

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

(interim, December 13, 2012, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

- 1) *FCPF REDD Country Participant R-PPs will be reviewed and assessed by the FCPF Participants Committee, the FCPF's governing body, taking TAP comments into account. External (Technical Advisory Panel or other) and Bank reviewers may provide recommendations on how a draft R-PP could be enhanced, using this template on a pilot basis until a process is approved by the PC.*
- 2) *One set of criteria should be used for review: specific standards each of the current 6 components of an R-PP should be met.*
- 3) *Your comments will be merged with other reviewer comments (without individual attribution) into a synthesis document that will be made public, in general, so bear this in mind when commenting.*
- 4) *Please provide thoughtful, fair assessment of the draft R-PP, in the form of actionable recommendations for the potential enhancement of the R-PP by the submitting country. A REDD Country Participant would be allowed three submissions of an R-PP to the PC for consideration.*

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

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

Review of R-PP of: MADAGASCAR

Reviewer: Germany (Lead), AFD-FRANCE

Date of review: 18 June 2014

General Comments:

The proposed R-PP for Madagascar is already the third revised R-PP version taking into account TAP Reviews from March 2010, January 2013 and April 2014. Considerable efforts have been made by the Malagasy team to improve the quality of the document and to address the majority of the recommendations of the reviewers (TAP and PC). We congratulate Madagascar in preparing this very good quality report.

Despite the political crisis and a confused institutional context, Madagascar has

managed to continue their involvement in the REDD-plus readiness over the past years.

Deforestation and Forest Degradation remain worrying and very significant issues in Madagascar. The implementation of REDD+ in Madagascar is really an opportunity to address at the same time the preservation of the environment and poverty alleviation.

The end of the political crisis since January 2014 and the re-start of the economic development should be closely accompanied by environmental concerns, in order to ensure the sustainability of the country's growth. REDD+ is a very good opportunity to achieve this challenge.

Overall, in our view, Madagascar has submitted a very valuable R-PP proposal (11 standards met over 12 in total) that should allow them to get access to FCPF Readiness funding.

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:

Madagascar's REDD Readiness Arrangements are clearly outlined and well presented. The proposed structures, which include a three level coordination bodies, seem very adequate.

We congratulate Madagascar for the very recent creation in February 2014, through a Ministerial Decree, of the National REDD Coordination Office (BCN-REDD), demonstrating their willingness to implement their proposed arrangements and to advance towards REDD-Plus Readiness.

We note that the REDD+ Platform plans to get together representatives of the several sectors which are responsible for deforestation and forest degradation. We encourage Madagascar to carry on with their efforts to involve multi-disciplinary stakeholders in their REDD+ readiness process. In particular, the engagement of the agriculture sector in the management and decision-making structures for REDD+ is critical for the success of the REDD+ readiness process.

We appreciate the proposal for a regional structure and platform. It is supposed to act under the presidency of the regional forestry commissions; in this context we encourage Madagascar to continue to enhance participation from other sectors and to consider how to further strengthen the role of the agriculture sector.

The foundation Tany Meva which is proposed as fiduciary agent and manager of the FCPF

financial support has long standing experience in managing funds, e.g. on behalf of local communities living near protected areas. They run offices in several provinces and should be able to manage the FCPF Budget at reasonable transaction cost.

This Standard is met.

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:

This component already met the standard in October 2010. We appreciate that new information was added to inform about the continuing communication and consultation process that took place over the past three years. The Alliance AVG / Alliance Voari Gasy is reported to be a well-organized platform of civil society with a lot of legal and juristic competence. AVG is working successfully with several donors such as EU and Norway and is capable to manage medium sized budgets. The „plate-form foncière SIF“ is participating in many discussions and fora. Still, it would be helpful to include an overview of the stakeholder groups identified and consulted, including indigenous and womens' associations.

This Standard is met.

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

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

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).

implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

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

Since 2010, Madagascar has already conducted a long process of consultation of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, at both national and regional levels. The consultation and participation process for the R-PP development is quite consistent and well-articulated.

The communication and consultation plan seems systematic, innovative and thought-out. Also, the role of civil society and the way they will be involved in the consultation process is better detailed in the latest version of the R-PP. The planning and budget have been revised and now look satisfactory.

This Standard is met.

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, 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:

This component already met the standard in October 2010 and January 2013. The component was even improved in the latest versions. We congratulate Madagascar for the quality of the analysis presented, which clearly identifies the main drivers and causes of the Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Madagascar, and takes well into account the geographical differences within the country.

This Standard is met.

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:

We acknowledge Madagascar's efforts in revising and restructuring the REDD-plus strategic options. The mainstreaming aspect of REDD+ is well described through the need for alignment of strategies that impact forest management (option 1.1). The revised R-PP now presents strategic options related to the conversion of forest into agriculture land (options 4) which was identified as a critical driver for DD (comp. 2.a). Madagascar may wish to consider building a closer relation to the FLEGT process, especially while further analyzing strategy option 3.1.

All Strategy options and sub-options have been analyzed regarding cost, feasibility, direct benefits and other impacts, sustainability/permanence and positive impacts, as well as potential leakage. Unfortunately these assessments have not yet been interpreted; we would therefore like to recommend undertaking this during further multi-stakeholder strategy development.

We note that five REDD+ Pilot Projects are currently implemented in Madagascar: feedback and first lessons learnt on those pilot projects could be further analyzed in order to feed the identification of the REDD+ strategic options, in particular in the link with the agriculture sector.

This Standard is met.

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.

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

The Standard was met in October 2010 and again in January 2013.

Same as TAP.

This Standard is met.

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

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence 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:

The Standard was met in October 2010 and again in January 2013.

A detailed description of commitment to the SESA process is provided, responsibilities are

clearly defined and compatibility with national legislation and procedures is positively checked. It would be good to outline how local communities shall be involved and empowered to contribute to the process.

Same as TAP.

This Standard is met.

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

Standard 3: a 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:

The Standard was already met since the January 2013 submission.

The text for this component has obviously been written before the Warsaw COP. It would be helpful to take into account the relevant Warsaw decisions and guidance during the further work on the REL/RL

Same as TAP.

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

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

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

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

The Standard was already met since the January 2013 submission.

We very much appreciate the revised institutional setting for the MRV System, stipulating that the national environment office ONE and the general forest direction DGF will jointly form the MRV/REL/SIS office (Cellule MRV/REL/SIS).

Same as TAP.

This Standard is 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, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

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

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

The proposed methodology and information system are consistent with international guidelines and standards. The country can largely build on existing monitoring systems, which is an excellent starting point to make safeguards and non-carbon benefit monitoring feasible. For the development of new indicators, it would be useful to put thought into which existing international guidance can be used.

The R-PP identifies multiple non-carbon benefits associated with REDD in Madagascar, including rural livelihood, non-timber forest products, watershed protection, biodiversity benefits and enhanced governance and acknowledges the importance of monitoring and evaluation of these benefits.

This Standard is met.

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

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

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

We note that there is an important funding gap for identified activities (not to be funded by the FCPF Grant). But the R-PP does not present or identify the existing or potential bilateral and multilateral donors (with on-going programs or future programs) that could help to fill this gap.

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:

The Standard was already met in October 2010 and again in January 2013.

Same as TAP.

This Standard is met.