

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism  
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**  
(interim, April 20, 2012, 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.*

**Synthesis Review of R-PP of Fiji**

Reviewer : Jayant Sathaye co-leading five TAP experts

Date of review : 10 Nov. 2013

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

(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)

**Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):**

**Overview and TAP General Comments:**

This Second TAP Review focused on Fiji Second revised R-PP submission (8 November 2013) that was submitted in November. It was designed to address the TAP First Review comments. The submitted draft addressed almost all the comments on each of the components with only a few minor items that need some attention. The text and inclusion of tables and figures in the overall document is now significantly improved. It is much easier now to read and understand

the text.

All Components reached the Met criteria except 2d, which was not addressed at all. We have noted items that need to be explained a bit more in many of the sub-components. Information provided on those items would improve understanding of the response made to each comment by Fiji development team.

The table below shows whether each sub-component meets R-PP standard.

Components	R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 16, Geneva – October 2013 Review	R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 16, Geneva – November 2013 Review	
1a	Partially met	Met	
1b	Largely met	Met	
1c	Partially met	Met	
2a	Partially met	Met	
2b	Partially met	Met	
2c	Largely met	Met	
2d	Largely met	Met	
3	Partially met	Met	
4a	Partially met	Met	
4b	Partially met	Met	
5	Largely met	Met	
6	Largely met	Met	

***First TAP Review (3 October 2013):***

**Background:**

Fiji submitted a first draft R-PP in Sept. 2013 for consideration at PC 17 (Dec. 2013). A TAP Team consisting of six members reviewed the draft R-PP. Members submitted their drafts that were assembled to establish a synthesized review on 2 October, which is reported below with a summary of the issues that were described for each component.

**Overview:**

Strengths of the RPP:

Six TAP reviewers have studied this version and their general impression is as follows:

1. The current version of the R-PP is quite well written and the ideas are presented in a comprehensive manner and the content under each component and respective sub-component have responded to the terms of reference set out in the R-PP Template.
2. The executive summary has provided a concise overview of the entire R-PP, in which the types of consultations and information sharing during the preparation of the R-PP are highlighted, as is a summary of the key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and associated strategy options.
3. It is evident from the R-PP that the rate of deforestation still needs to be further analyzed during the implementation of the R-PP and will certainly be needed in the construction of reference levels. In addition more systematic and precise data on carbon stocks in the chosen pools and forest definitions are required.
4. The proposed MRV system, including a system for monitoring of multiple benefits and safeguards seem sufficient, even though experience in the aspect of safeguards is still limited. What is unfortunate is that Fiji does not have a long history of forest resource mapping and other forms of assessment, which it hope to build upon.
5. The proposed SESA and EIA frameworks are relevant and generally demonstrate an admirable understanding of the subject matter. However, there is very little work done on this topic and is going to require considerable inputs from various staff and local communities.
6. We have concluded that Components 2c and 2d largely meet the standard while rest of the components partially meet the standards and will require more assessment and analysis to resolve the issues.

Key Recommendations:

Despite the general observation that the treatment of the various components are quite complete there are still some items and issues that need to be addressed in order to meet the standards set for them. These are noted below, and their inclusion would assist in meeting each component standard.

1. Under sub-component 1a, Cabinet level interaction and participation is critical for successful operation of REDD+ programs since sources of D&D are often promoted by non-forestry ministries such as agriculture, mining, land use, power sector, etc. Some of these are not included in Annex 1.

2. Although the process is at an early stage, the absence of any mention or indication of financing modality issues and how this might translate to landowner benefits and/or participation of commercial interests, is striking. Fiji's REDD+ process will likely succeed or fail largely on how it integrates the commercial realities into the process. There is no indication of this being a component of the consultation process described, and/or key local stakeholders with these interests.
3. There is real danger in engaging in widespread awareness raising of REDD + among forest landowners unless the benefits can be clearly articulated at the outset. This will only raise unrealistic expectations which if unrealized will jeopardize implementation. The only apparent discussion of benefit sharing is hidden in 2.c.7 REDD+ Guidelines where its significance for the whole of the REDD+ process is not highlighted.
4. R-PP can reduce funds from some Components such as 1a (\$819 m FCPF, \$1114 m total) and increase the allocation to Comps. 2b and 4b.
5. In Component 5, please include this Table – Schedule and Budget R-PP Template Version 6. It would report on each sub-component costs for four years from 2013 to 2106 and a total amount. It should also include the total costs for each of the six Components.
6. An important element would be to provide information about the goals for accomplishment of GoF of plans each year from 2014 to 2017 with their funded activities. It would be helpful to describe this in each Component Activities and Budget Summary Table. Each Table should also indicate how the government and FCPF funds are to be used for the listed activities.
7. Capacity building is an important topic for every component with particular needs in Component 2 that has no allocated funds.
8. The section on 'reporting' under 4a.7 of the R-PP essentially deals with the database management system. It does not adequately explain how the information will be used to produce reports, what reports will be produced and how the reports or the major findings will be made available to stakeholders and the general public. A similar situation applies to several other sub-components. Please check each to ensure their applicability to these items.

