

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

Revised Synthesis Review of the R-PP of Cameroon

Reviewer : Stephen Cobb and five other TAP reviewers

Date of review : 6th October 2012

Cameroon submitted its first draft R-PP on 6th August 2012; this was reviewed by the TAP and discussed between them and the Cameroonian team, then re-submitted by Cameroon on 28th September 2012. This revised synthesis presents the original review comments and the original assessment of attainment of standards, followed by the reviewers' assessment of the changes that have been made. This process was greatly facilitated for the reviewers by an excellent table, which provides a commentary on each of the TAP's original observations. This has been very helpful.

The Cameroon R-PP is generally a very good proposal, much appreciated by its reviewers. Although there is work to be done throughout the document to bring it up to standard, we believe that the majority of that work could be accomplished relatively easily, since the basic thinking behind the proposal is essentially sound.

A number of issues recur, from one Component to another, which do need consistent attention. These include the representation of the interests of local community and indigenous peoples' groups, the processes that will be used to ensure proper attention is given to benefit sharing and tenure issues, and so on.

While there is a fair analysis of the drivers of deforestation and degradation, it is less certain that the strategies will solve the underlying problems, many of which have been a recurrent feature of donor-supported interventions in the forest sector in Cameroon over the last two decades.

The proposal seems to all reviewers to have an over-ambitious budget, that has not been carefully enough thought out, in the context of the realities of where the money needed would come from, over the next two to three years.

The introductory pages need to be tidied up: a number of attributions are wrong; acronyms are missing; the list of participants in producing the R-PP is wrong, in as much as many people who were consulted, are listed as though they were authors.

General comments on the revised version and the response to the TAP's comments

A number of changes have been made throughout the document, many of which have gone a fair way to responding to our earlier comments. As we said earlier, the Cameroonian R-PP editorial team produced a very helpful commentary on the TAP's comments, justifying what had been said. In it, they have seemed to address their remarks to the TAP and the FCPF. This is understandable,

but much of what has been said could very usefully have been transcribed to the R-PP itself. The fact that it has not is an opportunity missed, since others who scrutinize the R-PPs may very well make the same comments themselves.

The time available between the first TAP review (and teleconference with the Cameroonian team) and the second Cameroon submission was very short. In that time, however, the team was able to make changes to the document which raised the status of the majority of the standards (7 out of 12). The standards are Met or Largely Met for 5 components.

The findings of the two TAP reviews are summarized in the table below:

Component	Preliminary evaluation by TAP (September 2012)	Revised evaluation by TAP (October 2012)
1a. National Readiness Management Arrangements	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met
1b. Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Standard Largely Met	Standard Met
1c. Consultation and Participation Process	Standard Partially Met	Standard Largely Met
2a. Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Standard Partially Met	Standard Largely Met
2b. REDD+ Strategy Options	Standard Partially Met	Standard Largely Met
2c. Implementation Framework	Standard Partially Met	Standard Met
2d. Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met
3. Reference Level	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met
4a. Monitoring - Emissions and Removals	Standard Not Met	Standard Partially Met
4b. Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Standard Partially Met	Standard Partially Met
5. Schedule and Budget	Standard Not Met	Standard Not Met
6. Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Standard Not Met	Standard Partially 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:

While the “gestation” period of this RPP is notably long, beginning over four years ago with approval of the RPP by the FCPF in July 2008, this has resulted in a substantial dialogue with various governmental bodies and units and relatively broad awareness of the program among governmental and quasi-governmental agencies such as research institutes and universities. The organogram presented in **Figure 1** and the *Arrete* establishing the steering committee and defining the mission of the Technical Secretariat, with the Environment Ministry as Chair and Ministry of Forests as vice-chair (**Annex 1a**) reflect a broad range of governmental agencies that will be engaged in the RPP process. The decision to deal with the climatic and ecological diversity of Cameroon by “compartmentalizing” work within the six “agro-ecological” zones in constructing a (ultimately aggregated) national program is innovative and appropriate. The establishment of 4 working cells within the Technical secretariat is appropriate and provides a good balance of effort among priority themes and elements.

With regard to the Steering Committee, it is noted that international conservation NGOs who have been active contributors to forest conservation and improved management in Cameroon for decades, are omitted. Given the long history of international NGO cooperation with the Government of Cameroon in forest conservation and management and the extensive experience and deployment of personnel that are qualified and actively employed in field based programs this failure to take advantage of these resources is, in the opinion of at least two of the reviewers a significant and unfortunate oversight.

In section **1a-1**. The text says that MINEF and MINFOF (with participation of some other ministries like Plan) make up the REDD Coordination operation unit. However, the diagram, (**Figure 1, p.5**) does not reflect that. It shows MINEF as the overall lead. Neither MINFOF nor Plan appears there. There is a general concern amongst reviewers that the true interdisciplinary nature of REDD+ is overlooked in this structure, and that it risks losing its real force by being too traditionally sectoral.

Another concern is the numerical marginalization in the committee structures, of both civil society groups and indigenous peoples groups. They are greatly outnumbered on the committees and will find it hard to make their voices heard.

The text and diagram make reference to an interdisciplinary pool of experts - drawn from where? What agencies? Private sector? NGO? Academic?

Many ministerial entities are mentioned but it is not clear how they will actually be engaged.

The text provides a good example of MINEF-MIFOF cooperation around the FLEGT process that bodes well for future productive collaboration under this programme.

