

**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.

Review of R-PP of: Honduras

Reviewers: Canada, European Commission, Germany, USA

Date of review: October 18th, 2012

The review process applies a classification scheme as follows:

- **Standard Met** (no further work needed to describe the actions proposed under this standard)
- **Standard Largely Met** (proposed work is acceptable, but can be enhanced with additional information)
- **Standard Partially Met** (some additional information is required before the proposed strategy fulfills the terms of the standard)
- **Standard Not Met** (information is incomplete and does not fulfill the terms of the standard)

The findings from the review are summarized in the table below:

Standard	Informal R-PP September, 2012
1a. National Readiness Management Arrangements	Standard Met
1b. Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Standard Largely Met
1c. Consultation and Participation Process	Standard Largely Met
2a. Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Standard Partially Met
2b. REDD+ Strategy Options	Standard Partially Met
2c. Implementation Framework	Standard Partially Met
2d. Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Standard Partially Met
3. Reference Level	Standard Met
4a. Monitoring - Emissions and Removals	Standard Met
4b. Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Standard Largely Met
5. Schedule and Budget	Standard Largely Met
6. Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Standard Largely Met

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

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:

Much progress has been made, especially with regards to the participation of Indigenous Peoples and other stakeholders in the overall governance structure. National readiness management arrangements are described with clarity, and appear inclusive and fulfilling the required standard. Although the standard is **met**, the reviewers recommend Honduras to consider the following:

1. Representatives of the *Consejos Regionales de Desarrollo*, and of other sub-national government structures, do not currently have a seat in the *Subcomité REDD+*. It is of great importance to ensure ownership and involvement of decentralised governments in the REDD+ process, including by ensuring direct participation of their representatives in REDD+ structures (both at coordination and decision making level).
2. The R-PP now does an excellent job of including indigenous and Afro-Honduran peoples as relevant stakeholders and places a large emphasis on them. However, a large portion of the country's affected forest area is subject to pressures from the rural poor who are not

indigenous or Afro-Honduran and are living in or near other forested areas not traditionally claimed by members of CONPAH. These rural poor are therefore not affiliated with CONPAH and in many cases are not part of any formal organizations. How will they be represented in the governance structure?

3. The establishment of a grievance mechanism or subcommittee on conflict resolution still seems to be missing here or in component 1c). Conflict resolution is defined as one of the tasks for the regional roundtables, which is a reasonable approach. However, there should also be a central contact accessible to everyone and with clear procedures for transparently handling cases that are brought to its attention. Some early ideas are mentioned under 2.c) (Unidad de Derechos) and could be referenced here, but it is recommended a grievance mechanism be available already throughout the Readiness phase.
4. Regional thematic roundtables referenced in the R-PP (p.20 of the document): these are still not operational. Budget allocation for these local platforms are highly recommended, which are key for the further implementation of REDD + and R-PP planning process, because it will be the operational “arm” of the National Plan (Plan de Nacion/Vision de Pais).
5. It is not entirely clear why a communication strategy is described and budgeted under this component, rather than under 1.c, together with the other outreach and communication activities foreseen.
6. Page 25 indicates that there are currently 38 institutions in the REDD+ Subcommittee. However, on pp. 22-25 only 24 of these institutions are listed. It would be useful to list all the institutional members of the REDD+ Subcommittee. A number of actors don't seem to be included yet but would be worthwhile to consider here or in Component 1b+c): the two main Honduran foresters professionals' associations (COLPROFORH and CIF), FEHCAFOR, ANPFOR, FHIA (Honduran Foundation of Agroforestry Research) as a pertinent potential collaborator having high credibility at the national level.
7. Erratum p.23: IHCAFE is not a governmental entity; it is now a private non-profit organization that has a “public” mandate to support the chain-value.
8. p.25. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is also another International Cooperation player (missing in the list) contributing to the forestry sector by financing COOPFORH which works with 27 cooperatives in forestry management (pine and deciduous forests). Honduras is one of the 20 Countries of Focus for Canada's Official Development Assistance.
9. There are large agro-industries in the country that could be important stakeholders in REDD+. It is not clear if any attempts will be made to include them as relevant stakeholders.
10. The R-PP does a thorough and careful job of describing most of the relevant stakeholders and laying out the mechanisms for their inclusion in the REDD+ strategy design. A notable exception, however, is in including women as key actors in forest management, whose interests often diverge from men in communities who largely access forests for timber. The only mention of a gender-sensitive aspect is the note on participation of INAM in the Subcomite REDD+. We urge thoughtful consideration of gender issues in the strategy, especially but not only at the local levels.