B. TAP Recommendations and questions that focus broadly on the R-P presentation are noted under each Sub-component. It has two items – Key Recommendations and Additional Recommendations. Key items refer to the important comments that will require more effort to address the requested changes. Additional items are simpler comments that may be addressed with less effort.

C. The TAP assessment of the standards for each section is summarized in the table above.

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

*(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)*

### **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, 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a very good response to Key Recommendation 4 about including information about yearly targets. It is included in all the other components as well.

***Additional Recommendations:***

1. No response noted for Item 12. Please explain your response.

**Component 1a meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

This section provides information on the arrangements for management of national readiness. It notes that Fiji established a REDD+ Steering Committee (SC) in 2011. It is chaired by Deputy Conservator Forests and is composed of 18 members from forestry, foreign affairs, iTaukei affairs, lands and mineral resources, etc. Government has provided continued support to REDD+ Project in Fiji through 2013. SC would be used to create a Fiji REDD+ unit and also set up Divisional REDD+ working groups. It plans to engage internationally with multiple countries and do peer-to-peer exchanges through regional travels.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

**Key Recommendations:**

1. Would the head of SC report to the Prime Minister? This has been a very effective approach in other countries and may work well in Fiji also. Please let us know about this possibility. SC goes to the CABINET. Does it also report to PM?
2. Energy use and power generation that generally affects the forest cover is an important topic for Fiji since it plans to expand its use of hydro power and wind energy. This does not appear to be included in the text. Please include it if the two sources are going to be significant.
3. Also, there is mention of Technical Working Groups but no information about an

important role they can play in strategy options, safeguards and governance, etc. Setting up TWGs and the way they would be monitored and agencies they would support would significantly improve the technical analysis and support to 1a SC managers. Please elaborate the TWG information and show its interaction with SC and others.

4. One critical question is what would be accomplished each year through these activities, funding for which is noted in Table 1a. In Work Plan Section 1a.3, a Timeframe is reported in each of the *Purpose* sections. These indicate that the work will be done throughout entire phase or in 2014. What would be much more useful would be to report on the activities that are to be accomplished in each of the four years 2014 to 2017. Please provide information about the accomplishments and related goals that are planned to be completed each year.
5. The R-PP needs to include an institutional review / structuring that incorporate work place assessment of the existing portfolio holders. The R-PP expounds on a range of tasks against primary responsible agencies with little analysis of their existing capacities to manage these. An inventory of new tasks arising from implementation of REDD+ is essential in the institutional analysis.
6. The Fiji REDD+ Unit seems to be intended to be more of a ‘technical’ group than an administrative group and it will be important to ensure that the Unit is led by a senior manager who has high level capacity to coordinate and manage the project.
7. Budget for this component at \$1.144 million seems high and should be revisited to come to a lower figure.

Additional Recommendations:

8. On the grievance mechanism there appear to be systems in place in Fiji that could be used in the context of REDD+. These are discussed under Component 2.c. It is therefore recommended to highlight them under Component 1.a and to show how they could fit into the overall institutional arrangements for REDD+. It is clearly important to build and use these existing systems, rather than create a separate system.
9. Faith based groups generally have better community presence amongst all CSOs and they practice regular updating of their data sets. As acknowledged in the R-PP they manage educational institutions however not mentioned is that they own the majority of primary and secondary schools. The R-PP has to find a more active role for them in public consultation, awareness campaign and addressing grievances. As of now they are assigned a passive landowner role.
10. It would be useful if the R-PP could briefly describe the skills and role of the NGOs (number 9 of the SC membership list in section 1a.1) particularly in relation to matters of community engagement, governance, transparency and social outcomes.
11. There are many ill-defined committees at all levels of the Fijian government at the moment, and the efficacy of many is questionable. It is important for the REDD+ Steering Committee to clarify whether it is a governing body or an advisory body or both.
12. Decentralization of REDD + management is attractive in plan but there are few if any precedents of what is visualized here – a practical and functional approach which can be absorbed at the sub-national level needs to be adopted.

**Component 1a 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

**Component 1b meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

Fiji's SPC/GTZ is actively engaged in sharing and collecting REDD+ information in a national consultation process on climate change across provincial and local level governments. It engages both the private sector and NGOs heavily in the process. It launched the activities back in 2009 and has pursued them since then. All the sections are well described and provide information about various activities. It also notes the challenges in the work being done in 1b.7 Issues arising out of REDD+ consultations to date section. These are then laid out to be addressed in Table 1b.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

**Key Recommendations:**

1. Much data is mooted to be researched via existing regional agencies (SOPAC & USP) and international CSOs. Simplifying scientific data for community uses need stronger emphasis. It is recommended that protocols be developed on data ownership, sharing and communication.

