

## **Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**

(interim, September 10, 2009, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

### **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.*

### **Draft Synthesis Review of R-PP of Kenya :**

**Lead Reviewer (Harrison Ochieng Kojwang) and TAP Team**

**Date of review (May 27<sup>th</sup> 2010):**

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

*(from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3:)*

## **General Remarks**

### **Strengths of the RPP**

*The document is quite well written and gives a well rounded introductory section prior to the main 6 components of the RPP. Of particular interest is the classification of Kenya's woody vegetation types, namely the closed (mainly montane) canopy forests, semi-open forests and the inclusion of the savanna bushlands which is the most extensive of the 3 woody vegetation types.*

*A fair and worthwhile amount of emphasis has been given to Kenya's catchment forests or water towers*

*Procedurally, the document also recognizes the phased approach toward REDD readiness and despite Kenya's low endowment with closed canopy forests, stresses Kenya's opportunities in the areas of enhancement of carbon stocks (rehabilitation, afforestation / reafforestation)*

*An annual rate of deforestation has been estimated and the drivers of deforestation and degradation are well described and the general promotion of SFM is clearly recognized.*

*REDD Strategy is nested within a wider Climate Change Response Strategy of 2009 which also emphasizes both mitigation and adaptation within different development sectors; Health, Agriculture, Water, Fisheries, Tourism, Livestock Rangelands & Wildlife and Disaster Preparedness. This is strategic.*

*There is a useful documentation on lessons learnt from recent and earlier efforts to achieve Sustainable Forest Management and reduce deforestation and forest degradation, and also a list of existing REDD+ related projects presented in the Annex S*

### **Areas for Improvement**

*There is need for the RPP to propose the correct placement of the National REDD Steering Committee at a level which will make it function effectively in a cross-sector environment and to minimize the risk of inter-sector conflict, particularly during the review of policies and implementation of REDD Programmes. Alternatively the RPP could justify the current proposal and state the associated risks and benefits.*

*The historical reasons behind the past losses of forest cover could be better illustrated as that would justify and even embolden the lead sector to pursue some of the institutional and other strategies proposed in section 2 c, to deal with the drivers of D &D*

*The RPP could highlight existing and past project experiences on SFM and the lessons learnt. At the moment there is no quantitative data on carbon stocks, even from a limited area presented in the RPP*

*In general the budget sections are not well aligned with the intended programme actions and section 3 is a case in point.*

*The RPP does not demonstrate an appreciation of Monitoring and Evaluation when in fact, the TAP is aware that the Country has a rich base of past big programmes for M and E have been applied*

## **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;

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

#### **Observations**

In summary,

- The section refers to the National Coordination Function being vested in the Office of the Prime Minister
- Sees REDD as strategy under Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and will contribute to the larger National Climate Change Response Strategy
- Proposes a REDD Secretariat based at Kenya Forest Service - which in turn, has constituted a Technical Working Group of 40 individuals
- A National REDD Steering Committee is in place but its members are still to be nominated. This will be followed by a Climate Change Commission
- There is a proposal to appoint a REDD National Coordination Office, contingent upon the RPP being approved.
- REDD+ component Task Forces are also envisaged and also, REDD Conservancy Officers in the most REDD active conservancies) for cross-sector implementation programme.

#### **Recommendations**

*The section would meet the standard with the following improvements:*

The mandate and authority of the REDD Steering Committee to oversee the whole REDD process and to guide and influence other sectors is critical and should be clarified. Linked to that are the issues of who the committee will report to and which office will chair it. In general, more clarity on the appointing authorities and the mandates of all the proposed committees is recommended.

It is not clear if the Ministry of Energy is included as a key player in both the High Level (Steering committee) and also the Technical Working Group. If not then it is strongly recommended, since energy is a core issue in REDD in virtually all African Countries.

At the Conservancy Level; which is where operations occur, Kenya should consider having Conservancy Committee rather than just the Conservancy Officer to guide conservancy level planning and implementation.

It would be useful to clearly state, the role of civil society and traditional authorities.

