

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, January 10, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

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

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

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

Final Synthesis Review of revised R-PP of Uganda

Reviewer : Stephen Cobb, Harrison Kojwang and three TAP members

Date of review: 6th June 2011

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5:)

Overview

Reminder: the situation at the conclusion of the FCPF PC Meeting in Vietnam, as far as the preparation of Uganda's R-PP is concerned, was that the TAP had tried to concentrate its comments on those Components which had not yet met the Standard in late March, firstly in a revised synthesis submitted to the FCPF and the Uganda Government on 20th May 2011 (which followed a discussion by teleconference, touching on all the major points) and then, after Uganda had had the opportunity to react to these comments, in this final synthesis of 6th June 2011.

The situation, in terms of attainment of standards, is now as follows:

Overall Summary of the attainment of Standards			
	January	March revision	May revision
<i>Component 1a</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Largely meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>1b</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Largely meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>Component 2a</i>	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Largely meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>2b</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>2c</i>	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Does not yet meet</i>	<i>Partially meets the standard</i>
<i>2d</i>	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>Component 3</i>	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Does not yet meet</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>Component 4 (4a in May)</i>	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Partially meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>4b</i>	<i>Not separately assessed</i>		<i>Meets the Standard</i>
<i>Component 5</i>	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
<i>Component 6</i>	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>

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.

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

The subcomponent is clearly written and demonstrates a good understanding of the key elements in management arrangements namely, High Level Policy Making Body, Steering Committee, Working Groups and their various mandates. The Apex Body, the National Policy Committee on Environment under the Prime Minister is appropriate and contains a good mix of relevant ministries, except those responsible for infra-structure and mining. However the National Steering Committee will be established by one Ministry (Water and Environment), to which it will also report.

The links between the RPP and other policies and programmes (Forest Policy, National Forest Plan, National Development Plan, Conservation Policies, Climate Change, Local Government) are useful.

The organizational chart (Figure 2) for the coordination and implementation of a national REDD+ Programme has been provided. The relationships are much clearer than in the first version

There are still concerns about the proposals for inclusion of the different sectors, both within government and outside it. Missing or underrepresented institutions include Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Industry and the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development, as well as the Uganda Wildlife Authority. Not enough reliance is placed on professional forestry and environmental groups. While these institutions are mentioned, the reader is left uncertain that they have been given their due importance (see Section 1.6 on p.23 and Table 1, for example).

There are a number of minor factual matters to be tidied up, and precision about bibliographic references to be attended to. For example, the year of publication is often missing, the authorship of some documents is unclear, the year of enactment of various laws is missing.

Some thought should be given to indicators of interim progress. The chart with feedback loop on page 28 shows a good understanding of the issues involved in making progress.

Recommendations made on previous version

- The summary on pages 11 and 12 still remains quite generic and does not portray any specific attributes of Uganda (Total forest cover, potential land area suitable for management under REDD+, key risks and opportunities etc)
- Section 1.4 should bear the title “outputs of the REDD+ readiness process” rather than “outputs of the R-PP implementation”
- Section 1.5 should ideally start with National Coordination Arrangements which appear later under 1.5.3.2
- Sub -section 1.5.4 (including its sub-components) fit better under section c (Implementation Frameworks)
- The advantages and risks of the proposal to have a Steering Committee Constituted by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Environment and Water should be explained. It is not entirely convincing that such a body would have the clout it needs to achieve inter-sector coordination and policy oversight.

Conclusion: The revised version was accompanied by a very useful Table (not formally a part of the R-PP) directing the reader to the way in which the Ugandan team has responded to the comments and recommendations. Each of these has been patiently dealt with, largely by directing the reader (in this case the TAP members) to the precise places elsewhere in the text, where the authors feel, with some justification, that they have tackled the issue in question.

The TAP therefore now feels that this component: **Meets the Standard.**

Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:

The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus, and commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The campaign's major objective is to establish an early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process that sets the stage for the later consultation process during the implementation of the R-PP work plan. This effort needs to reach out, to the extent feasible at this stage, to networks and representatives of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers and forest dependent communities, both at national and local level. The R-PP contains evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that a reasonable amount of time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD-plus including the SESA.

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

We have only minor suggestions to make (noting that in the previous round, only 1b was presented, not the newer formulation of 1b and 1c)

From the material presented here, it appears that there has been a real effort to listen to the needs of forest dependent people. A continual effort will be needed to show them that their feedback has been incorporated in the implementation plan.

In the footnote to page 39, the list of organizations: Environmental Alert sub-contracted the following institutions to facilitate Consultations: Care and Water Governance Institute – South-Western Uganda; Eco-Trust – Western Uganda; Tree Talk– Northern Uganda; ACODE – Eastern Uganda; Tobari/IPACC – Karamoja/KADP/Nature Palace Foundation and not ECO; NAPE/Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development and not REDD-Net ; CODECA instead of BUCODO (the name was changed in 2009) – Central Uganda.

