

**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: Switzerland, Denmark**

**Reviewer:** Astrid Zabel, Jürgen Blaser, Mike Speirs, Moeko Saito-Jensen

**Date of review:** 14.03.2013

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

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

Standard	
1a	Largely met
1b	Met
1c	Partially met

2a	Largely met
2b	Largely met
2c	Largely met
2d	Partially met
3	Met
4a	Largely met
4b	Met
5	Met
6	Largely met

**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:**

*This section provides detailed information on the state of the forest in Thailand and describes multiple forest user groups. The governance context of existing and planned management and decision making bodies is presented. Although it is emphasized that opportunities to participate will be created for various stakeholders, it remains unclear which form of participation is anticipated. This should be elaborated on in more detail, since participation can refer to a spectrum of options from simple voicing of opinions to true decision making power. Moreover, it is unclear how decisions will be taken among the large number of committee members in the readiness phase.*

*Mechanisms for conflict resolution and redress of grievances are only very briefly mentioned. The issues need to be covered more thoroughly.*

**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:**

**According to the R-PP there are about 57 ethnic groups in Thailand. However the constitution of Thailand does not use the term “indigenous peoples” to refer to these ethnic groups. Instead, they are referred to as “local forest-dependent communities”. Regardless of the wording used to refer to these ethnic groups, REDD+ initiatives should ensure their meaningful participation in policy dialogues and protect their rights to forest resources in accordance with the World Bank’s social safeguards as well as the UN’s social safeguards including free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). These considerations are fundamental to the success of REDD+.**

**In Thailand a stakeholder analysis was conducted to identify all parties affected by REDD. More than 1200 people then attended the stakeholder dialogue events. Much effort has been invested in spreading information on REDD throughout the country and listening to stakeholders’ questions and concerns. Whether SESA was covered is not clear. Criticism by agents of civil society toward the stakeholder selection process and the topics covered is openly dealt with in the R-PP.**

**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) 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:**

***This section discusses the importance of meaningful participation. A detailed plan for a consultation and participation process is presented. Although these plans are very specific in many ways, information on how stakeholders will be able to influence decisions is not provided. To understand whether the focus is more on consultation or on participation with decision making power (e.g. by giving vote rights or veto power to stakeholder representatives) it would be useful to elaborate more on the planned “mechanics” of the participation process.***

***Results of the many stakeholder meetings, in particular common expectations toward REDD+ and concerns are presented. How these issues will be addressed and feed into the REDD readiness process could be made more explicit.***

***Moreover, it is worth noting that Danida funded a major “joint management of protected areas” (JoMPA) scheme in Thailand over a six year period from 2003 to 2009 and there is a wealth of knowledge and experience both at the DNP and amongst the major NGOs (such as***

<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).

*the Seub Foundation, IMPECT, etc.) pertaining to community forestry. It is a little surprising to note that the IUCN does not appear to have been involved in the R-PP design. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature has an active presence in Thailand and is, inter alia, involved in exciting community based mangrove forest management schemes in the extensive coastal areas (see: [www.mangrovesforthefuture.org](http://www.mangrovesforthefuture.org)<<http://www.mangrovesforthefuture.org>>).*

## **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 section discusses drivers of land use change and the relevant judicial framework. The discussion is thorough and detailed, but more weight could be given to an analysis of forest governance.*

*According to the R-PP, about 1.2 million and 20-25 million people live, respectively, in and around protected areas and national forest reserves and depend on forests for sustaining their livelihoods. At present, more than 10,000 villagers manage 50,000 ha of forests under community forestry programs. According to RECOFTC (<http://www.recoftc.org/site/Thailand>) none of these community forestry sites are located within protected areas. This is mainly due to the National Park Act of 1961, "which prohibits use of timber and non-timber forest products within park boundaries". The consequences of this act include "widespread conflict, evictions, arrests, home demolitions, and armed protests..... around Thailand's forested areas." Moreover, the area managed by community forestry (50,000 ha) covers only 0,3 percent of the total forest area of 15.8 million ha in Thailand.*

*It would be interesting to obtain more information on the number of people/households living in protected areas to better understand the magnitude of the issues at stake.*

*It remains uncertain how the government of Thailand aims to reconcile the objectives of forest conservation and livelihood improvement of forest dependent people. It is also not clear whether the community forestry program will be scaled up as a part of its REDD+ strategy. It could be fruitful for the government to learn from the experiences of other countries' such as Nepal, Tanzania, India, Nicaragua and Costa Rica. This would allow the Thai government to consider how options such as co-management, PES or community forestry within protected area and national parks might contribute to achieve efficient forest conservation and protection, as well as to meet at least basic livelihood needs of forest dependent local communities.*

