

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism  
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**  
(interim, September 10, 2009, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

**Guidelines for Reviewers:**

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

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

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

**Review Synthesis of R-PP of ETHIOPIA**

Lead TAP Reviewers Harrison Ochieng Kojwang, Abdul Razak Saeed and Six TAP  
Team members

Date of Original review: September 12, 2010

Date of latest revision: October 19, 2010

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

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

This synthesis report is based on the comments of a number of independent reviewers on the RPP and it has been further revised following the submission of revised R-PP, after incorporating TAP original comments, by the Government of Ethiopia to FCPF on October 17, 2010.

## General Comments

### Strengths of the RPP

- In the RPP, the key tasks to be tackled under the framework of National Management Arrangements are clear and appropriate and the TAP notes that Federal Coordination Bodies; the Environmental Council and the Steering Committee are at the right levels within government to play their assigned national roles. In this regard, the TAP notes that the Environmental Council (EC) will be appropriately chaired by the Prime Minister.
- The TAP has noted that extensive stakeholder groups have been involved during the R-PP development. The process included relevant stakeholders from the federal, regional states, district and community levels and in addition, R-PP illustrates with a diagram that puts consultation and participation at the heart of REDD+ Readiness and clearly summarized and presented the outputs of the consultation process.
- The TAP notes that in table 15, a key output, namely the revision and harmonization of forestry policy, and the setting up of a dedicated forestry institution, among others are valid requirements to pursue successful REDD+ implementation in Ethiopia.
- The R-PP clearly elaborates on the existing gaps in data sources due to absence of regular forest inventory in Ethiopia and appears to have taken this into consideration in the design of components 3 and 4.
- The description of drivers is clear and interesting, and it has now been stated that Ethiopia largely meets most of its local biomass energy needs from Eucalyptus plantations. Essentially Ethiopia does not therefore regard demand for wood energy as a driver of Deforestation and Forest Degradation (D&D).
- The TAP has noted with satisfaction that most of the key elements of components 3 and 4 are presented in the main document and just need some rearrangements to meet the standards. The critical comments made on the two components are meant to improve them since, together with component 2 (b and c) they form the critical parts of a future REDD+ Programme for Ethiopia.

### Weaknesses

*Some of the items below were discussed with the Government and the responses or new understandings that arose from the discussions are highlighted in italics.*

- Given the number of political regions, the proposal to have mirror bodies of the Federal Technical Working Group replicated in all the regions could introduce an unintended complexity in the interaction between Federal and Regional Bodies.
- One gets the impression that the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA) will oversee the implementation REDD+ from national to local levels in REDD+. However because it does not have a nationwide institutional presence that it may need, to effectively play that role, the TAP was concerned. *{The Government of Ethiopia essentially agrees with the position of the TAP that FEPA is more suited to its role as a regulatory rather than an implementing body and will clarify FEPA's role. However it has taken the role of chairing the REDD+ process and could hand over the role to a dedicated forestry institution, should a decision be made to create one}.*
- The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD) also appears to have been given the least consideration in the outlined NRMA, while in the R-PIN of Ethiopia it was mentioned that MoARD will be the lead REDD+ implementing body together with FEPA. The R-PP fails to clearly indicate how MoARD and FEPA are going to operate together and what general and specific roles the Ministry will play in the NRMA. *{Again, the Government stated that it has not decided on which institution will lead its REDD+ programme and will wait for a decision to be made by the Environmental Council of Ethiopia.}*
- It also appears from the RPP that individuals from the EPA are overrepresented in different stakeholder groups. More room should be given to more representation from other stakeholder groups. In this regard the Federal Technical Working Group is such an example where a broader representation can be effected.
- Based on the observation of in-country experts, consultations were carried out mainly in 4 regions and while that could be justified on the grounds of time and other costs, the RPP should clearly state such consultation gaps and plan for more targeted consultations during the REDD+ readiness preparation phase. *{The Government welcomed the suggestion and will plan for more consultations during the 3-year preparatory phase}.*
- Despite some improvements based on the first round of TAP comments there is still a need for the Reference Scenario and MRV Components to be revised in line with the recommendations. This has to do with Forest definitions, quality standards for existing data, maps, use of drivers of D&D as inputs in Component 3 and also as a monitoring parameter in the MRV Component.etc. Details are provided in the components.