Conclusion: Standard Met

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

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

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

The proposal provides evidence that efforts have been undertaken to ensure dissemination of information and transparency during the R-PP preparation phase. An early dialogue on REDD+ and the R-PP development process appears to have been successfully initiated with a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders. The standard, however, is only **largely met**, due to the following reason:

1. It is noted that following CONPAH's letter to the FCPF in February 2012, the first draft of the R-PP has been withdrawn, and the government has successfully engaged in outreach and consultations with CONPAH. This has led to four meetings between the parties, and the creation of the MNICC (*Mesa Nacional Indígena de Cambio Climático*) as well as the development of a roadmap for the revision of the R-PP in agreement with CONPAH. However, as highlighted in CONPAH's letter to the FCPF of August 2012, it is also noted that a political agreement on the R-PP between the government and the indigenous and afro-honduran peoples represented in CONPAH has not yet been achieved. Stressing the importance of the active participation of all relevant stakeholders in the REDD+ process, we welcome the progress achieved since CONPAH's letter of February 2012, and we recommend that all parties involved continue in this dialogue, and that a political agreement is reached before the R-PP is finalised.

Further recommendations to improve the component:

2. It should include the UTSAN (Unidad Técnica de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional; in English, the Technical Unit of Food Security and Nutrition) from the ministry of the presidency. UTSAN is the leader and official unit from the government that organizes and leads the tripartite table known as COTISAN (Comité Técnico Inter-Institucional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional; in English, Inter-Institutional Technical Committee of Food Security and Nutrition at a national level, with meetings in Tegucigalpa, but represented in the regional tables of FS&N).
3. As it is mentioned in the previous section, CIDA finances COOPFORH (with SOCODEVI as the executor), which supports technically and financially 27 cooperatives (associated to FEHCAFOR-15 cooperatives within the coniferophite forest and 12 associations, which belong to ANPFOR within the broadleaves forest). COOPFORH should be included because it supports all these organizations with organizational, training, technical assistance on best and sustainable management practices of forest; and also on the commercialization of products from the forest (timber, resin and other type of products). In addition, it helps ICF to organize the communal, municipal, and regional forestry-consultative councils, oriented to co-manage national forest lands as well as their education about the new forestry law of Honduras.
4. P.40 (section 1 b. 2) - It is not clear how the logistics of the training sessions will be

implemented in the regions and with indigenous groups. This should be clarified.

5. P.43 (section 1 b.4) - Not sure if thematic tables of the “Consejos Regionales de Desarrollo” have been established. This should be confirmed by Honduras (Seplan). Precedent point (above) on budget to operate will be certainly a big issue.
6. In Table 6, pp. 46-47, the heading for the last five columns of the first part of the table on p. 46 should be “Programacion”. In the second part of the table on p. 47 the activity and sub-activity “Instancias para Resolucion de Conflictos” is missing and no corresponding budget for each of the five years is shown. Total budget for this table will also have to be revised.
7. While most of the plan for capacity building is appropriately focused on strengthening the ability of indigenous and Afro-Honduran community, an additional important element is missing. High level financial authorities, including the Ministry of Finance, often lack any familiarity with Payment for Environmental Services (PES) schemes, carbon markets and other financial mechanisms and policies whose introduction can be key to creating a long-term durable stream of funding for forest conservation. For highest leverage of the REDD+ plan, this type of training should be made available in an appropriate and convincing manner.

Conclusion: Standard Largely Met

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far (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.