2. The road ahead requires a lot of research and development and of eco-system monitoring in cutting tools science. The institutional structuring review should consider designating a national institute as a REDD+ Center of Excellence.

Additional Recommendations:

3. It would be useful if the R-PP could comment on whether the interests and rights of the iTaukei are adequately covered by this representation, particularly with respect to sufficient independence from government. The R-PP should explain how the “REDD+ resource owner representatives” are selected and appointed.
4. Further work is required in identifying and integrating lessons from applicable projects and processes. For instance the Drawa project has a history of over 15 years but very little is revealed in the document of what lessons can be learned, most important are the experiences of landowner involvement.

**Component 1b largely 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 far<sup>3</sup> (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) and concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

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

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

***Additional Recommendations:***

1. Please note the Annex to which the Item 6 response was included.
2. Item 7 is noted. Is it addressed and included in the text?

---

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



**Component 1c meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

The overall goal of the consultation and participation of stakeholders within REDD+ programs will be to increase awareness through wholesome participation of stakeholders when taking decisions on and implementing REDD+ activities. Due to the large percentage of customary land ownership in Fiji (almost 90% of the total land area), forest carbon financing must ensure that the interests and rights of resource owners are fully considered. Clarification over forest carbon property rights must be provided. A guideline for the implementation of REDD+ projects will serve as a template both at national and sub-national level and promote the accountability and transparency of REDD+ projects. This guideline will include strict consultation requirements.

In December 2012 the first drafting of the R-PP started. It intensified in May and June 2013 and this included a special steering committee meeting to draft the budget and work plan and a series of national stakeholder consultation meetings to further develop specific components of the draft RPP.

The introduction of carbon quantification and selling of carbon credits must be dealt with very carefully when approaching the communities. Significant time and effort has gone into the development of the Consultation and Participation Plan, but the Plan is in no way considered final. The plan lays out the stakeholder groups, priority issues and engagement tools.

In the short term, these consultations will be conducted on the seven islands that currently have forest inventories. These seven islands cover roughly 85% of the land area in Fiji and are the islands holding the majority of forests.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

**Key Recommendations:**

1. Table 1c Summary provides the main and sub-activity, and estimated costs. It would be useful to provide information about the requested funds and coverage of each sub-topic. The information should match the Table 3: Summary of actions for component 1c. Also, would the work focus only on the seven islands with no eventual expansion?
2. One critical question is what would be accomplished each year through these activities, funding for which is noted in Table 1c. Please provide information about the accomplishments and related goals that are planned to be completed each year.
3. SESA is proposed as a one off exercise using a number implied plethora of proven tools. It is a risk to slightly gloss over the unique customary tenure system in Fiji and use a tool

insensitive to this. Would not be appropriate to USE imported SESA tools without FIRST a through adaptation review to accommodate local context in customary tenure systems. Check and control mechanism has to be installed. Also, some consideration to link a re-visiting of the SESA baseline on ENSO occurrences is worth consideration rather than a one-off exercise.

4. The C&P plan recognizes the need to act on any concerns raised by stakeholders into the REDD+ program. However, it is unclear what arrangements will be put in place by the C&P plan to ensure this takes place. In particular if independent stakeholder platforms will be established to allow different groups to voice their opinions and/or how it might link to a possible grievance mechanism. More details are needed with regards how concerns will be adequately integrated into the REDD+ program and activities.

Additional Recommendations:

5. There isn't indication of a formal mechanism for addressing grievances. This should be added as a response to Standard 1c.
6. For the purposes of transparency it would be useful if this section could make reference to relevant reports on the workshops that document the views of stakeholders and how these views were addressed in the workshop reports or through other mechanisms during the preparation of the R-PP. It would also be useful to know how widely these reports were circulated to stakeholders outside of the direct participants.
7. The listing and coverage of representative agencies proposed in the Consultation and Participation Plan is substantial albeit two key stakeholders need to be mentioned. The Fiji Council of Social Services is the legislated agency for coordination of CSOs and in particular it houses the national Micro-finance project. Both these should be included as key stakeholder agencies for the Consultation Plan.
8. Also, the S&C Plan should not be about reaching as many people as possible, but about reaching the relevant groups with clear information because Fiji is a low deforestation country. It is likely that the opportunities from REDD+ may be limited to certain areas and to certain types of activities. For these items 7 and 8 reasons, it may also be prudent to roll the S&C plan out in a stepwise fashion to focus on pilot areas and then based on lessons learnt roll it out to the other areas.