In Section **1.a.4**. The discussion on decentralization is clear and informative. The establishment of Departmental technical committees with MINEPDED and MINFOF as core agencies is appropriate. The text says that departmental committees will “mobilize various stakeholder groups” but that is not the same as having them participate in the work and decisions of the committee. TORS for how these regional entities will be composed and how they will function should be produced early on in PY1 of implementation.

Discussion of role to respond to “conflicts” is to be coordinated with the IEC operational cell but it is not clear what is really anticipated there. Perhaps this will draw on civil society collaboration but this needs to be described, including how it will be structured and financially supported.

The component partially meets the standard.

Comments on the revised version

The revised R-PP has made reasonable, though very small responses to the need for better representation of civil society and indigenous peoples' groups, and to the concerns raised about sectoral representation. The fact that the Chair of the Steering Committee can enlarge the representation by civil society "as needed" will give little comfort to those who already feel underrepresented.. The proposal answers the question about where the experts come from, and proposes that an action plan will produce terms of reference for the regional entities. This is all useful new material, though on the whole it does not respond as wholeheartedly to the comments as it might have done. Exploiting the commentary to TAP (in the table of responses) in the text itself would still be a helpful exercise.

Our principal recommendation at this juncture is that a real effort in this part of the document should be made to demonstrate an approach and structures that are more plural, more inclusive, and seem less top-down.

This component still **partially meets the standard.**

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

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

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

The proposal documents (in this section and the table in **Annex 1b**) a substantial number of outreach activities (40 workshops are listed) at least some of which are in provinces other than Central. It is notable that a large fraction of the outreach efforts were (apparently) sponsored or cosponsored by NGOs and, presumably, were carried out as cooperative ventures with the Government. This makes the lack of significant NGO involvement in the oversight and implementation of the proposed work program (at least as reflected by the structure of the Technical Secretariat) worthy of note and a potential weakness of the program design.

Section **1b.1** notes how the Cameroon forest law and FLEGT processes have contributed to establish a public dialogue about forest rights and use in particular the establishment of "forêts communautaires" although this process has been criticized for moving slowly. Examination of what the impediments are to progressing more rapidly, would be important to undertake early on during RPP implementation.

Section **1.b.2** notes the importance of Indigenous Peoples and women and intention to reach out during PY1 to get them on board and involved in the process of identifying key elements of policy

reform. *This should be given priority.*

Section 1.b.3. notes 40 workshops have been carried out for sensitization/awareness since 2008. 11 workshops were held between December, 2011 and March 2012. There is a stated intention to organize further outreach by agro-eco zone which seems like a good organizing principal. The section notes some printed and broadcast materials have been produced and distributed. Beginning to assess the impact of these methods early in RPP implementation could provide useful feedback for fine-tuning the process and being cost efficient.

Figure 3 page 18 gives a sectoral/demographic breakdown of participants in regional consultations (but not by gender). The text provides estimated 7% IPs and 25% women. 60% NGOs. The document declares estimates of having reached 4,000 people through direct and up to 100,000 by multiplier effect of proxy information dispersers (e.g. NGOs and CBOs) Additional coverage in media (radio, video, press) has probably increased these numbers but no assessment has been done yet on that. The large NGO-CBO presence in the workshops to date leads to the plausible assumption that this will lead to broad information dissemination through grassroots networks.

Though Cameroon has made a very good start on promoting REDD awareness through outreach efforts to date, the “key” will be to turn this awareness into ongoing participation. Much effort has been placed in recent years (outside the R-PP preparatory process) on working out how, in Cameroon, to transfer increasing responsibility to village structures. This is a promising platform on which to build dialogue, and has been noted positively by reviewers. They note however, that the claim that 100.000 people have been reached by the consultation process is surely an exaggeration.

The reviewers are concerned that the interests of indigenous peoples have got buried under the more general rubric of “civil society”, an area of dialogue which is not well suited to the needs and habits of expression of the indigenous peoples of Cameroon’s forests.

This section (pages 19-20) describes a very good start on getting feedback regarding people’s concerns.

The main stakeholder expectations recorded during the workshops cover aspects that should be given special attention during the construction of the strategy. These include:

- Participation by strengthening information and consultation of stakeholders at Local level;
- Training of civil society actors;
- Taking into account the rights of communities (especially those dependent on natural resources and forests);
- Access and equitable benefit sharing and the importance of the share of profits going back to the community that has made the efforts to reduce GHG emissions;
- The development of legal and regulatory frameworks recognizing the different REDD + rights of resource dependent communities, especially indigenous peoples;
- Capacity building through technical and material inputs to empower civil society to be a full player and participant in the process;
- The need for a communication strategy that extends to all stakeholders, with application of appropriate methods and tools;
- The need to take into account the risks that may affect stakeholders and hinder the success of REDD +;
- Mobilization of key local institutions for mounting the strategy and its implementation work (including local governments);
- Taking into account indigenous knowledge;
- Promoting private sector involvement in setting up REDD+ projects that embrace fair and

transparent revenue sharing principles and put them into practice.

The cost estimates given in **Tables 2 and 1b (p 21)** concerning stakeholder consultations appear unrealistic at this stage of program development and need to be adjusted to adapt to reasonable expectations of the resources available in the short term and actions need to be carefully prioritized to make best use of the limited resources.

This component largely meets the standard.

Comments on the revised version

On the REDD+ awareness issue, the revised R-PP slightly misinterprets the TAP concern. "Awareness of REDD+" is different from "consultation.." Making many people aware of REDD+ is a good thing, but different from how many people are actually consulted, which will be a much smaller number. Concerns of indigenous people are noted in the R-PP, but in what way will "this problem be treated in the preparatory phase"? It would have been reassuring to have more information here.