Conclusion: this section **largely met the standard** in March All these editorial changes have been attended to and therefore the TAP feels that this section: **Meets the Standard**

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (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; (v) and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

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).

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

There are one or two residual concerns about the consultation process, but they should not be difficult to deal with. Development of an R-PP implementation awareness and communication strategy is an issue that all R-PPs face, and there are many common elements.

The term REDD-COP in table 10 could usefully be altered, since the word REDD COP could be misunderstood to imply a Conference of Parties (COP).

Conclusion: There was no 1c in the previous version as reviewed by the TAP, but it is clear from the lightness of these comments that this version: **Meets the Standard**

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD; 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:

The section is much improved, has additional data on forest cover types and biomass estimates associated with each. The drivers of deforestation have been described, and for each driver a set of underlying causes have been described. This is later used in 2b to design strategy options.

Governance issues have now been better clarified. The section now recognizes the need for Uganda to clarify the issue of '*carbon rights*' as a factor which may be an incentive or hindrance to the participation of key stakeholders outside government in REDD+ Programmes.

This assessment provides a generally excellent analysis of the issues faced by a REDD+ country - and does an excellent job of linking forestry, energy, and food in a clear and concise way. Important points are made on page 55 about the key importance of dealing with land tenure and boundary demarcations, on page 74 about GIS maps and the need to "increase transparency by making comprehensive information available to the public on the forest resources and the management of those resources" and on page 79 noting that the "worst challenge is inadequate management of information at central and district levels." Each of these points underscores the need for adequate Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and their associated decision support tools. The GIS systems are a key element of both Reference Level and MRV systems - once they are in place there, they will help in these policy areas.

The observed increase in wetland area is yet to be confirmed by the Wetland Management Department, which is using a slightly different classification method. Wetlands also increased especially in Teso district because of heavy rains and blockage of drainage into Lake Kyoga (NEMA

2009b).

Citation of the National Forestry and Planting Act as 2004 Page 57 & 58 is not correct: refer to section 1a above.

The link between the charcoal production and REDD+ remains not linked well. What is the role of access to and affordability of renewable energy sources such as hydro-electricity if it has no effect on halting deforestation and forest degradation in Uganda?

Concentration of people in internally displaced camps: severe deforestation has been observed in northern Uganda especially in a radius of 5-8 km around IDP camps. All trees are converted to fuel wood including the Borassus palm and the high value Shea butter nut tree. This point could be deleted since the last IDP camps were demolished in 2009.

There is a need to improve the data relating to the National Biomass Study, and to the way tree cover data are presented. Otherwise, this component is nearly there.

Conclusion: this section largely met the standard in March. The authors of the Uganda R-PP have provided a careful narrative explanation, taking the reader to those parts of the text, both in this section and elsewhere, which provide adequate and satisfactory answers to each of the six major points listed above. Therefore the TAP feels that this section now: **Meets the Standard.**

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and 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 should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD 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 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 strategy over time.

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

This is an excellent attempt to describe programmes / actions that could counteract the identified drivers. The clear linkages between 2a and 2b are commendable, as are those between 2 b and 1 a.

The objectives of the sub-component are also well articulated.

It has been stated that a Task Force will be created to further elaborate on strategy options which have been proposed in section 2 (a) and presented in a table in 2 (b).

Comments on the feasibility and the key risks associated with key strategy options would be useful. However the R-PP proposes that this will be done by a special task force that will be appointed during the readiness preparation phase. This is acceptable.

Conclusion: The TAP review already gave this component the green light in March and there is nothing of importance to add now. **Meets the Standard.**

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

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

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

Although there has been more development of institutional arrangements and identification of key issues and clear TOR have been set, there is still no real work plan with a flow chart of activities, a time line for completion, and a list of outcomes (see Reference Level and MRV comments). There is the basis of a work plan in 2b, which could be exported and developed here. It would be well worth looking at the Work Plans in the Kenya and Vietnam RPPs.

Sub-section 1.5.4 fits under this section and a commentary on outstanding legal and policy requirements for REDD+ should be clearly listed

The provision of a framework for conflict resolution among stakeholders is still not elaborated

The development of a carbon registry which is also an important element for implementation is still missing

Conclusion: this section **did not yet meet the standard** in March. The June version provides a paragraph of helpful guidance on institutional arrangements, though still without workplan and flow chart. There is no evidence that the good models in the Kenya and Vietnam R-PPs have been taken into account. Conflict resolution and carbon registry issues have been dealt with elsewhere in the R-PP, and the authors have guided the reader to the appropriate places to find these descriptions.

It is unfortunate that the advice on work plans and activity charts does not appear to have been taken.

For this reason, the TAP feels that this section still only: **Partially Meets the Standard**

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

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the World Bank's or UN-REDD Programme'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. For countries receiving funding via the World Bank, a simple work plan is presented for how the SESA process will be followed, and for preparation of the ESMF.