**Component 1c partially 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

***Additional Recommendations:***

1. Item 9 is noted and included in Component 1. Please inform where it was addressed and included in the text.

**Component 2a meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

Fiji consists of over 300 islands, of which 100 are inhabited. The two main islands of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu comprise 1.58 million hectares out of the total land area of 1.83 million hectares. The two main and a few smaller islands, have mountainous interiors covered with dense natural forest resources. Landform towards coastal lands is marked by easterly and westerly watersheds with very steep interior rivers and creeks, giving way to undulating slopes and river lowlands, and coastal mangroves. The total Fijian population is projected to be one million by 2020.

An inventory of the indigenous, or native, forest resource was completed in 1995. These indigenous forests cover 858,000 ha, representing 47.5% of Fiji's total land area. About 5 to 6 percent of Fiji's land area is covered in pine and hardwood plantations. Softwood plantations, mainly of pine (*Pinus caribaea*), representing 2.5 percent (46,379 ha) of the land area, have been established on the leeward and grasslands areas and there is great potential for further plantation expansion. Hardwood plantations of mainly mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*), representing 2.9 percent of the land area, have been established on logged over rainforests, mainly on the eastern and central parts of the larger islands.

The forest sector is an integral part of the economic sector of Fiji. Export earnings from forest products rank third. The forestry sector currently contributes 2.5 percent of GDP and some \$50 million in foreign exchange annually.

Fiji's mahogany plantings, which amount to approximately 50,000 ha in area (38,850 ha in eastern Viti Levu, 11,000 ha in the Northern Division), are recognized as possibly the most valuable in the world.

**Recommendations and Questions:**

**Key Recommendations:**

1. A significant and growing amount of timber serves local market demand, which stems for the

most part from native forests, and some pine. Production of this timber is hard to quantify as many domestic sector timber activities fall outside of a legal framework and remain unregulated. Please estimate and cite whether this timber would be a large share in the future.

2. Drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are both important topics that are well explained on pages 64-66 and in Annex 2a. Does FAO or anyone else do an analysis of the past, current and future levels of DD activities and report on the numbers associated with them? Also, fire is treated in a trivial manner, yet it remains the most significant proximate agent for deforestation and forest degradation in the country. Please cite such useful data in this Component if it is available.
3. In the Table 2a, funds will be used in 2014 and 2015. However, a continued set up for data collection for assessing DD will be very useful to lower emissions in the future. Please consider a continued use of this topic beyond 2015.
4. The section contains a description of lease arrangements for iTaukei lands by TLTB but there is no indication at all or apparent recognition of what could be the key challenge for the successful implementation of REDD + in Fiji – under what conditions, specifically financial arrangements, will TLTB permit REDD + activities on iTaukei lands. It may be early days but some recognition that this needs to be resolved as early as possible (as a component of the benefit-sharing issue) is essential because it is fundamental to the commercial realities of REDD +.
5. REDD+ strategy should be one of the catalysts in implementing the Permanent Forest Estates requirement of the Forest Policy because no sustainable forest management or REDD+ can be undertaken **until there is long term security** of the forest in question. Please include it in the REDD+ strategy.
6. It identifies a major need to review the legal and governance arrangements. The benefit of a major review is not doubted but the R-PP does little to elaborate on the need and importance of such a review for Fiji. Please include this in the text.

Additional Recommendations:

7. An important question is whether the customary land tenure system and the rights established for the iTaukei are consistent with competitive land use and carbon credit payments resulting from REDD+ policies (see also section 2c.2 on Forest Carbon Rights)?
8. In the discussion of lease arrangements, there is a surprise omission of the implications of the recently created ‘Land Bank and its legislation’ on potential use of native land for REDD + purposes. This should be included.
9. That R-PP should include institutional and capacity building/capacity boosting since it needs assessment to address such components, e.g. the R-PP to consider other options of out-servicing regulatory functions as monitoring and policing as core ministries do not have sustainable capacity and expertise.

**Notes:**

pp. 55-56 figures for forest areas in the text vary considerably from those provided in Table 4 – 2007 figures in the latter are all way out.

p. 56 Dept. of Town & Country Planning has nothing to do with mangroves at any juncture.

p. 57 last sentence refers to Box 1..... but it is not provided. Please include it if it is intended to be placed there.

p. 67 last sentence is a nonsensical and erroneous description of planned Permanent Forest Estates in the Forest Policy. Integrating REDD + sites into the Permanent Forest Estate provision of the Forest Policy is an objective REDD + development should focus on, rather than setting up a parallel forest category.