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

The standard is **largely met**. We encourage Honduras to take into consideration the following comments:

1. While extensive information is provided about FPIC requirements to be met during consultation with Indigenous Peoples, they seem to be designed mainly with a view to approving specific REDD+ projects in some geographic area. It is not clear whether consent will be needed for all elements of national Readiness as well, e.g. the reference level or MRV system. It would be helpful to clearly define what would be the contents of consultations that require consent, and a clear work plan with an integrated timeline for stakeholders’ inputs to and validation of SESA, REDD+ strategy options, regulatory framework, reference level and monitoring system.
2. Honduras has recently started working with the European Union on a FLEGT VPA (Voluntary

Partnership Agreement). Both the REDD+ and the FLEGT VPA process greatly depend on extensive outreach and engagement of all stakeholders in the forest sector. Indeed, stakeholders in the forest sector are affected by the two processes, and need to be fully aware and involved in them to ensure their effectiveness. In addition, while there is significant overlap in terms of stakeholders involved in REDD+ and FLEGT, experience shows that the two processes tend to be effective in promoting participation of different stakeholder groups (i.e. FLEGT is very effective in engaging the civil society, including the private sector, while REDD+ receives a lot of attention from representatives of local communities and indigenous peoples). Therefore it is recommended that Honduras considers interactions between consultation and outreach activities under the two ongoing processes, as there could be synergies and economies of scale to be achieved.

3. As mentioned in Section 1a) the RPP does not yet propose mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances. It is recommended to add a first reflection of such mechanisms to this component of the R-PP or to 1a).
4. There is a clear and thorough reference to Free, Prior and Informed Consent as a basis for consultation and participation with Indigenous communities. While we welcome the emphasis on consultations with indigenous peoples and afro-honduran communities, and their right to free, prior and informed consent, the proposal could be strengthened by including information on the consultation process and potential participation of other key stakeholder groups such as the private sector, the agriculture and livestock sector, agro-forestry organizations, as well as sub-national level government bodies.
5. It is good to see the addition of section, “II. Participacion de Otros Actores Relevantes en el tema de CPLI” on p. 68. This is where the many others, less organized rural poor who live in and near forest areas and who are not affiliated to CONPAH could be included. This represents a very large number of stakeholders, so more information could be provided in this section on the number of people represented by these PIR and the scale of the effort required to reach them. See also comment above on Budget for the Regional Development Councils.
6. Even during a CPLI process, women’s voices can be effectively silenced. And this can lead to less effective design and execution of forest policies. We encourage Honduras to think about a special sub-strategy for including indigenous, Afro-Honduran and poor rural women in the consultation process.
7. In Table 11, p. 71, the principle activity “Fortalecimiento de la MNICC para la Socializacion, CPLI del document R-PP” could include also the strengthening of other relevant stakeholders or “Partes Interesadas Relevantes”. The budget to support this activity also appears insufficient to cover the costs of socialization to these many other PIR.
8. An introduction to the FPIC process is mentioned on page 49 as an annex to the R-PP, but appears to be missing.

Conclusion: Standard Largely Met

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 standard is **partially met**. We encourage Honduras to consider the following comments:

1. More specific information on the first budget item (study on drivers in selected areas) would be appreciated (e.g. ToRs). Currently it seems more like an input to the construction of the reference level than an in-depth assessment of the identified governance challenges. While a study on drivers in specific regions will provide important insights on land use dynamics in deforestation hot spots (e.g. agricultural frontier), institutional drivers (tenure, weak law enforcement) as well as the analysis of past successes and failures (e.g. community forest management) might be better addressed at a more general, national level.
2. It would be useful to prioritize the causes of deforestation and to provide an estimate of each cause's percent contribution to the total deforestation.
3. Illegal logging has been identified as a direct driver of deforestation - studies and workshops are activities being proposed to address this issue. It has been noted that the reality of safety and security of rural community members working in the forest to promote SFM has not been mentioned. The role of national enforcement agencies and their potential role in monitoring and enforcement in areas where illegal logging is more prominent has not been mentioned despite acknowledging illegal logging accounts for 30-40% of total harvested volume nationally.
4. The R-PP does not provide an adequate assessment of major land tenure and natural resource rights and related governance issues. It is recommended that the R-PP is reinforced on these aspects. E.g. there is little information provided about irregularities in land titling as a driver of deforestation, although addressing this via e.g. re-nationalization of forest land titles becomes a major strategy option under 2b). Some information is provided under 2c) but maybe would be better placed under 2a).
5. A work plan indicating the timeline and responsibilities for the studies and outreach workshops would be appreciated.