Cost estimates remain unrealistic - they may represent the end costs of a very large and fully implemented program, but for the first few years it would make more sense to match the program with more realistic budget goals.

Despite these caveats, the text and the work programme have made specific note of the need to focus early on vulnerable groups, and though the proposals are not watertight (it would still be good to show how the sharing of information is being turned into a dialogue, rather than a one-way output of information), we feel that the standard is met.

This component therefore **meets the standard.**

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP; (v) and mechanisms for

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

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:

The preparation team has made notable efforts at outreach to increase knowledge and awareness of REDD+ and the issues it involves both across government agencies and institutions and geographically. The consultation and verification process for the RPP Proposal is less well documented. There appears to be broad cross-sectoral engagement (as evinced by the *Arrete* establishing the steering committee and the design of the Technical Secretariat with a number of "lateral" partnerships proposed with national institutions to accomplish technical elements.

All reviewers have appreciated the efforts that have gone into this part of the preparation and the mechanisms and procedures proposed seem to be well-grounded. Reviewers note, however, that the circumstances of rural life vary enormously from one end of the country to another, both for ethnic as well as geographical reasons. For these reasons, it is necessary to be both flexible and sensitive in the design of consultation processes, for they will need to be very different, according to circumstance. The subtleties of this are missing from the R-PP so far.

Section 1c-3. The steps in the process are well outlined: identify key constituents, develop tools and materials, do consultations.

Box 3 p 23-4. Provides a good summary of objectives but begs the question of "what is the business model?" It appears very top down and government driven as presented.

I question whether all agro-ecological zones deserve the same attention. There is need for some prioritization as to where the "problems" and opportunities are.

P25. The "topics" identified for consultation are inclusive but some will require some background preparation to be useful. There is also a need to sequence and prioritize topics due to resource limits.

P27. Setting up a "permanent framework" for information dissemination (and an archive of relevant data and analysis) is important. Lessons learned in DRC (and possibly other early action countries like Guyana could be relevant here). Cameroon should consider drawing on regional (e.g. COMIFAC) and Global (e.g. Global REDD Readiness Forum) institutions for assistance in drawing in these lessons and good practice experience.

P28. The BUDGET estimate for 1c shows a very high estimated cost for dissemination \$1.7m and an exorbitant cost for "consultations" (\$6.725m). The total budget estimated (\$12.5m) is unrealistic given the current level of resources on offer. This will require careful sequencing and prioritization of expenditures in the initial years of implementation. Successful initial work will make it more likely that additional funds will be forthcoming one some results are shown.

Efforts to date have been successful in raising awareness both across sectors within government and to some extent to more local (provincial) authorities. Outreach to local community stakeholders has (apparently) already begun to show the value of this dialogue although the major "engine" of such consultations appears to be international NGOs whose participation in the proposed future process is not well represented.

This component partially meets the standard.

Comments on the revised version

The revised R-PP is responsive to most of the TAP concerns for this component, with additional text added in places throughout that give comfort that a rather open and transparent process will be put in place. The outstanding issue here continues to be the very high cost of "consultations." The explanation provided is that great importance is attached to this in Cameroon. The problem for FCPF is that only some 8% of the budget apparently needed seems to have been secured (from three sources, including FCPF). This is not a trivial issue and would need careful discussion during grant negotiations.

This component **largely meets the standard.**

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:

Section **2a.1** provides a fair summary of existing historical data on deforestation, bushfires, woodfuel demand, illegal logging and a good overview of the principal direct causes of deforestation and degradation. The breakdown by agro-eco zones to show the different situations and drivers among these is a sound technical approach, though ambitious. It underscores the utility of the approach taken by Cameroon to base their national evaluation on a compilation of data by agro-eco zone.

Box 5 (p32) attributes 51% of land-based greenhouse gas emissions to land use change. It would be important to distinguish "permanent" land use change such as industrial scale conversion for crops vs. "temporary" conversion for shifting cultivation artisanal agriculture. After Cameroon's long history of research into these issues over the last thirty years or so, it is a pity that more use is not made of the rich data sources that could support these presentations.

Pages **36-37** provide a good summary of laws and regulations, discussion of issues that will need to be addressed in the course of REDD+ implementation

Some weaknesses of past efforts that will need to be addressed in the course of RPP implementation that are identified in this section include (1) the slow implementation of land titling, high cost and long delay. (Less than 2% of eligible land titles issued) and (2) to date there has been a lack of coordination among various land use and development strategies. This section also notes the challenges posed by the existing "dual system" of land rights allocations and

farmer-pastoralist conflicts that will need to be addressed under RPP implementation.

Pages 38-40 provide a good overview of the range of existing government policies and strategies that will need to be reviewed and may need to be adjusted as a REDD+ action plan emerges.

Not enough attention is given to the fact that there is a serious lack of inter-ministerial coordination, leading to big anomalies, such as those between the ministries in charge of mining and minerals, and those in charge of forests. This lack of joined-up government is thought by several reviewers to be, in itself, a serious cause of weak governance and forest loss.

It would be worthwhile to note what kind of cross-linkage is planned with the program getting underway to update the national Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and how this might relate to development, implementation and monitoring of environmental safeguards (biodiversity in particular). Similar acknowledgement of coordination with NAPA and Desertification action plans would be appropriate.