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

This section has been greatly improved and more details have been added about how the SESA process will be followed. It shows a familiarity with the World Bank's Safeguard Policies.

Conclusion: The TAP review already gave this component the green light in March and there is nothing of importance to add now. **Meets the Standard.**

Component 3. Develop a Reference Level

Standard 3: 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 (MRV 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 has been substantially rewritten and as recommended, material from the annexes has been brought forward. The procedures listed are sound, and clear TOR are in place. The proposal has now identified the elements of a work plan in section 3.4.2.c on pp 118-119 with activities of high priority. Using that work plan, the first job for the Reference Level Task Force will be to develop a detailed flow chart of activities, time line for completion, and a list of outcomes so that Uganda can expedite the implementation process.

In the elaboration of the flow chart of activities, it will be very helpful to have the analysis of the 2010 Landsat data as an additional data point. Careful attention should be given to the predicted changes in drivers.

The issue of sub-national projects nested in a national framework still needs work both for Uganda and internationally. This can be taken up as the work plan is developed. A key element will be the establishment of a robust GIS system, as noted in the comments on section 2a. The experience of other countries shows that developing a reference level will take some time, so some no-

regrets interim steps should be identified for capacity building, data collection, initial system design and indicators of progress.

The statement on required capacity gaps will entail further attention to the potential participation of collaborative institutions such as the World Resources Institute and WCS. The question remains about how the technical capacity of these outside institutions can be transferred to government and university institutions in the country.

As the work plan is being developed, it will be useful to keep in mind the examples of Kenya, and the work plans for RL and MRV from other R-PPs, see Ethiopia pp 123 and 148, Kenya pp 59 and 67, and Cambodia (annex) pp 140 and 148. All of these provide good guidance for Uganda to emulate

A good example of Performance Indicators is found in the documentation of the Guyana-Norway-Redd Investment Fund, references to which have been sent.

Conclusion: this section did not meet the standard in March, but now:
Meets the Standard.

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:

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 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 has been modified and expanded with helpful material. It is a good start to build on the work of the National Biomass Study and it makes sense for the Forestry Sector Support Department (FSSD) to take the lead in development of the MRV system. The TOR and procedures have been clearly stated. The proposal now, in section 4.3 b), has a good start on an action plan to develop the MRV system. This action plan can now be expanded to include specifics about what kind of capacity building will be needed, what will be monitored, and the roles of actors. A key element will be the establishment of a robust GIS system, as noted in the comments on section 2a.

As with the Reference Level, the next step is to fill out this work plan with a detailed flow chart of activities, a time line for completion, and a list of outcomes for an integrated monitoring system. It will be particularly important to address the issue of nesting sub-national projects into a national framework - this will be an area where some early activities, based on existing sub-national projects, can be identified.

As noted for the Reference Level, some no-regrets interim steps should be identified for capacity building, data collection, initial system design and indicators of progress. A good example of interim performance indicators for RL and MRV has been prepared by Guyana as part of the agreement for the Guyana-Norway REDD+ Investment Fund (GRIF).

The comments on this are very similar to those relating to Standard 3. Using Table 32, and the references to the other R-PPs already mentioned, would help in making the framework now identified more operational. The Guyana model cited above (comments on component 3) would also be helpful here.

Conclusion: this section partially met the standard in March, but now:

Meets the Standard.

Standard 4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts, and Governance:

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 part of the plan is important for rural livelihoods and governance but especially for biodiversity. New material has been added on page 131 that further clarifies the objectives of monitoring plans for multiple benefits, other impacts, and governance. This material, in section 4B c), provides the framework necessary to proceed.

Starting with this framework including the summary activity plans and schedule in Table 33 it will be possible to move towards an integrated system. The development of an integrated plan with a focus on biodiversity conservation should be viewed as a particular opportunity for Uganda given that Uganda is 2nd in Africa for mammalian diversity and that much of the biodiversity occurs in forests. As the work plan is developed, biodiversity should have high priority. In the case of biodiversity, this links back to Standard 1a on the role of Uganda Wildlife Authority, guardian of an important proportion of Uganda's forest estate.

Conclusion: this section was not separately assessed in March, but now:

Meets the Standard.

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:

A very complete budget and list of activities is presented here - this will be helpful for monitoring progress. Although this was judged adequate in March, it would still be very helpful to know what steps are being taken to meet the \$1.6 million shortfall that is apparent in the budget

Conclusion: The TAP review already gave this component the green light in March and there is nothing of importance to add now except the clarification about the budget shortfall.

Meets the Standard.

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:

While generally pleased with this, TAP reviewers have realised that a bit more thought now, could make this a much more useful tool, To do so, the M and E framework should define more clearly how the M and E tool will be used, by whom, and by what means it will be used to adjust, to react, to redefine in the light of the attainment, or non-attainment, of targets and indicators in the framework

Conclusion: The TAP review already gave this component the green light in March and there is nothing of importance to change that view now, except the advice given above.

Meets the Standard.