### **Standard 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation**

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders: Inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, assessed in the following ways:

- i. the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far<sup>3</sup>, the extent of ownership within government and REDD coordinating body, as well as in the broader national stakeholder community; and

the Consultation and Participation Plan included in the R-PP (which looks forward in time); and the inclusion of elements in the R-PP that adequately document the expressed concerns and recommendations of relevant stakeholders and propose 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:**

#### **Observation**

- The consultation process seems to have included the relevant institutions, despite the relatively short period allocated to it. As Kenya moves into more advanced phases towards REDD+ readiness, more consultations will be needed. In addition, there should be clarity on whether and how local government was represented at national level consultation meetings. Local authorities under the ministry will manage forests on trust lands and hence the need for them to have been involved,

#### **Recommendation**

**In its current state, the section largely meets the standard.**

<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 2. Prepare the REDD Strategy

**Standard 2.a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance:** A completed assessment is presented that identifies major land use trends, direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD, and major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues. It documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD. The assessment 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:

#### Observations

- The subsection has an interesting account of the main drivers of deforestation and degradation (Policy, Technology, Cultural, Economic and other drivers)
- It provides details in Annex 2a on lessons learnt on past efforts to curb deforestation and forest degradation
- This section makes an interesting observation on operations on forestry land which had hitherto been dominated by the Government. Today, the government has allowed the formation of community forest associations and is considering opening up state forest lands for plantation development by the private sector. In addition, the forest sector seems to have increased their activities in plantation development.
- It asserts that a set of policy and legislative provisions (Forest Act of 2005) can be used against the forces of deforestation and degradation. These are:
  - A new and independent Forest Service
  - A decentralized forest administration
  - Greater protection of forest reserves against politically inspired de-proclamations
  - Private Sector / community participation
  - Payment for Ecosystem Services
  - Promotion of Sustainable Forest Management
- In general there is a good analysis of the drivers but an improvement can be made by distinguishing between direct (agricultural expansion, charcoal burning, fires) and indirect causes (pervert incentives such as prices of inputs and produce and alternative energy etc) as done in the Annex
- The new policy options chosen are appropriate

***Based on the opinions of reviewers the section partially meets the standards and could do so fully with the following recommendations taken into consideration.***

***Recommendations***

- re-state the drivers of deforestation and degradation, distinguishing between direct and underlying drivers as Annex 2a,
- give a frank analysis of why past actions to reduce deforestation have performed below expectations, particularly leading to loss of gazetted forests. Annex 2a page 70 has alluded to excisions without its major underlying drivers
- Special reference should be made to the new land policy and its possible effects on REDD, as well as rules and regulations for farm forestry gazetted last year under the Agricultural Act.
- A significant loss of forest comes from woodlands (5% between 1990 and 2010 as shown in the table) most of which are un-protected as they fall under the local authority administration. Promotion of bio fuels for example is a major threat to these woodlands (for example, 50,000 ha of Datkacha woodland which is a trust land woodland in Malindi is proposed for leasing for the growing of Jatropha, Agricultural Development Corporation - ADC - has set aside 100,000 acres for the growing of cassava and 200,000 for Jatropha in Galana Ranch). This type of threats should be highlighted.
- While Kenya is formulating a bio fuel strategy and a draft already exists, there is no reference or linkage made on this strategy
- A more participatory approach to capacity building including non-government partners , particularly at the field level has not been mentioned.
- Partners such as, training institutions, particularly NGO s that can help in building local capacity, are missing, or not strongly reflected.

**Standard 2.b: REDD strategy Options:** Alignment of the proposed REDD strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies: the R-PP includes a summary of the emerging REDD strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD strategy options. This summary states:

- i. how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD strategy;
- ii. early estimates of cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental benefits;
- iii. socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD strategy;
- iv. major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD strategy; and
- v. 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 strategy over time.