Some notable strengths of this section include (p.40) a good overview of actions relevant to governance; (p.41) a good summary of future threats and concerns broken down by sector; and, (p42. Table 7) a summary of presumed future causes of D&D organized by agro-eco zones

The text also recognizes possible climate-driven immigration and internal migration as potential drivers.

This component partially meets the standard

Comments on the revised version

The text of this section has been added to in a number of places, but the changes are really quite modest. Although the analysis is basically sound, there is still not enough treatment of the legal aspects of land and forest tenure (despite much work on this subject in the past), nor have our comments on the incoherence of governance in the mining and forest sectors been addressed. The analysis of the causes of D and D has scarcely changed, despite our encouragement to exploit more fully the rich background of data on this subject which has been accumulated over the past two to three decades in Cameroon.

Our recommendation is therefore that it would not take very much more work to bring this section up to standard: the task is an editorial one, that does not need to go through any consultative process. It is a good account, but not yet quite as good as it easily could be.

This component largely meets the standard.

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:

Perhaps one of the strongest elements of this section is the recognition and acknowledgement of the high geophysical, climatic and cultural diversity of Cameroon and thus the need to adopt an approach to assessing carbon stocks, establishing baselines and identifying drivers on the basis of agro-eco zones that can then be aggregated at national level - a bottom up rather than top down approach.

Table 5 gives a good representation of the most important sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies to be deployed to address deforestation and degradation and the document recognizes that implementation of the strategies will vary considerably by agro-eco zone.

However, the proposed strategies as a whole do not yet give the confidence that, if implemented, they would deal adequately with the drivers of deforestation and degradation identified in the previous section.

The breakdown by sectors is a good start. However most of these look like "traditional" sectoral policies or strategies. Some ideas like producing electricity from biogas, may need serious feasibility analysis before adoption. Cogeneration in wood processing facilities is likely a cost effective option without subsidies. There is a need to analyze what sort of studies will be needed to fit in with the REDD/LEDS plans generated by this program.

Much more attention needs to be given to strategies to address the challenges of land title. And also to address the all-important relationship between forest loss and agricultural expansion, the major dynamic of rural life in much of Cameroon. This is simply not given enough attention

P50. As the text indicates, a thorough analysis of the forest sector including carbon stock values and projected changes based on current and future plans for logging, conservation and conversions - particularly the "permanent forest estate" is needed in order to assess the potential and the bottlenecks of creditable REDD interventions and to define a work program for sector wide implementation.

Table 9 p 51 Provides a useful preliminary "scoring" of potential interventions across the agro-ecozones.

P52. The text rightly identifies resource or land tenure as key issues to be addressed by the REDD strategy and recognizes that institutionalizing different ways to hold tenure (individual and collective) will be key to effective REDD implementation.

P54- Tableau 10. The analysis presented here recognizes the relative importance of various cross-cutting strategies to address Deforestation and forest degradation in the various agro-eco zones.

P55. The concepts of Zones of implementation (ZOMO) and Zone of Optimal Action (ZOA) are useful as subnational (macro-zone and landscape?) level designations, providing an objective basis on where to focus limited resources. This should be integrated with existing landscape programs under implementation in Cameroon such as the Sangha Trinational and Tridom landscapes and areas in the South Western region (Mt. Cameroon, Takamanda, etc.) and south (Campo Ma'an).

P56. Table 11 - Pilot projects by agro-eco zones (conceptual) This give a good glimpse of the scope and scale of what will be embraced in the Strategy and Action Plan and examples of the types of projects that could be encouraged and how this varies by agro-eco zone. The issue of pilot projects and their costs is something of a distraction, however. A large price tag is put on the potential pilot projects (twice that of implementing the RPP itself). Since we underline later, in Component 5, that the proposed budget for the R-PP is huge by comparison with the fund-raising already secured, it would be unwise to put too much store at this juncture, by the pilot projects.

P59-60. Figure 6 and Table 12. These provide a good starting base to identify the steps and the chronological sequence of their implementation for preparing the national strategy. **Box 8** provides a succinct summary of the need and rationale for robust "cost-benefit" analysis in choosing among intervention options. This will be important were resources are limited.

This component partially meets the standard.

Comments on the revised version

The revised version briefly recognizes a small number of things: the importance of customary rights in establishing an appropriate legal framework for a future REDD+ regime; the need to put REDD+ planning in the context of emerging national development plans; the relationship between implementation agencies and pilot projects; the need for feasibility studies and cost-benefit analyses; the need for an early zoning exercise to define the limits of REDD implementation zones; the need to extend participation to a broader range of institutions.

The question of the high costs of the pilot projects is addressed only by the statement that "these projects will implement REDD+." More detail would be required to justify those costs, but since they do not form an integral part of the R-PP, this need not concern the PC of the FCPF in considering this proposal.

Our recommendation here focuses on the need to strengthen the narrative about the interface between the forest and agriculture, to give comfort that the strategies proposed in this all-important part of the country, are likely to be capable of leading to reductions in the rate of degradation and deforestation. If this were done, the narrative could be considered to have met the standard.

This component largely meets the standard.

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:

The bullets in the opening paragraph capture the main elements needed.

The text (on p. 63) notes that some ideas for implementation have come from the consultation workshops, for example, community based projects and activities -- that presumably would generate locally retained revenues, and also acknowledges the role of CSOs in project origination and management. Follow-through on these suggestions should be a key element of monitoring program implementation.