**Component 2a partially 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

***Additional Recommendations:***

1. Item 5 is not addressed. Please inform where it would be addressed and site the topic to be included in the text.

**Component 2b meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

Since the Cabinet endorsed the REDD+ policy in December 2010, Fiji has made important steps

towards the development of its REDD+ strategy. Fiji is in the second phase of its national REDD+ program, which includes the establishment of pilot sites and strengthening technical Measuring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) capacities as well as the development of a national REDD+ strategy.

The proposed strategic options and required actions for implementing REDD+ outlined in this sub-component build upon the progress made thus far in the development of Fiji's REDD+ strategy, but will directly address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

The options described in the table are necessarily broad and these potential activities will be assessed and prioritized during R-PP implementation; certain strategic options will also be removed if not considered viable. These include agriculture, large-scale forest conversion by local communities, mining, infrastructure development, forest fires and unsustainable timber harvesting.

Once the full drivers assessment described in sub-component 2a becomes available, a study identifying and detailing the strategy options to address these drivers will be carried out. Following this study, a number of follow-up or parallel studies will take place in order to further elaborate and prioritize the REDD+ identified strategy options. These would focus on (1) Identifying, evaluating and choosing options and (2) Cost benefits analysis.

### ***Recommendations and Questions:***

#### **Key Recommendations:**

1. There is little or no information on how successful the ongoing REPP+ projects have been to date. What lessons were learned from their operations? How well were they implemented? Did any local communities gain from them; how much? Is deforestation not a major problem compared with degradation? Should the emphasis be on degradation in such a case? Such information should be provided in this section or in 2a. It would help to understand how the R-PPs Components were designed by making use of the collected information.
2. One critical question is what would be accomplished each year through these activities, funding for which is noted in Table 2b. Please provide information about the accomplishments and related goals that are planned to be completed each year.
3. In the section 'Continued and strengthened sustainable forest management' there is no comment or analysis on Fiji's experience with forest certification – why has it not succeeded to date? Does this have implications for the REDD+ strategy, and what role this might play in the future? Will it be the same for REDD+? Forest certification and concomitantly Permanent Forest Estates are central to sustainable forest management and need consideration in any strategy option analysis.
4. As noted under Standard 2a, it would be useful if the R-PP could specifically discuss the reasons for the lack of implementation (e.g. lack of capacity, low institutional support, stakeholder resistance etc) and how the challenges for implementation could be best overcome under the FCPF project. R-PP should include institutional and capacity building/capacity boosting needs assessment to address this component.

#### **Additional Recommendations:**

5. In section 2b.3 (Work Plan) it would be useful if the analysis of economic, social and environmental trade-offs could specifically address to whom the costs and benefits of

alternative strategies are apportioned. That is, which costs and benefits are assigned to landowners as private goods and which are assigned to the broader community as public or common-pool resources.

**Component 2b partially 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

**Component 2c meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

Very promising array of ideas is recommended in this category.

Fiji has chosen to take a ‘hybrid’ model for REDD+ implementation, which include payments flowing at the national, programmatic, and project-scale as specified in the National REDD+ Policy. It decided to broaden the scope of Fiji REDD+ from ‘Carbon Trading’ objectives to general ‘Carbon Financing’ goals.

Fiji has decided to postpone the development of implementation framework and associated analyses until the strategy options are agreed upon.

Nearly 88% of the land in Fiji is owned by indigenous (iTaukei) landowning groups and approximately 90% of iTaukei land is forested. Much of this land is registered in the Register of iTaukei Lands with boundaries recorded (even if not all have been formally surveyed), with members of the landowning group recorded in the Vola ni Kawa Bula. To make a policy decision for carbon rights Fiji has chosen an option for a landowner (who by law owns the carbon rights in his forest) to benefit from them by engaging directly in a relationship for a REDD+ project on his land.

It will consider one pilot site Emalu to conduct many surveys, and two REDD+ projects, Southern and Northern slopes of the Nakauvadra Range and Drawa, to develop a multiple benefit, community based reforestation projects.

There are a number of on-going projects and programs related to REDD+ in Fiji and it is important to ensure that REDD+ is additional to and builds upon these existing projects and programs. As described below, Fiji is active in the CDM market and it is therefore theoretically possible that afforestation/reforestation projects may be developed in Fiji under the CDM.

It is commendable that Section 2c.7 identifies the need for standard procedures and adequate training in dispute resolution for officers and village headmen who are involved in the implementation of REDD+.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

These include capacity building for law enforcement, REDD+ guidelines and grievance redress mechanism, registry for REDD+ activities and projects, designing a benefit sharing mechanism, implementation plan for pilot initiatives and programs, integration with bilateral programs with several countries and multilateral initiatives, and community-based REDD demonstration activities.