*Although the document states that land rights issues need to be investigated, it does not follow up on how this is planned to be done. Since clarification of land rights questions can be tedious, it is surprising that the investigation is not explicitly mentioned in the budget.*

**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:**

*Overall, the strategy options are carefully derived and well- presented in this section.*

*Encroachment by local people is identified as one of the main causes of deforestation. The R-PP lists unclear tenure and overlapping and conflicting regulatory frameworks concerning the use of forests as underlying reasons.*

*As suggested, the clarification of forest tenure and regulatory frameworks (within agriculture, forestry, energy, tourism) seems to be essential to address this problem. In clarifying forest tenure, it is important to carry out a participatory mapping exercise to identify both formal and informal claims to forest resources and lands made by different forest users, not least in order to mitigate possible boundary related conflicts. The clarification of regulatory frameworks may require changes in existing laws and regulations in other sectors such as agriculture (concerning lands), tourism and energy.*

*In addition to this, infrastructure development and mining are identified as another major cause of deforestation. There seem to be competing and conflicting interests and regulations concerning the use of forest areas among different ministries such as agriculture, tourism and energy as well as mining. Thus, there is a need for REDD+ processes to ensure sectoral coordination and cooperation among relevant departments and ministries to achieve REDD+ policy goals.*

*To address the threats posed by organized illegal logging (identified as a major cause of forest degradation), the government can consider strengthening forest law enforcement by increasing the frequency of forest monitoring and introducing more severe penalties. Increasing border controls may also be an option if precious wood is likely to be exported. Involving communities in forest monitoring could be another option to promote effective local surveillance of forest resources.*

**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:**

*This section lays out the planned REDD+ implementation framework. An assessment of land ownership and carbon rights is planned. An explanation of how this will be done is not given. Although general intentions to clarify land use issues are applaudable, the prospects of success may increase if the planning is done with care. Technical expertise is necessary for land mapping, and most likely, a lot of effort will need to be devoted to negotiations and conflict resolution mechanisms.*

*A question that should be elaborated on is whether, the individual land owners will be held liable in case of deforestation on their property.*

**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 RPP is a bit brief on a work plan for the SESA process. Basic principles and intentions as well as experts that will be consulted are listed. It is stated that a detailed plan for consultation will be devised at a later stage.*

**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:**

*This section provides a good overview of data requirements and data availability. Four approaches to estimate current emissions are discussed. The first is based on historical forest cover data only, the second includes macro-economic factors, the third uses the relationship between population density and forest cover, and the last makes use of periodic estimates of forest carbon stocks.*

*Capacity building in terms of GIS training and forest inventory and measurement training are explicitly planned for.*

*(Note: Figure 3-1 is not self-explanatory. Why is the real data curve so different from the smoothed curve?)*

#### **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:**

*This section presents an overview of the different data sources. It is noted in the R-PP that different departments (e.g. DNP, RFD, DMCR) have historically applied different sets of methods to collect different types of data to monitor forest conditions under their respective jurisdictions. This implies lack of consistency, accuracy and harmonization in data collection and analyses. Hence, there is a need to ensure a consensus and harmonization among respective departments concerning the choice of methods for data collection and analyses to be applied for MRV under REDD+. Furthermore, strengthening MRV for REDD+ could contribute to enhancing human resource capacities to conduct systematic and reliable data collection and analyses and maintenance. Moreover, transparency of data handling is a key issue. More could be said on how transparency will be ensured.*

*On p106, the R-PP notes that "The PASs are to be re-measured every 3-5 years at a cost of approximately USD 800 per pilot on average for the forest and non-forest area." This seems quite expensive. In order not only to reduce the cost but also to enable collection of large amounts of data, the REDD+ offices that are envisaged at both central and local levels could consider using the option of community based forest monitoring as one of ground*

*measurement methods. Involving communities in monitoring may also enable incorporation of local knowledge into monitoring results and enhance the sense of local ownership over REDD+ and local interest in sustainable forest management. There does appear to be some provision for this in the R-PP, in terms of “identifying capacity needs for community-level monitoring support.”*

**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:**

*This section provides information on various governmental and non-governmental sources of socio-economic data that could be useful in an integrated monitoring system. Expected multiple benefits such as reduced loss of biodiversity and soil erosion and improved governance, especially with respect to land tenure questions are identified. Monitoring of governance is said to depend on cooperation between the different departments affected. A plan for the development of a monitoring system is outlined. Areas that require monitoring and corresponding indicators are presented.*

**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:**

*The tables are provided.*



**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 monitoring framework lists a number of important activities. Yet governance reforms and land tenure clarification is not included although this was highlighted earlier in the RPP.*