A major issue is that Cameroon is particularly well endowed with legal texts on forests and the environment, but none of them, of course, pay specific attention to the circumstances which will prevail under a REDD regime. Therefore, unless specific REDD legislation is passed, there is a risk of all-important issues of benefit-sharing and legal title to forest lands and benefits, being marginalized. Reviewers feel that this has to be given greater prominence in the RPP.

Conflict resolution mechanisms - basically the provincial technical committees then ultimately the judiciary. Treatment of this subject needs more structure based on experience. Thought should be given to developing mechanisms that operate on a more local level with, perhaps, broader (e.g. more inclusive by gender and ethnicity?) representation or different actors than those that comprise the regional technical committees.

Benefit sharing mechanisms. The text recognizes the need for a legal basis for assigning carbon rights. The intention to share benefits on a national scale seems overly optimistic (and potentially cumbersome administratively, at least in initial stages where benefits are small. There needs to be a transparent - and simple - way to provide incentives to early adopters to continue. This section acknowledges the need for legal review to establish a basis for carbon rights allocation consistent with existing land and forest laws. The document proposes using an existing community oriented fund (FEICOM?). This merits further study and analysis including of the track record and performance reputation of FEICOM. This subject is fundamental to the future success of REDD in Cameroon, and the reviewers feel that the issue is not given the prominence it needs.

Overall this section addresses the main or most important elements that will comprise an adequate workplan. The chronogram may be somewhat optimistic and should provide for initial studies and evaluations of the capabilities of some of the institutions targeted to "lead" implementation of various components and anticipate where technical assistance will be needed.

This component partially meets the standard

Comments on the revised version

The question of REDD+ legislation has been addressed quite adequately, with clear statements about

how the revision of legal texts will take proper account of the coming into being of REDD+ as a new element in rural land-use planning. There are now statements of intent that are much clearer, in the matter of sharing the potential benefits of REDD+ amongst all stakeholders. Neither the answers to this challenge, nor draft texts, are yet in existence, but the standard does not ask for that: only that key issues be identified, including those of land tenure and carbon rights.

There is a clear statement of the intent that the Technical Secretariat will take steps to become involved in the processes of legal revision under way in related sectors (such as land ownership and territorial administration); there is a new statement about how the new laws will treat issues of “leakage” as part of the benefit sharing texts.

This component now **meets the standard**.

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 recommendation

The initial pages of this section provide a useful and highly relevant preliminary list of questions, many of which were raised in the initial consultations about rights and revenue sharing at various levels. The document could usefully go quite a bit further in the discussion about benefit-sharing, land-use and land-tenure, all of which are fundamentally important issues in the impact of a potential REDD regime on forest communities. The text does not yet give enough reassurance as to how these issues are going to be tackled. The text is much stronger on “what” the SESA process is about, than “how” it is going to be implemented. This needs some further work.

The rationale for the SESA seems appropriate. Also building on prior experience with VPA/FLEGT etc. as noted, will be useful. The text also acknowledges that capacity building is an element of SESA given limited local experience. This may be particularly relevant at the provincial (e.g. subnational) level. The technical committee should draw on experience of long standing rural development programs linked to conservation implemented by organizations such as GiZ, WWF and WCS as a source of best practice knowledge for engagement with civil society and rural communities. A review of existing legal texts and regulations as indicated on **P 72** with regard to potential conflicts and gaps is an important component of this activity. This should be scaled to match the budget resources available (e.g. from FCPF) that are indicated in **Table 2d**.

This component partially meets the standard

Comments on the revised version

The revised text has short additions on the use of a pool of expertise, covering different relevant

disciplines; on generic indicators already developed by some of the international NGO partners of MINEP and MINFOF; on the way in which the ESMF will be an integral part of the work plan of the REDD+ preparatory phase; it also makes passing reference to the role that might be played by disadvantaged groups in the SESA process.

The TAP noted that the original text was much stronger on the "what?" the SESA process in Cameroon is about than on "how it is going to be implemented?". The response says only that "it is not possible to know how the SESA will help manage these issues." The R-PP requires a "simple plan for how the SESA process will be followed." The original TAP review said that this needs further work. The additions listed above do not really respond to this request.

Our recommendation therefore is that some further work is required to provide a fuller explanation as to how fundamentally important issues of impact (on land-use, land tenure and benefit sharing among affected populations) will be taken into account in the SESA process.

Until this is done, the component still only **partially meets the standard**.

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:

Overall, this is a good statement of the tasks that must be undertaken but it is done on a very generic level - on the whole we have a list of the things that must be addressed, but we don't have a good sense of how hard it will be and who will do it. These specifics, put into a stepwise work plan, are required before the section can meet the standard.

For example, we don't see the specific drivers of deforestation and forest degradation discussed - only more vague points that various options will be "taken into consideration." Moreover, it will be important to settle on a definition of forest as soon as possible - the proposal says "early in 2013" - because that definition will drive much of the work on data. Some discussion of the stratification of the country into agroecological zones is provided, and that will be a good way to develop the reference level and MRV systems, but that connection has not yet happened. There is a good list of available data on page 78, but not much in the way of assessing the quality of that data and the relative importance of the various data sets. The point about lack of reliable data on the major causes of deforestation, which was made in section 2a, is repeated here, but there is no plan for collecting such data on causes, which will be critical.

The document proposes to use an “adjusted” historical baseline beginning in 1990, with adjustments based on projected patterns of development. These patterns are well documented and are a part of the country’s development process from now until 2035, and need to be properly taken into account. The analysis will be organized by the six agro-ecological zones described and delineated previously, in Component 2, Carte 1 (page 31).