**Key Recommendations:**

1. There is not a detailed work plan yet, but the elements of such a plan have been laid out. There should be a more detailed plan that shows how the strategic issues will be evaluated and incorporated into the eventual Readiness Package. Please process this and include it in the text.
2. There is mention of a registry but there is no discussion around REDD+ Funds. This should be further elaborated in this section. Once money for REDD+ flows to the country, how will it be captured and then distributed, for example through a National REDD+ fund or through levies on projects. How it will then be distributed down to local communities should also be a critical element of any REDD+ implementation framework.
3. The document provides good information about these activities. The work plan lays out a series of activities that will be undertaken to support REDD+ implementation plan and support four key activities. A critical question is what would be accomplished each year through these activities, funding for which is noted in Table 2c. Please provide information about the accomplishments and related goals that are planned to be completed each year.

**Component 2c largely 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 in the form of an assessment of environmental and social risks and impacts as part of the SESA process. It also provides a description of safeguard issues that are relevant to the country's readiness preparation efforts. For FCPF countries, a simple work plan is presented for conducting the SESA process, cross referencing other components of the R-PP as appropriate,



and for preparing the ESMF.

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

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

**Component 2d meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

SESA has not been implemented in Fiji as yet and hence it intends to make use of SESA and provides information how this would be implemented in support of the programs that are described in Sections 1, 2 and 4b. An important aim of SESA is to assess the likely positive and negative impacts of Fiji's REDD+ strategy options (Component 2b) and implementation framework (Component 2c). More on FPIC and the Guidelines for REDD+ initiatives is explained.

A preliminary timeline and milestones of the SESA is outlined as follows:

- Launching (June 2014)
- Scoping (June 2014-June 2015)
- Assessment (July 2015- December 2016)
- Preparation of ESMF (January 2017- December 2018)

During R-PP implementation, a closer assessment for how to involve Indo-Fijians and other groups, include Fiji's youth, and engaging all land owner communities is planned.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

**Key Recommendations:**

1. Section 2d.3 describes the statutory basis for impact assessments in Fiji but it does not say how it is relevant to the proposed SESA Assessment and it does not explain what role, if any,

the EAI Unit will play in the SESA.

2. The National MDG Report 2004 states that the Literacy Rate amongst 15-24 years old is 99.2% in 2002. It has remained above 97% since 1986 and above 99% since 1996. The R-PP needs to re-think strategies to engage with the youth and tap into this vast pool of very literate population group.
3. The document provides good information about these activities. It also provides information about the timeline and milestones. It would be useful to provide an explanation of each of the items such as launching, scoping, assessment, and preparation of ESMF. Also, similar information should be provided in all other Components.

Additional Recommendations:

4. Phase 1 of the SESA Assessment (section 2d.1) should explicitly identify the need for an evaluation of how the costs and benefits of REDD+ are allocated (see comments under section 2b above).
5. Section 2d.5 on capacity building is rather vague and confusing in relation to the intended outcome and outputs from the proposed training sessions.

**Component 2d largely meets the standard.**

**Component 3. Develop a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level**

**Standard 3: National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest 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 (monitoring 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

**Component 3 meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

The report lays out the UNFCCC approach for setting up RELs and RL for Fiji. Fiji conducted a preliminary study assessing the availability of data and information required to develop a REL/RL in 2012. The study shows that the available data and information is insufficient for the development of the REL/RL, requiring Fiji to undertake concerted efforts by a wide variety of national stakeholders, and with the support of international development partners and experts to collate and analyze the required data and information. Past conversion from forest to non-forest land has been described by SOPAC (2011). Detection of certain degrees of degradation is being developed, applicability to past remote sensing data cannot be determined yet.

The development of RL and MRV system will initially focus on land cover change, gradually incorporating forest degradation and carbon stock enhancement. Data will be collected for above and below ground biomass, soil carbon, litter, dead wood and harvested wood products. The work will be supported by ongoing Univ. of South Pacific and DoF efforts

It plans to use 1997 classification of forests published in Vegetation of the Tropical Pacific Islands.

The institutional framework as described here and in section 1a will be the foundation for the MRV institutional framework. Thus, the Forest department will be responsible to develop the REL/RL and report emissions from changes in land cover and land use to the Government of Fiji for the national report on GHG emissions.

It notes that very little work exists for estimating forest cover change assessments and carbon stock data. In order to address these issues it lays out a nine step plan, which also addresses the MRV component. All this is worth doing.