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

***Observations***

*The section is well articulated and it recognizes the need to match the drivers of deforestation and degradation with appropriate policies and actions*

*The proposed strategies grouped under Governance, Incentives, Efficient technologies, promotion of investments outside the forest sector and studies to fill knowledge gaps are all appropriate.*

***However, some improvements should be made in the following areas:***

***Recommendations***

- It is not clear in the main text (in the annex some attempt has been made) how each or a combination of strategies, addresses specific drivers. This needs to be explicitly stated in the main text
- The strategies proposed are not clear (except on charcoal use efficiency) on how energy policies will be influenced to support or be consistent with reducing emissions. Issues of demand management on consumption patterns need to be addressed.
- It is also not clear how the agricultural sector will be engaged to support or take on board the issues of REDD. An attempt has been made in Table 2b-X under promotion of investments outside the forest sector but it falls short of what would be expected if one has to influence tendencies in the Agricultural Sector.

- The management of bush lands (which are communally owned) needs to be discussed as is the role of the private sector.
- In this section as well as the next, existing REDD+ relevant / pilot programmes / projects (some of which are already in the Annex) should be listed or briefly described and their lessons taken into account in the design of strategy options , c
- The budget also needs more detail that should be linked to programmes, actions and outcomes

**Standard 2.c: REDD implementation framework:** Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD in the country setting that identifies key issues, explores potential arrangements to address them, and offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package.

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

**Observations**

- In this section the identification of legal, organizational, financial conditions are correct
- Issue of facilitation or vetting of project or programme proposals to comply with standards is also appropriate
- The idea of choosing and launching early actions , including a fund for such actions is tactically appropriate

**Recommendations**

- The responsibilities and roles of the various committees proposed under section 1(a) would need to be clarified. The TAP has noted that, if this matter is not addressed there is a strong risk that conditions for a 'scramble for power and control between various ministries and agencies' is highly likely
- To reduce the risk of unproductive competition, the document should consider creating an apex institution housed in the Office of the President or Prime Minister for the purpose of directing and guiding the entire REDD process. This institution should be a coordinating secretariat responsible for oversight and direction of the REDD architecture within Kenya
- For example, the document suggests that the REDD plus and Land Use unit will fall



under the commission which is housed at the Ministry of Environment, however, it seems that the REDD unit will receive funds from the treasury through the Forestry and Wildlife Ministry meaning then that this unit will be housed at the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife. It is -we presume - the reason why the PS Forestry is proposed as a chair of the steering committee. This arrangement can create conflict and should be revisited.

- The section is rather weak on suggesting or demonstrating how cross-sector collaboration which is needed in the successful implementation of any national REDD Programme will be facilitated.

**Standard 2.d: Assessment of social and environmental impacts:** The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the Bank'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.

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

**Observation**

- This section is thin on detail and merely mentions that it will comply with WB safeguard requirements.

**Recommendation**

- It is recommended that Kenya states its own policies and how it has dealt with similar issues and the existing policies and legislation relevant to SESA and so on. However, if Kenya is happy to adopt the WB safeguards, it should state whether its own laws and policies are compatible with those of the WB. In this regard, reference to the Ghana RPP is recommended.

**Component 3. Develop a Reference Scenario**

**Standard 3 Reference scenario:** Present work plan for how the reference scenario for deforestation, and for forest degradation (if desired), will be developed, including early ideas on feasibility of which methods to use (e.g., scenario of forest cover change and emissions based on historical trends in emissions and/or based on projections into the future of historical trend data), major data requirements and capacity needs, and linkages to the monitoring system design.

(The FCPF recognizes 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-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:**

**Observations**

- The section is clearly written and the proposal to stretch the definition of forests to include trees of 2 metres and crown cover of 10% or more and a minimum area of 0.5ha is certainly interesting and worthy of inclusion and to say the least, innovative.
- The steps and explanations are clear and the budget seems appropriate to the proposed actions in the process
- Data needs and data/information gaps have been clearly recognized in Annex 2 (a) pp 78

**Recommendations**

- This section could present some existing data on carbon stocks from earlier studies and then states existing capacity and gaps. In fact several past assessments / inventories have been referred to an a summary of the kind of data they yielded would be useful with respect to REDD+.
- The chart on page 52 is certainly useful since its elements could be used to develop specific work plans, tasks, and deliverables, with budgets associated with each one.
- The proposal to involve universities such as Jomo Kenyatta and others on GIS applications and capacity building is encouraging and worthwhile.
- It is also recommended that the document consider facilities to acquire satellite data as cheaply as possible. In that regard, The Group on Earth Observations National Demonstrator Program which helps with access to satellite data and technical training is relevant. As a matter of fact Tanzania is already a beneficiary under that scheme.
- Other than the above, the section largely meets the standard.

#### Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

**Standard 4: Design a monitoring system:** The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation. The system design should include early ideas on including capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor other benefits and impacts, for example rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD implementation in the country, and to assess the impacts of the REDD 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 implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD monitoring system with this full set of capabilities.

(The FCPF recognizes 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:

##### Observations

The TAP feels that the section is well articulated and is easy to understand. It has clearly identified the key steps to designing a monitoring system (mapping, stratification, use of pilot sites)

There are signs of emerging roles for civil society, local government authorities, forest communities, private sector and land owners in the system as defined, which is an additional strength.

However there are areas for improvement as per the comments .

##### Recommendations

- The steps as listed are a good overview of what needs to be done, but much more detail will be needed before an MRV system can be put in place. The annex does not have much detail at this point, underscoring the emphasis on developing the reference levels.
- Section 4b makes mention of monitoring other benefits and impacts, which is useful, but with no details as to who is going to monitor those and how the key variables would be monitored. Water quality and yields, biodiversity indicators and socio-economic benefits would be such key variables that ought to be monitored.
- While the diagram on page 59 shows how outcomes will develop, it should be augmented by a companion diagram with elements and connections, as well as a

timeline with actions and deliverables that can be turned into a detailed budget.

- Kenya could propose and develop a web-based decision support tool that takes in data and provides easy access to information on the state of the forest, future scenarios, and impacts of various decisions on REDD+ actions. Decisions about sub-national projects are best made within the context of such a tool which can show where the best impact can be found.
- As a general guide, the document should view building an MRV system as a process, that progresses in phases. Typically these will generally include, scoping & consultation, country specific design, start-up, test and finally operational phases. It is worthwhile for a country to gauge how well and how far it has gone in each phase, even if it chooses to run some phases concurrently.
- To get full satellite data access and technical help, Kenya should consider joining the Forest Carbon Tracking task of the Group on Earth Observations (GEO) as a National Demonstrator. This can be done by way of an government request to the GEO secretariat in Geneva. Such access will offer opportunity for Kenya to access to long-term remote sensing data that, in combination with in situ data, will contribute to Kenyan forest carbon estimations and at the same time will contribute to Kenyan forest conservation goals.
- The section should therefore highlight key country challenges in MRV in terms of systems in place, technical capability, coordination, type of data required and sources, currently monitoring needs etc.
- The section should also identify existing types of monitoring and who is doing what, and institutional strengths in monitoring and areas where such can be enhanced (DRSRS has some equipment for example including aircrafts for monitoring - this is an institutional strength).

With the few improvements suggested, the section can meet the standards set for it.

## 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, as well as from other international sources (e.g., UN-REDD or 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 readiness activities identified in the R-PP, or gaps in funding are clearly noted.

## 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, as well as from other international

sources (e.g., UN-REDD or 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 readiness activities identified in the R-PP, or gaps in funding are clearly noted.

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

- The R-PP partially meets the minimum requirement for standard. The format of the work schedule and budget remains weak through-out the document and making reference to the DRC RPP is recommended. Also see comments on budgeting on sections 3 and 4 of this document.

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

**Standard 6:** 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:**

**Observations**

- There is not much detail here and only a minimal budget. Before going forward, this section needs further clarification about exactly how the monitoring and evaluation will be carried out, who will do it, and what are the timelines.
- The impression is that M and E will be developed during the implementation of R-PP and therefore indicators have not been provided.
- It would be good to suggest an M and E framework at this stage that can form the basis of a comprehensive one later on, and by so doing demonstrate a good grasp of this important section.

**This section does not meet the standard**