Data on carbon stocks and changes will be drawn from vegetation maps, remote sensing imagery and previous UNFCCC National Reports with unspecified “adjustment factors” linked to projections based on expectations of development trajectories. The process is outlined in 4 steps: assessment of existing data, development of analytical models, development of a reference scenario (done by agro-ecological zone) and capacity building of the technical secretariat for future monitoring.

The “adjusted” (projected) baseline will incorporate information on trends and policy factors (Section 2a) that will be used in modeling projected changes based on national development trends and projections. Calculations will be “clustered” by agro-ecological zones. It is not clear whether a tier 1 (global defaults) or tier 2 (national or subnational base values) will be used.

The document indicate the intention to focus national emissions calculations on “forests” and reviews various definitions of forest including international (FAO) and various outputs of the UNFCCC (Kyoto Protocol, Marrakech Accords), and the 1994 National Forest Law but notes that adoption of a working definition of “forest” for calculations of forest cover and emissions will be done based on further analyses to be done during PY1.

On pages 78-81 and Tables 16 and 17 the document provides a good summary of existing data sources and methodologies to be evaluated in the development of the analyses for recognizing “forests” and calculating carbon stocks and flows but does not indicate a “choice” of methodologies, pending further analysis. Particular mention should be made of the thousands of hectares of forest that have been inventoried as part of the community and communal forest programmes of the last twenty years.

The document notes the intention to engage a number of government departments and national universities in the compilation and assessment of relevant datasets. It is noted with some concern that no mention is made of the institutions in the north of the country, essential for doing justice to the full range of agroecological zones that cover the length of this diverse country. Engagement with regional institutions with relevant experience and expertise (such as OSFAC) should be considered for advice and expertise on relevant and practical assessment and production of useful products from remote sensing data sources.

The document acknowledges the need to collect new and more precise data on drivers (also noted in section 2a), notes the potential impacts of sectoral policies on drivers and also provides a relevant list of factors to be considered and a brief summary of trends in various sectors to be taken into account in future analyses. The team intends to model expected changes at both quantitative and “spatial” levels using a variety of modeling tools and to share findings and results across relevant sectors. The intention is to acquire the capacity to project future trends and to identify potential “hot spots” of future change linked to drivers. These will seek to incorporate data on projected agriculture, mining and demographic changes.

Studies to establish the projected baseline and reference level will be integrated with work on establishing an MRV system (described in Component 4). The section also provides a brief and somewhat superficial overview of capacity development needs to achieve the intended results. If

financial resources are limited, it may be necessary to scale back on the range of national institutions that are envisioned to contribute to this component. This should be done on the basis of prioritized needs to accomplish the intended project outputs within available resources.

A good point is made that choices of development goals will have repercussions on the forest and GHG removals, and that rapid development of mining and agribusiness must be taken into account. This is all true, but there needs to be in addition a plan to show how each of these points will be addressed (the impact, the institution that will deal with it, and the timeline and budget). The plan must also show different approaches for the different agroecological zones. The annex provides a list of topics and data collection needs, but not a plan for carrying this out. There is a good discussion of how models will be used, and this provides a start on a plan. But it is also noted that modeling skills are low, so there will be additional capacity building required.

There is a brief discussion of existing capability at various institutions, and it is noted that these capabilities must be strengthened through training - but no specifics about what actual training will be required. The COMIFAC/FAO program mentioned in component 4 could be helpful here.

The chart at the end of the section gives a sense of “what” should be done, but we still lack the “who” and “how” - which institutions will be responsible for which activity and how will they carry them out? It would be useful to develop a work plan with an outcome chain (see Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda R-PPs for examples that clearly show what is to be done.)

This component partially meets the standard

Comments on the revised version

The text has been enriched with a large number of more detailed descriptions of a number of important steps, including detailed descriptions of the sequence of activities in the establishment of the reference scenario, a description of how the different satellite image series will be treated, a brief reference to the use of data from forest concessions, as they implement their management plans, and an improved description of capacity-building requirements.

A number of new activities have been added to Table 18, and to the reference scenario construction stages. These provide a clearer explanation of how the REL program will proceed. But reference level work is critically dependent on specific drivers - those that have been important in the past, and those that are expected to be important in the future. It is still not clear whether a tier 1 or tier 2 approach will be used, and the response about tiers and approaches is confusing, though perhaps resolved in Component 4a, where Tier 2 is proposed. The definition of forest is still lacking, although the sources of information that will be used to define it are clearly mentioned, and it is stated to be a highest-order priority for the start of the implementation phase.

The TAP point about including the thousands of ha. of forest that have been inventoried is only mentioned very briefly in Table 15 - it's not clear if the importance of this is fully understood. Table 18 on Planned Activities and Timetable is much improved with several additions of new and relevant activities and their timeline.

Our recommendation therefore is that, with a careful discussion of how specific drivers will be treated, as well as answers to the two other small points above (Tier to be used in REL establishment; and use of inventory data), this component should meet the standard.

But as it stands, this component still only **partially meets the standard**.

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:

This is a statement of what will be developed. At the end of the component, there is a budget which is very high - and could be substantially reduced. To do that requires a carefully developed plan and outcome chain; see comments on component 3 for suggested examples.