#### Key Recommendations

- *The list of abbreviations (acronyms) should be placed right after the Table of Contents and not in the Annex as is currently case.*

- *The RPP should take the opportunity in this RPP process make a strong rationale (justification and urgency) for the creation of a devoted Federal Forestry Agency to manage the Forest Sector in general and REDD in particular. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture should play a key role and be given more responsibility in the Implementation of REDD.*
- *The proposed strategies appear to be restricted to actions within and largely by the forest sector (CDM, Pas, PFM, REDD Pilots, Area enclosures, plantations, AF systems) and while they are highly relevant, they may not be sufficient to deal with policies and programmes from outside the forest sector. The ideas on Table 15 could expanded to show how the REDD+ Programme will address such policies.*
- *Furthermore the RPP should clearly show how and whether the strategy options will address the identified drivers of D & D.*
- *There are several specific recommendations on the Reference Scenario (3) and MRV (4) Components which are detailed under each. Because most of the key elements of the components are already in the text, a practical and probably useful recommendation is for Ethiopia to follow the structure or format in some of the recently approved RPPs. In that regard, the RPPs of the DRC and Kenya could be useful examples.*
- *As a general concern, the RPP should clearly express capacity building targets in the key areas that would enable Ethiopia to manage and report on its REDD+ Programme.*

## Component 1. Organize and Consult

### Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness;

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

#### Observations

- The proposal to have the leadership of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA) to oversee REDD from national to local levels in REDD+ implementation appears to have risks since FEPA does not have a nationwide institutional presence that it may need, to effectively play that role. So far it has only a single office and most of the skills and expertise exist outside its main structure. So far it seems more suited to its role as a regulatory rather than an implementing body.
- It is good to note that membership of the RSC will include at least one parliamentarian.
- Nearly half of the team (20 out of 48) contributing to the R-PP are staff of the EPA. This perhaps is a sign of the difficulties of making the process both interdisciplinary and inclusive.

- The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD) appears to have been given the least consideration in the outlined NRMA, while in the R-PIN of Ethiopia it was mentioned that MoARD will be the lead REDD+ implementing body together with FEPA. The R-PP fails to clearly indicate how MoARD and FEPA are going to operate together and what general and specific roles the Ministry will play in the NRMA.
- Based on the observation of in-country experts, individuals from the EPA are overrepresented in different stakeholder groups. More room should be given to more representation from other stakeholder groups. In this regard the Federal Technical Working Group is such an example.

**Recommendations:**

- *The role of key government institutions such as the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and other agencies who have direct responsibility for, or strong influences on forest management, should be highlighted both in this section and also 2 (c). One suggestion from some TAP members is that the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development should be the rightful host for a Federal REDD Secretariat in view of the observation already stated. {The TAP now understands that such a decision will be made by the Environmental Council of Ethiopia.}*
- *The organigramme in Fig.4 shows that the EPA is to chair both the RTWG and RSC, which in turn is supposed to supervise the work of the RTWG and the REDD Secretariat. This is not appropriate since the EPA should not be supervising itself.*
- *The names of the Umbrella NGO to be included in the REDD Steering Committee and those of relevant sectoral ministries should be provided specifically in the main text or annex.*
- *Consideration should be given to the representation of more stakeholders in the regional and federal bodies.*
- *In order to create a good regional foundation for the implementation of REDD and the monitoring of progress under REDD, regional bodies such as State Forest Enterprises should be empowered.*

*In general, the section largely meets the standard.*

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

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

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

<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

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 Observations:**

- The RPP clearly recognizes the importance of free, prior and informed consent as an operating principle in the consultation process
- The results arising out of the consultations (stakeholder expectations, understanding the causes of D&D, issues of governance, choice of pilot areas etc) are well laid out
- The reviewers also appreciate the clear link drawn between the consultations and the development and implementation of components 2, 3 and 4.
- The national workshops described in the RPP seem to have been limited to the key government agencies and in some instance some NGOs. Woreda and Community level consultations were held with forest dependent but it is not clear how their voices are heard at higher decision making levels
- The characterization of the various stakeholders (Table 5) in terms of their power, how they are likely to be affected by REDD decisions, and their desired status at REDD Readiness, is quite useful.

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

***Recommendations***

- *Some in-country experts have suggested that since Consultations were carried out mostly 4 regions more should be done at both the regional and community levels to understand the concept and then clearly discuss the challenges and opportunities.*
- *The ownership of the R-PP among other stakeholders is not obvious in the document and to the extent that others participated in its formation drafting, that should be made clearer than is apparent.*

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).

*This section largely meets the standard.*

## 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.

### Reviewers Observations:

- The section clearly describes the 9 land cover classes and makes reference to past land cover mapping and woody biomass estimation projects which are relevant to REDD.
- It appears that there is no general agreement on historical deforestation rates.
- The matrices on Table 9 gives a very useful description on the challenges and gaps.

