

**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)**

Objectives of a Readiness Preparation Proposal (condensed directly from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

The purpose of the R-PP is to build and elaborate on the previous Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) or a country's relevant comparable work, to assist a country in laying out and organizing the steps needed to achieve 'Readiness' to undertake activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), in the specific country context. The R-PP provides a framework for a country to set a clear roadmap, budget, and schedule to achieve REDD Readiness. The FCPF does not expect that the activities identified in the R-PP and its Terms of Reference (ToR) would actually occur at the R-PP stage, although countries may decide to begin pilot activities for which they have capacity and stakeholder support. Instead, the R-PP consists of a summary of the current policy and governance context, what study and other preparatory activities would occur under each major R-PP component, how they would be undertaken in the R-PP execution phase, and then a ToR or work plan for each component. The activities would generally be performed in the next, R-PP execution phase, not as part of the R-PP formulation process.

Review of R-PP of Lao PDR

Reviewers: Jayant Sathaye, Lead TAP reviewer + 8 TAP team reviewers

Date of Original TAP review: October 1, 2010

Date of Revised TAP Review: October 17, 2010

Short Summary of Comments by TAP of Lao R-PP

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: Overall, the R-PP presentation is excellent, the text is well written and it is stated in a logical order, it is very well composed and addresses most of the key issues requested by the FCPF for each of the six components. The R-PP meets the Component Standards for some of the components and partially meets for rest of them. The TAP review team has several clarifications and questions that are noted in each component. Addressing these topics would make the R-PP more comprehensive and it should readily be able to meet the standard. Following is a summary description of the key issues related to each component and the TAP comments.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: Overall, the R-PP presentation is excellent, the text is well written and it is stated in a logical order, it is very well composed and addresses most of the key issues requested by the FCPF. The revised R-PP provided responses to all the major comments, and hence it meets the standard for five out of six components.

In Summary,

Component 1 a)	Standard has been met
Component 1 b)	Standard has been met
Component 2 a)	Standard has been met
Component 2 b)	Standard has been met
Component 2 c)	Standard has been met
Component 2 d)	Standard has been met
Component 3	Standard has been met
Component 4	Standard has been met

Component 5	Standard has been met
Component 6	Standard has not been met
<p>In the executive summary there is a very important statement in the paragraph on pages 8 and 9, however, the statement is missing the word “not” and thus its meaning is changed. The statement should read “The drivers of degradation are primarily illegal logging and shifting cultivation. The latter is not considered as degradation as long as it is done on a rotational basis and there is a fallow period with secondary forest so that forest stock may be reduced but not forest cover.” The second problem is that this sentiment does not appear to be reflected as clearly anywhere in Section 2 of the main body of the report.</p>	
<p align="center">Standards to be Met by R-PP Components (from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3:)</p>	
<p>Component 1. Organize and Consult</p> <p>Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements</p> <p>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;</p>	
<p>Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:</p> <p>Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010:</p> <p>This section provides information on the arrangements for management of national readiness. Lao PDR has established a REDD+ Task Force, which coordinates all REDD+ activities. It coordinates efforts across agriculture, land use and forestry technical working groups. The document states that it will be strengthened by addition of other ministries and establish several technical working groups for development of reference scenarios, MRV, Land-use Planning, etc. High level coordination is to be provided by the National Environment Committee chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister. It has held two stakeholder consultation workshops on May and August 2010 that included mostly staff at the central level.</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Overall, this section is well prepared and the proposed REDD structure has most of the members that would constitute a complete group. Among others, it is encouraging to note that the ministries include those of agriculture, mines and energy, finance, planning and investment. As the R-PP notes in a later section the DD activities result in part because of differences in energy and forestry and agriculture and forestry ministries. Regular coordination among ministry officials will help in establishing ways or laws to overcome these types of differences.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The list of ministries does not include those dealing with science and technology. These would be important to include for ensuring proper technical guidance. 2. One apparent drawback is that the R-PP was drafted only by the Department of Forestry staff, international aid agencies and independent consultants. While it is encouraging to note that the plan calls for inclusion of many ministries their inclusion in the R-PP draft would have provided a better resolution of ongoing conflicts between policies and implementation plans. If views and concerns of other ministries were reflected in R-PP through consultation during its preparation, clearly mention it in the R-PP. Otherwise, one approach may be to get the other ministries to review and comment on the R-PP. 3. The R-PP implies that the DoF has been intentionally planning to be transparent and sharing with other involved agencies. The REDD+ Task Force should however limit a number of its members not to exceed 16 members (based on defined positions/departments) in order to fulfill its steering roles for the REDD+ Office. 4. P.13, Para 2 says they will expand membership of the NEC to include the NLMA, but it already has a voice on the Task Force. This same paragraph refers to a National Environmental Committee, while the organigramme opposite refers to a National Environmental Council. Which? 	