The section starts with the principles for the development of the MRV system and outlines what should be done for monitoring. It notes that there have been many efforts to map the forest, but no real centralization of the data. Examples of available data are discussed, but how these will be subject to quality control is not clear. Maps of land use are discussed, and there is a generic figure on p. 92 that shows how regional data are combined to provide national information. There is a useful list of the elements of the MRV system, and a discussion of which institutions will be involved. There is also a discussion of the existing technical capacities and needs for the future with specifics on courses to be taught.

Local communities are mentioned (p. 89) as playing a role in data collection, but exactly how this will happen is not developed further. This is a serious shortcoming, since these groups are an essential component of the dynamic of the forest, and have a potentially important role to play in any MRV system. This needs to be better addressed.

The MRV system aims to measure carbon stocks and flows in all of the components of REDD+ as well as tracking changes in drivers, socioeconomic benefits and governance changes, adhering to IPCC and other UNFCCC generated guidance, to the extent appropriate, clustered by agro-ecological zone.

Data inputs from satellite-based remote sensing, forest inventory plots and cartographic products will be used. Actual methodologies and their application will be influenced by future UNFCCC

decisions on monitoring requirements and IPCC guidance on methodology. There is a certain amount of confusion in the text about the use of different satellite image systems (Landsat and Terra Modis); this should be easy to clear up.

A considerable amount of capacity building will be required. This is not very clearly delineated and a prioritized assessment of existing capacity and needs should be done as an element of the PY1 work plan. Consideration of what regional facilities and capacities are available should be given, both for capacity building and for production of high quality analytical products.

Related to the presentation in the proposal, and given its importance, it is surprising not to see mention of the new UN-backed forest monitoring program involving Cameroon and 9 other Central African countries - the new initiative targets 200 million hectares in the Congo Basin, and is funded with about €6 million from the Congo Basin Forest Fund, managed through COMIFAC and FAO, with technical support from the Brazilian Space Agency INPE. This program will be helpful to Cameroon as it plans its REL and MRV system. There is a brief mention of cooperation with FAO and Brazil in Annex 2b on p. 131 which may refer to the new program. If that is the case, it would be better to have some mention of this program in the body of the proposal. Funding from COMIFAC is mentioned at the bottom of p.99, but it's not clear that this funding refers to the new MRV program.

Now all of this needs to be brought together into a true work plan with identification of the specific methodology to be used, the priority of actions, which institutions will be responsible for which part of the plan, and how this will be spaced out in time. From that plan, it would be possible to develop a more realistic budget.

The component does not yet meet the standard

Comments on the revised version

A number of useful additions have been made in this component, providing more detail on what will be done and emphasizing in a most helpful way, the potential for involvement of communities in MRV work, as Cameroon goes through decentralization. The request for more detail on capacity building is met with a comment that this must wait for a detailed action plan (though there is a new quite detailed text on capacity building in Component 3). This is a reasonable response, but it would be useful to have some specifics here, even if only in broad categories against specific MRV issues.

The request to put the UN-backed FAO/COMIFAC technical assistance program in context is answered only with the statement that this will be part of capacity building. The work plan should show in more detail how that and other on-going, funded programs can contribute directly to the implementation of the MRV system. At the end, it is stated that "a general work plan will be carried out at the beginning of the implementation of the R-PP." At this point, the R-PP presents only the elements of a plan, though it is much more detailed than it was previously, and this is noted favourably. But it does not represent the kind of outcome chain that has been so useful for other countries, for example, Kenya. Table 19 is useful to show the thinking, and is a good first step towards the "proposal and workplan for the initial design etc" as called for in the R-PP template. But it is the view of the TAP that it is only a first step.

Our recommendation therefore is that these related comments, in particular those about the FAO/COMIFAC MRV project (funded by the CBFF) be attended to carefully, to enable the component to meet the standard, which it does not yet do.

For this component, the R-PP has improved and now **partially meets the standard**.

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 recommendation

This is a generic statement of co-benefits and the things that must be done to monitor them. But it is not specific to Cameroon and its drivers of deforestation, local biodiversity, or land use stratification of the country. It does point out the need for introduction of training on accounting and monitoring in various schools and universities. The mention of pilot projects during the preparatory phase (p. 98) is a step in the right direction - these could be set up based on land use stratification, with different projects in each of the agroecological regions. Then a national system could be set up incorporating the successful projects. However, the pilot projects present a further funding challenge (see Component 5) of enormous proportions.

The intention is for the information system to capture and maintain information on multiple benefits, impacts and risks of REDD+ implementation building on the baseline established by the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and including relevant aspects of governance reform and implementation.

This section provides a fairly good checklist of issues to be monitored during implementation that range from institutional structure to tracking the flow of benefits and the achievement of co-benefits by various segments of society (IPs, women, etc.). This should be followed closely during co-implementation missions both through the initial design and implementation stages and beyond, once the project becomes effective.

The intention of involving a number of institutions in this aspect of monitoring is admirable. What is not made clear is how non-institutional stakeholders (IP groups and other forest-dependent people) might be involved. To be effective and efficient the system needs to identify the most important parameters to monitor and set up a practical system to do so. There is a sense that the monitoring of carbon will always assume a higher importance than the monitoring of the potential co-benefits.

While Annex 2d provides TORs for an SESA, a simple **workplan** for how this part of the program will be put into implementation that provides more detail than is given in Table 19 is needed, in particular for the initial 2 years of RPP implementation.