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

#### Recommendations

*While the analysis of problem issues in the forest sector is good on policy, use rights and institutional failures, there is nothing specifically on law enforcement and other related governance failures, which seems unlikely to truly represent the situation.*

*The R-PP mentions benefits sharing mechanisms but it is not clear if the mechanisms will be backed by existing policies and laws or if new policy and legislative reforms are needed.*

*The R-PP should also state what mechanisms it envisages to deal with conflicts that may arise over issues such as carbon rights and benefit sharing.*

*The standard has largely been met*

**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.

#### Reviewers Observations

- The section emphasizes an experimental approach to building and testing strategy options (which is rational).
- The proposed strategies appear to be restricted to actions within and largely by the forest sector (CDM, Pas, PFM, REDD Pilots, Area enclosures, plantations, AF systems) and while they are highly relevant, they may not be sufficient to deal with policies and programmes from outside the forest sector.
- Appears to be little by way of policy advocacy outside the forest sector.
- The proposal to monitor and deal with the issue of 'leakage' particularly under Participatory Forest Management Programmes is encouraging.
- Again the matrix of Challenges and proposed solutions on tale 11 are useful.
- There is no detailed analysis of past successes and failures in policy implementation, the R-PP only lists efforts made.

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

#### Recommendations

- *The constraints to the implementation of past and current policies (an assessment of past forestry with respect to REDD) should be described.*
- *Further thoughts should be given on how to deal with policies outside the forest sector, but which underlie Deforestation and Forest Degradation. The issue of deforestation and degradation is most often externalized and so policies from the other sectors need to be considered. In general the current strategy options are weak on policy level work within and outside the forest sector. Examples of such are existing national and sectoral strategies such as the investment policy, agriculture led industrialization, economic development strategy of Ethiopia (ADLI), energy strategy (e.g. bio-energy development strategy) and the food security strategy.*



- *There should be a clear link between the strategy options and the drivers of D & D. Since managing REDD requires tackling the drivers of D & D, the strategy options should demonstrate how they tackle the main drivers which have been identified and described in the RPP.*
- *Before an implementation of the strategy options begin, some preliminary assessments on the likely costs and benefits and the risks associated with of each strategy option should be considered.*

*The section only partially meets the standard and needs to be revised in line with the recommendations*

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

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

#### *Observations*

Despite the inclusion of parliamentary representation in the REDD Steering Committee, this framework does not seem to recognise enough, the need to bring in broad sectoral support at a high enough political level.

Table 15, Action B.2, seems to miss the point. It is not just cash flow that needs to be managed; a whole accountable, transparent financial management system, has to be established, that people both within and outside Ethiopia will trust.

#### *Recommendations*

- *Clearly state the institutional mandates and needed policy and legislative instruments to guide the implementation of REDD+*
- *Add a carbon registry facility to the programme to aid implementation and monitoring*
- *Justification should be made (in addition to table 15) on the need to create a devoted Forest Administration to enable it to manage REDD+ and SFM Programmes, since this has been identified as a major impediment to the performance of the forest sector.*
- *There should be firm time-bound plans in the RPP to resolve the issue of benefit sharing and in doing so, Ethiopia should learn from its participatory forest management (PFM)*

*programme.*

*In the present state, the section partially meets the standard.*

**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:**

*This is the best treatment of the ESMF that a number of TAP members have ever seen, even though it is comparatively expensive.*

*Ethiopia has had large projects in which EIA and SESA principles have been applied and the RPP has sufficiently treated this section.*

*This section meets the standard.*

### **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.)

#### **Reviewers observations**

- A lot of information is given about attempts on estimating GHG emissions/removals for project scale activities, national communications etc. but with no clear details on how such data and activities will be used to develop national reference scenarios.
- Ethiopia plans to base a lot of work on the project scale REDD+ and CDM project activities—but from later material these do not seem to be in a very advanced state, lacking the details to assess their value, and also seem to be led by non-Ethiopian organizations.
- A survey on existing capacity in remote sensing, mapping and forest inventory across a

number on institutions has been done

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

*Some of the steps needed are described in this component but improvements can be made. Here are some recommendations:*