### ***Recommendations and Questions:***

#### **Key Recommendations:**

1. It cites a Table 3 reported forest area in Section 2a. However, there is no Table 3 in that section. Please check where else it is.
2. The work plan lays out a series of activities that will be undertaken to support RL and MRV. A critical question is what would be accomplished each year through these activities, funding for which is noted in Table 3. Please provide information about the accomplishments and related goals that are planned to be completed each year.
3. The R-PP recognizes that there is no current reliable way of assessing forest degradation and consequently the step-wise approach in section 3.2 is designed to initially focus on changes in forest cover. Possible current measures of forest condition/degradation would be the proportion of forest covered by a timber license and logging plan and the degree to which the Harvesting Code of Practice (HCOP) is applied (i.e. the compliance standards being achieved over time) and consideration could be given to assessing the utility of this approach and/or ways that the monitoring conducted under the HCOP could be modified to improve the assessment of forest condition after logging for the purposes of standard 4a (below).
4. As with component 4a, the work plan (3.10) lacks the initial design for a stepwise

process with actors, deliverables, and a timeline. It needs some more discussion of early ideas on how the system will evolve into a mature REDD+ monitoring system. The overall needs are identified, in 4a.8, but the early elements of a true work plan are still needed.

5. Would sub national be at the jurisdiction of the island and some will be bundled? However, in Component 1a the institutional arrangements were at the jurisdiction of a Division. It might make sense for REL/RLs be developed at this level. It would be helpful to pick the same chosen level in Components 1a, 2a and 2b.

Additional Recommendations:

6. It would be useful if the proposed step-wise process could be summarized in a flow diagram or similar so that the relationship of the various factors and methods can be shown. It would also be useful if the work plan could indicate the relative effort, precision and utility of the various methods in contributing to an accurate and practical approach for establishing an RL.

**Component 3: The standard has been partially met.**

**Component 4. Design Systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards**

**Standard 4a: National Forest Monitoring System:**

The R-PP provides a proposal and work plan 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. The R-PP should also address the potential for 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

***Additional Recommendations:***

1. Not clear where responses to Items 7 and 8 are included. They don’t appear to be on the noted page 124.

**Component 4a meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

The proposal to establish a national GHG inventory and monitoring system is very significant in the framework of carbon accounting under the UNFCCC. Effective stakeholder engagement is essential to ensure accuracy, due process and accountability in this system. The proposed activities would benefit from more concrete measures on how this stakeholder engagement will be managed beyond assigning this responsibility.

National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) will focus on ground-based assessment and also Remote Sensing (RS) analysis which is based in Component 3 (Table 13). The PSP system is focused on three islands. It will be upgraded to seven islands for this exercise to comply with IPCC standards for carbon accounting. The data basis for emissions factors will be improved to at least Tier 2.

Many of the necessary steps required to develop Fiji's MRV system for REDD+ are captured in the work plan for Component 3. Thus, the activities in Comp. 4a only cover those that are additional to the work plan for RL.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

**Key Recommendations:**

1. The work plan lays out a series of activities that will be undertaken to support RL and MRV. A critical question is what would be accomplished each year through these activities, funding for which is noted in Table 4a. Please provide information about the accomplishments and related goals that are planned to be completed each year.
2. It is not clear how project and sub-national MRV systems will be established and fit together; for example how do existing MRV systems for ongoing projects links with the proposed national system.
3. To support capacity development, consideration may be given to establishing a technical group on MRV to help on this element.

**Additional Recommendations:**

4. What is p. 117 paragraph 4. (as in component 2X)?
5. How the MRV system will capture emissions from degradation and the 'plus' is not clear. Given its importance to Fiji, it is necessary to provide further explanation.
6. The component's discussion of the work plan (4a.8) lacks the initial design for a stepwise process with actors, deliverables, and a timeline, and also discussion of early ideas on how the system will evolve into a mature REDD+ monitoring system. The overall needs are identified, in 4a.8, but the early elements of a true work plan are still needed.
7. The R-PP lacks discourse in the option of independent MRV that should be included.
8. The section on 'reporting' under 4a.7 of the R-PP essentially deals with the database management system. It does not adequately explain how the information will be used to

produce reports, and how the reports or the major findings will be made available to stakeholders and the general public.

**Component 4a: The standard has been partially met.**

**Standard 4b: Designing an Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards :**

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, rural livelihoods enhancement, conservation of biodiversity, and/or 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

***Main and Additional Recommendations:***

1. All Items 1 through 7 were difficult to find in the literature. Would you please note the pages where the items have been addressed?

**Component 4b meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (24 September 2013):***

This section is designed to focus on multiple benefits that may be derived from reduced environmental emissions and other impacts, governance and safeguards. Following the general guidance provided by the UNFCCC, a Safeguard Information System (SIS) will be developed in order to assess and regularly monitor how safeguards are addressed by Fiji’s REDD+ activities.

In order to guide the development of this system, a working group dedicated specifically to non-carbon monitoring will be created in the Steering Committee. This working group will be comprised of experts in biodiversity, cultural heritage monitoring and any other experts identified as being relevant for the SIS. It is possible that this will be the same working group created for the SESA.