This component partially meets the standard

Comments on the revised version

The R-PP makes clear the intention to involve indigenous people, women, etc. But it does not yet identify what are considered to be the most important parameters for potential co-benefits for Cameroon itself. Table 20 is useful to show the thinking, and will be a good first step toward the "initial design and workplan etc." as called for in the R-PP template. Curiously, although biodiversity

is mentioned in the initial paragraphs of the Component, it fades from view later. With Cameroon's long record of leadership in biodiversity conservation in Central Africa, this is an omission.

Our recommendation is that this section needs some more thought, carefully listing the co-benefits and describing how each would be treated, and with assistance from which institutions, as part of the MRV system.

The component therefore continues to **partially meet the standard**.

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:

This component has struck all the reviewers as being unrealistic. The large gap between the \$4.3 million already identified from four sources, and the \$32 million sought in all, makes the whole programme a very risky one. Which components of the work would be at risk, if less than 15% of the budget were all that was available? Where will the rest of the money come from? It also seems that the projected costs of the components are, by comparison with other countries, very high.

Given the large "gap" between expected funds from FCPF and those that are projected to be needed and the plan to meet the shortfall from UN-REDD and other (unspecified) bilateral donors, careful phasing and sequencing of activity implementation will be necessary to maintain program coherence. This is especially true because of the time lag between proposal preparation and funding approval for most donor agencies and the uncertainty of funding from sources that are not yet committed. Noting that no Cameroon Government funding is indicated beyond 2012 in Table 5, that needs to be explained. If the Government is committed to this exercise, a more long-term commitment of funds should be indicated. **Table 5 (Pages 100-101)** needs to delineate more clearly how FCPF (and UN-REDD?) funds will be applied as together these will fall far short of the figures given in the table.

In conclusion, the proposal does not provide a clear delineation of how FCPF and UN-REDD funds will be used. The budget needs to be constructed based on funds that are expected to be available at inception or are expected soon thereafter. There needs to be a plausible assessment of expectations of funds from other sources (GEF, bilateral and multilateral donors, etc.). The contributions from the GoC need to be indicated within the budget breakdown, not just in a single line at the bottom of the table.

This component does not meet the standard

Comments on the revised version

It's understood that this document will be used to attract other donors. Nonetheless, the now-reduced budget of \$29 million still seems to the TAP reviewers to be unrealistic. The timing of proposed

expenditures, starting early in 2013, also seems over-optimistic. Whilst the TAP has no business in curbing Cameroon's legitimate ambitions, it might be helpful to the FCPF to have a budget and workplan that have a higher chance of being funded within the timeframe of the FCPF's anticipated readiness implementation phase.

This component does **not yet meet the standard**.

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:

The schedule for project monitoring and reporting with annual reviews and semiannual reports and a mid-term evaluation seems appropriate. However the plan to "merge" project implementation monitoring with the overall MRV system that is to be developed under the project seems inappropriate. The project monitoring needs to be closely controlled by the project management team while broader MRV for emissions, deforestation and degradation and safeguards will be done by specialized units existing within the government or collaborating institutions. It is not realistic for these programs that are "under construction" to take on the role of monitoring project implementation other than reporting out on progress (and problems encountered) within their own domains.

Indicators need to be defined more clearly, not just in "generic" terms as they are currently (with details relegated to an Annexe). There should be specific targets and milestones to ensure adequate and timely progress can be tracked. It would also be appropriate, and reassuring to other stakeholders, to indicate how the results of the monitoring will be made public.

The budget for monitoring of project implementation is inadequate and, as presented in **Table 6** is funded for only one year (2013, PY2), This does not conform to normal conventions and best practice for project administration.

This component does not yet meet the standard.

Comments on the revised version

The table in Annex 6 is an attempt to meet the TAP's concerns, but still falls short of detail in the indicators. The budget has been provided for four years as requested (though unlike the rest of the programme, it is too low, rather than too high).

For this component, the R-PP has improved and now **partially meets the standard**

Supplementary notes and comments on the Annexes

Annex 1a. P 105

Notable by its absence, is any inclusion of international conservation NGOs who, for decades, have been active contributors to forest conservation and improved management on the steering committee. Given the long history of international NGO cooperation with the GoC in forest conservation and management and the extensive experience and deployment of personnel that are qualified and actively employed in field based programs this failure to take advantage of these resources is, in the opinion of this reviewer a significant an unfortunate oversight.

Annex 1b

I note that many of the public consultations were organized (and sponsored?) in collaboration with International NGOs (IUCN, CI, WCS, WWF) during the preparation phase for this proposal. It would seem reasonable to expect that future collaboration would be formalized in this document if that is anticipated. If not, why not?

Annex 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

This would benefit from further planning and elaboration during the first semester of PY1 and should be given priority then. The document does a good job of organizing “target” groups for communications but would benefit from more thought and input from communication specialists in elaboration of the work program to carry it out as well as some analysis of how to use various media most effectively to reach target groups.

Annex 2 a

Good summary of general characteristics of the agro-eco zones. A good place to start in identifying drivers and also establishing Tier 2 (or higher) baseline data on carbon content of forest and other cover types.

Annex 2b

Good summary of “early action” projects and initiatives that can be a rich source of experience and expertise. It isn’t clear what kind of “formal” relationship(s) the Tech Secretariat will establish with these to ensure they get maximum benefit from these in terms of learning.

Annex 2d

As noted these TORS for SESA will require further elaboration during the beginning of PY1.

Annex 3

Establishing a robust and credible reference scenario will require some sophisticated expert input to chose appropriate methodologies and implementation plan to establish credible baseline figures including minimizing error bars.