5. The bottom two boxes of the organigramme both say Provincial REDD+. Please explain the role of Provincial REDD+ activities.

6. The Network does not list members that would represent local communities and these were not invited to participate in any of the meetings. While the whole document is well written it is unclear what challenges might be faced and whether pilot programs would be successful without including other agencies and local communities in the R-PP now.

7. The budget lists the names but does not provide information about funding from other agencies and the government. This should be updated.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: No further comment, as most of the original comments have been addressed in the revised R-PP.

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 far³, 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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010:

The R-PP preparation included consultations with relevant stakeholders such as government ministries and departments, donor agencies, civil society, and national and international NGOs, and the private sector. The meetings resulted in a strong consensus on mechanism for promoting multiple benefits, incorporating existing and future government programs, raising awareness, capacity building, and strengthening cross-sectoral coordination. Existing regulatory framework and political systems have consultative mechanisms through village and district officials that enable grass-root issues and concerns to be brought to the attention at higher levels.

Comments: The document provides a detailed listing of how the consultation and participation process would take place. It is very complete and provides an effective approach to accomplishing the tasks. The process thus far does not appear to have consulted with the four ethno-linguistic IPO groups, who deserve a higher priority given the challenges REDD+ is likely to face, which are noted in the Strategy and Implementation sections.

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

The document also notes the extensive involvement of seven international partners, which is very encouraging, but there is no explicit mention of the involvement of IPOs in their activities either.

1. How important are private companies today and in the future relative to government entities?
2. The consultation and participation plan notes the need for stakeholder consultation and participation at the community level, which is very good. Would be even better if this were initiated to support the preparation of the R-PP.
3. Will the REDD program build on ongoing projects such as SUFORD and learn from their successes and failures?
4. A priority for initial consultation and participation programs should be the drier forest formations (Dry Deciduous, Dry Dipterocarp, and Savannah Forests) of central and southern Laos.
5. Would it be possible to terminate the current top-down imposition of quotas and rely on future harvesting targets bottom-up aggregation?
6. Can and will the government engage current swidden farmers in sustainable forest management?
7. Consultations on specific topics are not mentioned. Report on 2nd consultation should have some links with the consultation and participation Plan, strategy options, implementation framework and MRV/EIS which are proposed in RPP. It should ensure main components of R-PP are discussed and agreed to in the 2nd consultation.
8. May need more clarification about civil society and ethnic group in Laos in terms of their composition, rights, activities, status in society and participation in decision making including REDD.
9. Whilst the authors recognize the importance of other sectors in the context of a future REDD regime, they give no hint of the concerns of those other sectors. Would be useful to provide a list of their concerns.
10. Given the importance of consultation and participation in the future preparations for REDD, the budget to support this seems unrealistically low.

