TAP questions whether data and information are available for the sub-national RL/RELS to indicate how the country is divided into different provinces or sub-national regions?

***Recommendations:***

- Define the scope of the REDD+ strategy and briefly describe the different RL scenarios needed
- By developing RL at national and sub-national levels, use a stepwise approach and clearly define what steps are necessary and what capacity is needed for each step
- Clearly develop and identify capacity building steps in the development of RL.
- Describe possible synergies in the work of developing RLs with other partners, e.g. JICA and others
- Reflect on the importance of soil carbon and consider a way to associate specific studies on this to the R-PP

→ ***The standard has largely been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

This component had been already well elaborated in the January version of the R-PP. Few addition have been made in the Revised R-PP, addressing some of the recommendations made above (scope, capacity building, synergies with other partners). No further information has been given in respect to the carbon pools included in the RL, in particular the issue on the importance of soil carbon in the context of Cambodia.

→ **In general terms, the standard has been met.**



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

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

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

###### **TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

For this component, as for component 3, the issues are laid out clearly. The work plan/ outcome chain charts make it clear how the process should proceed. The tier-2, approach 3 accounting principles for emissions and activity is the right way to start this process. Also, the two phase approach is the most efficient way to proceed - in fact, there may be additional phases - design, test, implement, operate, etc., but these will become clear as the first stage of development is carried out. The three stage process for NFI sampling is also very reasonable, and the TAP emphasizes the importance of a standard, uniform data base.

As mentioned in component 3, the real question is how this plan will be executed - there will have to be a combination of national capacity building and outside consultation, balanced to ensure that full control is exercised nationally. The training needs have been listed on page 78 - this is a good start, but will need more detail.

The TAP is of the opinion that without adequate national capacity, the MRV/REL will remain just a plan. Thus, the R-PP needs to emphasize the capacity building element in MRV and RL establishment.

The important next step will be a detailed work plan and timeline with specific dates, deliverables, and responsible parties. An important part of the MRV/REL success will be engagement of local communities and local management authorities, as mentioned on page 79.

In terms of definitions, the proposed method of dealing with land use classification/stratification is good- The recommendation to revise the minimum crown cover to 20% based on the accuracy of remote sensing imagery is well understood. However, TAP members raised concerns on this, considering the characteristics of some forest types being naturally very open forests and having less than 20% of crown cover naturally. A revised definition will result in more deforestation rate, less forest cover, and fate of deforested land. In addition, some of the discussions in the previous sections of the R-PP might become obsolete. As is noted, this change would require more consultation and reflections.

The TAP also noted that there could be an opportunity for additional satellite data to be provided through the international Group on Earth Observations Forest Carbon Tracking Task, which is

developing a program of National Demonstrators. Cambodia might consider becoming a National Demonstrator with broad and low-cost access to data, and use this as a possible way to address issues like flooded forest and mangrove areas.

The budget for the MRV component seems reasonable for what is being delivered. The TAP also noted that the largest share of the budget in the first two years is proposed to come from the Government of Japan, and the second largest from UN-REDD. The TAP questions if this financing is secured or still in a planning phase.

Overall, the TAP is of the opinion that Components 3 and 4 as presented here are well presented. If the scope of REDD+ will be expanded (in the sense as it has been suggested by the TAP), there will be a need to adapt component 3 and 4 accordingly.

***Recommendations:***

- Emphasize the capacity building aspect for MRV at all levels
- Reflect further on the need to change the forest definition

➔ ***The standard has partially been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

In general terms, this component is comprehensive and complete. The introductory chapter to the component (design a monitoring system) however only refers to carbon and should be complemented by larger issues, including deforestation, degradation, governance etc, as described further under 4b. References have been made to the need of capacity building, but no budgetary provisions have been made for it. Is it that capacity building does not cost anything or is it automatically embedded in the proposed activities? As Cambodian universities should take a key role in training (see page 90), there might be a need to provide additional financial support to undertake the important task of creating national MRV capacities. The TAP is still keen to know more about the issue of forest definitions. The recommendation to further reflect on the need to change the forest definition has not been addressed in the revised R-PP.

➔ **In general terms, the standard has been met.**

**Standard 4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts, and Governance:**

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities), for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

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

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

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

This component has been addressed in the plan in a reasonable way.

The TAP was informed that the World Bank had supported in the past national poverty assessments and population censuses program in order to make annual assessments of a large number of socio-

economic indicators which are undertaken by village chiefs and submitted to Commune Councils for entry into the Commune Database. Such data can be considered in assessing co-benefits of REDD+. Also, local data exist on migration. Migration is a significant cause of deforestation, and research suggests that rates of migration might be a useful indicator of deforestation pressure.

In general terms, the TAP considers the monitoring of D and D as part of the governance monitoring as a critical element. The proponents might wish to consider allocating more resources and giving a higher priority during the implementation of the R-PP.

Furthermore, the TAP proposes to also consider hydrological regulation provided by forest ecosystems as possible monitoring indicator as about 85% of Cambodia population depends almost entirely on rainfall and ground water for cultivating rice and other crops.

***Recommendations:***

- Consider expanding the work on governance monitoring

➔ ***The standard has largely been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

Complementary information has been given to strengthen this sub-component of the R-PP.

➔ **The standard has been met.**

**Component 5. Schedule and Budget**

**Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements**

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD readiness, and identifies capacity building and financial resources needed to accomplish these activities. A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF and/or UN-REDD, as well as from other international sources (e.g., bilateral assistance), are summarized by year and by potential donor. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP, and is sufficient to meet the costs associated with REDD-plus readiness activities identified in the R-PP. Any gaps in funding, or sources of funding, are clearly noted.

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

**TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

The overall budget is within the bounds to be expected, but emphasizes the reliance on the government of Japan and UN-REDD for funding. A long-term commitment from these sources will be necessary to build the capacity necessary for dealing with REDD-plus in Cambodia.

What is missing is a further break-down into the major activities under each "sub-activity" with a corresponding scheduling of these activities over time

***Recommendations:***

- Provide, in addition to the presented overall budget, a more precise workplan with a more detailed scheduling

➔ ***The standard has largely been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:**

A summary table is provided; more details are given under each component. It is understood that the budget identified all the available sources of funding and that there is no major funding gap for the implementation of the R-PP with an overall estimated budget of the US\$10.5 million US\$ (without demonstration projects)

→ **The standard has been met.**

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

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

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

##### **TAP Assessment Feb. 7, 2011:**

The Monitoring and Evaluation framework and risk management framework are presented in the tables 12 and 13. They are very useful and well done and include all elements required.

All that is necessary now is to provide some more detail on each of the elements. Following the framework will aid in transparency, but only when the system is in place, all the necessary changes will be clear.

Attachments of the annexes are very useful and provide more details.

##### ***Recommendations:***

- Give some more details on the proposed indicators in the main text.

→ ***The standard has largely been met***

**TAP Assessment on Revised R-PP, March 7, 2011:** no further comments