Once the priority safeguards and governance indicators are defined and the institutional and management arrangements clarified, quantitative and qualitative data will need to be gathered on a regular basis and fed into the monitoring system

The project will focus on three key aspects – adaptive management, independent monitoring and capacity building.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

**Key Recommendations:**

1. This session addresses issue of multiple benefits. Would be helpful to provide additional information about the involvement of NGOs, CBOs and key stakeholders at sub-national level. These are the groups that will be engaged in a lot of work on MRVs on ground level including ground truthing and will need to be trained also. Also provide useful information for two specific examples – new livelihoods and particular biodiversity conservation, etc. Please explain their engagement in this sub-component.
2. The work plan (4b.2) lays out three activities that will be undertaken to create Fiji’s Safeguards Information System. It needs to address a critical topic about what would be accomplished each year through these activities, funding for which is noted in Table 4b. Please provide information about the accomplishments and related goals that are planned to be completed each year.

**Additional Recommendations:**

3. The monitoring of governance is not well developed in this section. The R-PP acknowledges the benefit of independent monitoring and this discussion should be further refined to clarify the role of the Steering Committee (SC) and other bodies, and the need for a fully independent auditor.
4. An apparent gap is with respect of a need to address strengthening coordination at institutional and program levels. The R-PP should articulate roles of key and supporting agencies and how operational activities will be coordinated.
5. It is not clear how the indicators will be developed to measure and monitor change with regards to multiple benefits, impacts and governance. It would be good to better understand how the SIS and the SESA aligns; some concern that info and efforts will be duplicated.
6. There is a lack of discussion in this section on how co-benefits are promoted under any REDD+ program; for example through alignment with efforts on climate change adaption, biodiversity conservation, PES etc.
7. Do references to Fiji Trust presumably mean National Trust of Fiji?

**Component 4b: The standard has been partially 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-plus 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

**Component 5 meets the standard.**

***First TAP Review (21 September 2013):***

The document provides information identical to those included in each of the Component Tables 1a through 6.

It also notes that the Fijian Forestry Department would provide \$190,000, and GIZ would provide \$588,000 with bulk of it \$363,000 allocated to Component 1.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

**Key Recommendations:**

1. Budget for Component 1a seems high and should be revisited.
2. The mooted institutional structure review will need budget and timeline consideration.
3. It would be useful to demarcate (perhaps by coding) those activities that are complementary to other work and those that are new initiatives or activities that would otherwise not be funded.
4. In Component 5, please include this Table – Schedule and Budget R-PP Template Version 6. It would report on each sub-component costs for four year 2013 to 2106 and a total amount. It should also include an item about the total costs for each of the six Components.

**Component 5: The standard is largely 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:**

***Second TAP Review (10 November 2013):***

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the recommendations that were noted in the First TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items. It includes a good response to Key Recommendations.

**Component 6 meets the standard.**



***First TAP Review (21 September 2013):***

The document provides useful and relatively complete information on most of the Components.

***Recommendations and Questions:***

Key Recommendations:

1. The information lacks two items. It should provide the years when Action Items will be implemented. Second, it is missing the names of Responsible agencies. Please provide this information to improve the consistency of the messages.
2. One question will be whether Fiji has the capacity to carry out what is a comprehensive set of actions – this is a question generally applicable to most of the parts of the R-PP.

Additional Recommendations:

3. General – the column for ‘responsible agency’ is largely blank for most of the component actions, which seems to be a major omission.
4. General – for many components the column ‘means of verification’ says ‘check with stakeholders’ or ‘talk to stakeholders’. It would be useful if the framework could describe how this will be done e.g. through the SC representatives or through other communications with stakeholders such as direct contact/survey/workshop etc
5. Component 1a (1st row)– further to my comment under point 2 above, it is important in this component for the R-PP to clarify to what extent it will check that the views of the individual representatives on the SC are in fact representative of their stakeholder constituency and that the stakeholders themselves feel that their views are being heard and represented, particularly if their views are at odds with the position taken by their stakeholder body.
6. Component 1a (5th row)- the ‘action item’ needs to clarify whether the intention is to conduct a capacity analysis of the members (as stated) or of the organizations that they represent.
7. Component 1b (1st row) – the ‘means of verification’ should include checking for evidence that the guidelines have been applied in the implementation of the project.
8. Component 1b (3rd row) – add ‘verify the existence of manuals’ to the column ‘collection method of evidence’.
9. Component 1b (4th row) – in the column ‘collection method of evidence’ replace ‘audits of research institutes’ with ‘collect project reports and publications’. In the column ‘means of verification’ replace ‘check accounts of research institutes’ with ‘check that outputs have been delivered in accordance with project funding’.
10. Component 1c (6th row) – in the column ‘indicator’ instead of ‘published in different languages’ name the intended languages

**Component 6: Noting these deficiencies, the standard is not largely met.**