The proposal does a quite complete job of engaging national level participants and partners but the engagement of state and local level participants particularly IPOs is very limited.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: No further comment, as most of the original comments have been addressed in the revised R-PP.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010:

Lao PDRs forest loss averaged around 134,000 ha or 1.4% per year in the 1990s. Forests occupy about 70% of the land area. The current main direct causes of deforestation and forest degradation are generally agreed to be a result of: (i) conversion to agriculture (particularly to industrial perennial crops); (ii) unsustainable logging (notably illegal logging); (iii) the impacts of infrastructure development; and (iv) forest fires. These involve different actors such as farmers, shifting cultivators, logging companies and contractors, local and foreign investors, unspecified individuals, construction companies, and government authorities.

Comment:

1. The material reported in this section provides very thorough information to answer the issues noted in this component of the R-PP to the extent data and information exist. Would be helpful though to have a

table with basic information about total forest area, fraction occupied by different forest categories that are subject to different types of deforestation drivers and degradation drivers, and their location on a Lao map. My p.35 calculation suggests 10.8 Mha but this seems too high.

2. The basic data and assumptions behind the model of emissions, presented in Table 2a.2 on p.33, are not clearly enough stated for the model to be very convincing.

3. It provides information about forest governance and policy but is lacking similar information about the policies that are promoting deforestation and degradation drivers or the failure of policies that have been set up to prevent D&D.

4. The R-PP would benefit from the use of a tool developed by Ostom (2000) elaborated in Private and Common Property Rights. The tool will help to differentiate between State, Communal, and Private property and help identify bundles of property rights for each of the affected actors.

5. There are different legal systems in the Lao context (state law, customary/traditional, and project laws). How do these systems complement and/or reinforce each other? A related question is how land concession agreements are made by the government to investors?

6. It mentions the need to take leakage into consideration. Would be helpful if it could provide more information on how this task will be accomplished.

7. The information provided is quite complete but it lacks information about the successes/failures of the many past policies that were put forward by the legislature for implementation by forestry entities. Also, how effective was the interaction between DoF and other agencies that oversee the drivers of DD?

8. The budget sheet shows very small allocation to this category of activities about \$30K. Cost is not allocated to studies of deforestation drivers, success or failures of past programs, and a study of illegal logging which is listed as one of the important drivers of deforestation among other things. If these studies are being carried out under other ongoing programs (e.g. FLEGT), it would be helpful to mention explicitly in the R-PP.

9. Why is the funding for 2a so much lower at \$60K than for 2b (\$4.5 million)? The latter requires strategy development, which should not be so much more expensive to accomplish than the detailed studies needed for 2a.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: No further comment, as most of the original comments have been addressed in the revised R-PP.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: The document lays out a quite comprehensive plan for addressing DD drivers, evaluation of costs and benefits, and examining major potential synergies and challenges of country sector strategies. This is one of the only countries to give systematic treatment to costs and benefits, at the village level, and this is a very good feature of the R-PP.

Comment:

1. A major driver of forest degradation is the significant over-capacity of the wood processing industry, which drives both politically- motivated quota allocations and illegal forest harvesting. This should be addressed in the document.
2. In Section B2b the answer to agricultural production in these poor upland soils is not necessarily static farming in commercial plantations because this may not be sustainable except with massive inorganic fertilizer inputs. Building on swidden with incremental improvements (green manuring, composting, etc) may be a better solution.
3. Natural regeneration should be confirmed as the preferred method of achieving adequate stocking on production and protection of forest areas. Artificial regeneration should be employed only where it can be demonstrated that natural regeneration is not possible and where it can be justified both economically and ecologically.
4. The write-up is missing one component, which is the lack of information about the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse gas benefits.
5. The R-PP often mentions large sums as possible income from REDD+. These figures might be misleading for example, a sum of \$3,250 for a village is important if annual but if it is a onetime deal it is hard to imagine that it will provide a great incentive to change land use. Furthermore the UNFCCC has given no indication on the compliance funding for REDD+.
6. The section on Strategy Options says that a detailed strategy will be developed to deal with the drivers of D+D that have been identified. But the comments just made about Component 2a indicate that these drivers have been listed, but neither analyzed nor understood. Without understanding the detail of the processes involved, it will be all but impossible to devise strategies to counter them. The logic here is weak.
7. Mining and Hydropower development, and conversion to Agriculture, account for 5.3% and 40% of emissions, respectively. If so, would it not be more logical to discuss Agriculture before Mining, as the major source of emissions?
8. The photographic representation of the five different densities of forest is a nice helpful feature; the brief tabulation of emissions and their value, at the foot of p.39, is also helpful, since it clarifies one of the issues at stake: future emissions reduction values. When such data, or projections, refer to annual values, the authors should say so.