- It would have been useful if the component set out a clear statement of specific goals followed by the expected outcomes. For example will the historic emissions be just for one interval? Or would it use several intervals to obtain a trend, over a given time frame, and how historic emissions might be used to develop reference scenarios?.
- There is a description of what constitutes a forest—but it is clear that Ethiopia has different thresholds for different forests—this might be a problem in future monitoring which should be raised. It would have been good to see what approach Ethiopia might take to either harmonize the definitions into one for all forests or an approach to overcome monitoring problems for them by keeping several definitions.
- All the material on the four projects is all very interesting and could be added to an Annex rather than in body of R-PP. How will this be used—what steps will be taken to see how this fits into a plan for developing a Ref Scenario?
- It would help if the component started with a description of the steps needed to develop a Ref Scenario. This would provide the framework, then they could see which projects and which aspects of projects could feed in where. As it stands I do not see any logical approach written up in this component.
- Section on terms of reference: It seems that a major task for Reference Scenario is to develop a national, consistent and credible data base to be used for quantifying carbon emissions from different land use conversions in different regions of the country—that is it would help Ethiopia to know which land use changes and where they occur cause the highest emissions. This then could feed into Ethiopia's strategy for implementing a REDD program.
- The forest area data underlying figure 18 should be presented as total areas for each cover type and also as percentages of total land cover in the main text. In effect tables 42 to 44 in the Appendix should be included under section 2a where forest resources are described.
- If Ethiopia decides to use data from ongoing or recently initiated projects, then it should clearly set the quality standards for such data. In this regard, one should be sure that the data of carbon values per hectare that have been quoted for Montane Forests (203 t/C ha, which some would view as somewhat high) have been thoroughly checked.
- The summary in Table 24 on the steps is currently too brief. It could be improved with more detail. To date, the table has not clearly presented the details concerning the steps to be taken to develop Reference Emission Levels and Reference Levels. More detail on the time frame over which reference emission levels will be estimated, the use of the current data on biomass and how historic emissions will be used to develop reference level projections into the future.
- It may be helpful if Ethiopia refers to the Reference Scenario Sections of recently approved RPP from countries in east and central Africa (DRC, Kenya and Republic of Congo are good examples)

*The component partially meets the standard and should be revised in line with the recommendations given above. It is suggested that Ethiopia also study component 3 from the RPPs of for example, DRC and Kenya.*

#### 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.)

#### 4 (a) Reviewers Observations

- Like component 3, it has made useful reference to IPCC Good Practice Guidelines
- This section does not take into consideration how the MRV system will be linked to the REDD+ strategy that Ethiopia plans to develop and implement. Also, like component 3, it has too much detail on less important topics, repeats material already in component 3, and provides too little detail on critical steps that are needed. Some specific comments follow
- The choice of emission factors is clear but the RPP suggested that it will merely use default values for estimating below ground biomass
- The suggested adoption of the World Bank Project (WBISAPP) methodology for a nationwide sampling is wise, provided that it is critically examined and improvements, if any, are made for REDD+.
- Table 33 on designing an MRV Systems contains useful information

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

*Recommendations*

- There should be a step that discusses how and which Carbon pools will be included in the monitoring plan.
- Building on the sampling completed as part of the WBISPP project obviously makes sense but it is important that this plan be assessed to determine if it produces results that are verifiable and robust, have followed standard operating procedures, meet the desired level of certainty, well archived and available.
- There is no recognition or reference to the concept of stratifying the forests based on where change is expected—based on past activities and based on where GoE plans to implement REDD activities.
- The section on verification is quite specific but this topic is still under international discussions so it might be useful to include how this will be tracked and plans for verification modified as it becomes clearer what the modalities will be .
- To detect forest degradation the RPP could exchange methodological approaches with Madagascar which is currently experimenting with a remote sensing method (CLASlite)
- Attempts should be made to estimate below ground biomass for each major forest class considered under REDD+ if Ethiopia's forest are different from those used to generate the IPCC default values The use of default values as suggested in the RPP could be risky
- The component should consider monitoring the key drivers and agents of deforestation (eg biomass energy consumption, agric expansion, sector policies etc) in addition to what has been stated
- The current proposal (table 31) seems to favour mostly federal institutions at the expense of state institutions (such as State Forest Enterprises) and CBOs and other sub-national institutions in the implementation of an MRV system. This should be corrected.

**4 (b) Other benefits**

Other than the mention of biodiversity, this section has barely mentioned a number of non-carbon variables (governance, policies, biodiversity, water etc) that should also be monitored.

It is crucial that Ethiopia as part of its MRV develop methodologies for monitoring the key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

*The MRV section only partially meets the standard and needs to be revised as per the recommendations.*

**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.

**Observation:**

This is one of the most expensive proposals we have seen; but without any indication of counterpart funding from Government, or of parallel funding from other agencies. This is important, since the FCPF contribution cannot exceed approximately 18.7% of the requested total, where is the rest going to come from? Is the proposal otherwise viable, or too ambitious?

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

*The component largely meets the standard but please refer to the observation above.*

**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:**

*The component should be improved as listed below*

- *The importance of collecting of baseline data for monitoring and evaluation is a standard requirement that this component should recognize and refer to.*
- *Mention should be made of the key indicators that could be used*
- *Institutional mandates for leading the evaluation (at the moment it seems that it is the responsibility of National Management Arrangements (table 36) when the basis for such evaluation should be spearheaded by the REDD+ Secretariat in conjunction with the national Technical Working Group*
- *The R-PP focuses on the development process of social and environmental impact assessment criteria and indicators, but is rather silent on the methods it will use to evaluate how the impacts are assessed.*
- *In addition M&E framework does not show how it will assist in transparent management of*

*financial and other resources. This should be improved.*

*The section has not meet the standard*

DRAFT