9. Discussion of non-forestry policy issues is rather limited in the current text. Additional information on these topics will help to assess any impacts resulting from them.
10. Throughout the R-PP a great deal of attention is given to capacity building. It would be useful to note the activities that the capacity building would enhance in order to ensure sustainable outcomes. During the REDD+ preparation, procedure on how capacity building will be organized deserves more detail.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: No further comment, as most of the original comments have been addressed in the revised R-PP.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: The document correctly notes the three instruments that the government will use - institutions, fiscal measures and regulatory framework for REDD+ implementation. It further focuses on the creation of a dedicated REDD+ fund as well as ways to retain revenues by the government and to provide local payments. It highlights most of the issues for REDD+ implementation framework.

There will be a pilot project at selected locations on revenue allocation mechanism and payment structures. There are 3 main beneficiaries identified during the first R-PP stakeholder consultation workshop including 1) ethnic communities, 2) government agencies at national and sub-national levels, and 3) private sector and NGOs involved in the implementation phase. If the pilot outcomes are functional and effective, the REDD+ implementation is likely to be successful.

Comments:

This is an informative section that sheds light on many of the ongoing REDD-related activities in Lao PDR. The topics covered by the implementation plan are quite comprehensive.

Most of the issues for REDD+ implementation framework are highlighted, however, the R-PP needs appropriate detailed work plans so as to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: No further comment, as most of the original comments have been addressed in the revised R-PP.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: The SESA documentation provided in the R-PP is quite complete and it plans to apply WB safeguards particularly for IPOs. It explicitly calls for compliance with the World Bank's Safeguard Policies related to environmental evaluation, natural habitat, indigenous persons,

physical cultural resources, involuntary settlement and forestry. It also provides a list of national and international experts who will participate in the SESA activities.

Comment:

The topic of shifting cultivation that was commented on earlier is important in this section as well. Careful assessment of shifting cultivation is needed to determine whether it is destructive by nature or not. Upland farmers, being ethnic groups, are more ecological sensitive than commercial and industrial investors. Evaluation of social impacts on these farmers will help in reducing potential sources of deforestation.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: The document clearly notes the two approaches for developing a baseline scenario - historical trend lines and changes in forest cover and carbon density due to macroeconomic factors and policies.

Comment:

1. The information provided in this section is very limited. Figure 3 data are not clearly explained nor is Table 3.1 very clear. Would the RELs be produced on a regional basis and then aggregated? Which are these regions? How do the drivers of D&D differ across these regions?
2. A critical factor in the preparation of the future reference scenario is the change in government or industry policies that can bring about sudden changes in the rates of deforestation.
3. Given the significant impact of economic drivers that contribute to major exports, it will be extremely important to consider these in the development of reference case scenarios.
4. Although the R-PP, in pp 67 (component 3) and pp 70 (component 4a) briefly describes inclusion of soil carbon in analysis, it would be helpful to have more detailed plan, if possible, in this component.
5. Would be useful for reference scenario to anticipate changes in climate and its impact on soil and vegetation conditions.
6. At a minimum, it will be extremely useful to lay out a plan for the development of historical and future emissions reference scenarios.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: Standard for Component 3 was partially met in the first R-PP document. The revised R-PP provides considerably more detailed information about how the reference scenarios were estimated, and about how future scenarios would be set up. It thus meets the standard set for this component.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: The monitoring set up is quite complete and covers most of the topics that are traditionally covered in the estimation of forest cover inventory and the embedded carbon content; it also goes beyond carbon stock to include other sustainable development factors. Integrated monitoring system of measurement, namely Integrated Forest Information System, was presented clearly and showed the possibility by the Forest Inventory and Planning Division (FIPD) under the DoF. The scope of monitoring was planned for 3 levels: multi-country regional monitoring, national monitoring and sub-national monitoring. Regional monitoring is expected to be among the trans-boundary countries in the Greater Mekong region, which will be a pilot study. National level is based on the government set-up of a monitoring and accounting system. Sub-national monitoring will engage more with provincial and district offices, as a basis of nested approach designed.

Reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and forest degradation is possible if the exact data of forest cover, deforestation rates and affected areas, degraded forest areas are collected and analyzed properly. However, this needs to prove that the results of planned National Forest inventory (NFI) of 2,400 plots are satisfactory and good enough to be the basis of all calculation of the forest cover and land use change for carbon accounting. The concern is that data analysis may take longer than that expected, similar to the much delayed analyses of permanent sampling plots (PSP) undertaken by NAFRI for the SUFORD sustainable forest management project holding the FSC Forest Certification at present

Comment:

1. There is no description of earlier monitoring activities in Lao PDR if any. It is thus not clear what data exists since 1992 or earlier and how these might be used to build into the proposed MRV system.
2. The R-PP however leaves out the coverage of monitoring of DD drivers, which is a critical element for a REDD program. Since the system is being designed to monitor future DD drivers, it is important that this element be included in the monitoring system design.
3. The proposed activities should build on Permanent Sample Plot program being developed under SUFORD.
4. Although the R-PP indicates that Lao PDR is looking for co-benefits, such as biodiversity, there is no mention of a MRV system for these co-benefits.
5. Although it was stressed that local population will help in monitoring at the sub-national level, there was a concern of limited experience in involving communities in carbon monitoring in Lao PDR. A statement

that is of reviewer's concern is that the REDD+ Task Force thinks that they should work with local people only in the areas where degradation and deforestation are mainly driven by local population. Engaging local populations in all regions would help in ensuring a more complete ground truthing of satellite data.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: No further comment, as most of the original comments have been addressed in the revised R-PP.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: The Lao REDD+ Task Force for R-PP seems to propose a full range of activities to achieve REDD readiness in its country. Financial resources needed to accomplish these activities are fully presented. There are other requests of funding and technical support from other international sources, in addition to FCPF. Besides, some other projects funded by international organizations or specific country donors have been ongoing for some time.

The total budget amounts to \$24.177 million of which FCPF share is \$3.6 million and other donors (UN-REDD, KfW, GTZ, JICA, and Finland and WB would cover the remaining amount. FORMIS, JICA, FAO, NORDECO-Finland, and the government will provide additional funds for a total amount that exceeds \$10 million.

The information in this section shows that the GoL has planned the budgeting well although with various assistance from international experts. The GoL is ready to take steps further while requesting funding and technical support from FCPF. Priorities for actions and the costs associated with REDD readiness activities are feasible. Only one concern is that the MRV activities at sub-national level included in the proposal (item 4a.9.2) require hardware and software immensely and costly, which may be inefficient on the ground and cause loopholes in the entire system since the personnel are not yet ready. A multi-phase approach should be applied instead.

Comment:

The total budget meets the standard set above but the individual allocations are not uniformly distributed as noted in the comments for individual sections.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010: No further comment, as most of the original comments have been addressed in the revised R-PP.

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:

Original TAP Assessment on October 1, 2010: Component 6 is not included in the submitted proposal.

Revised TAP Assessment on October 17, 2010:

The revised R-PP is still missing the coverage of Component 6.