Further comments on fine-tuning the document:

6. Figures should be made consistent throughout the text and the tables (e.g. p. 73, the sum of the different types of forest areas, and Table 13 on p. 77).
7. It would be best if deforestation rates could also be expressed in terms of the rate of loss in percentage of the remaining forest area each year within the given period, as is the standard. The authors could also use the results found in FAO's Global Forest Resource Assessment for 2010. Annual change rates for forest area in Honduras are quoted as being -2.38, -1.95 and -2.36 for each of the respective periods, which is among the highest rates of deforestation in the world. Total area

of forest and other wooded lands is also estimated in the FRA and these figures could also be used.

8. It is not clear in the R-PP if the various areas quoted for forest are actually covered in trees or forest or if in some instances the number refers to the areas belonging to the forest estate even though some of these may no longer have any trees on them. A definition of “forest area” would be useful.
9. Table 14 could be improved by clarifying how much of the total forest area is public and how much is private. The figure for private appears accurate, but all of the other categories may actually be under the public domain and where the management rights of forests are under the public administration. More information on the types of land tenure and management rights existing for each of these categories could be provided in the table.
10. New text generally mentions a statistical portal (SNIF) - this section could be strengthened by providing more details on the role of the SNIF, specifically in providing an authoritative information source and addressing challenges such as standardizing land-use data and mapping; methodologies to estimate deforestation; and filling gaps relating to catastral information.

Conclusion: Standard Partially Met

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:

The R-PP presents a number of ongoing and planned strategies to reduce deforestation and forest degradation, but is not entirely clear in linking the strategies to the drivers discussed in the previous section. The standard is **partially met**. We recommend Honduras to consider the following comments:

1. The R-PP suggests to analyze various ongoing forest sector strategies, to understand how they can successfully support REDD+ objectives by contributing to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. It does not, however, include the FLEGT VPA process, which by targeting illegality in the forest sector and focusing on strengthening law enforcement, directly addresses some of the key drivers of deforestation in Honduras, as identified in section 2.a.
2. We appreciate that the R-PP will give the chance to Honduras to analyze and unite all of

the strategies presented in this proposal, and to fix all some of the existing gaps and inconsistencies. However The R-PP discusses in detail strategies targeting the forest sector, overlooking the role of other sector strategies (agriculture, livestock, hydropower, fuel wood). Hence, most proposed REDD+ strategy options are limited to the forest sector and will likely not address all drivers or create sufficient cross-sectoral ownership (e.g. agriculture). What may be missing is a strategy that spans all relevant government institutions in a national effort endorsed by the highest level of government, using a multi-sector approach with actions from a multitude of government agencies.

3. While the analysis and revision of strategies is helpful, particular attention should be paid to their implementation and enforcement through institutions with clear mandates and with enough budget to accomplish them. Between SERNA and ICF many actions may be done through the coordination of complementary actions or by the unification of some key departments which currently work with not enough complementary results (e.g. on watershed management or protected areas/biodiversity).
4. The alignment each identified driver with its associated REDD+ strategy option would be helpful in order to see whether all drivers are addressed and to better understand the logic behind it. Figure 8 does not align but only lists everything in one page. Some strategy options (e.g. eliminating irregular titling in national forest lands by re-nationalization) don't seem to be based on a previous drivers analysis.
5. Even though a comprehensive approach is recommended, prioritization will be needed as well. Currently, the RPP does not discuss the feasibility or cost-benefit-analysis of different strategy options. A first prioritization seems to have taken place via the budget but is not discussed in the text. There seem to be no budget items for the strategy options relating to community forestry (also inconsistent between table 2b2 and figure 8) or illegal trade. Under 2b.2 a sub-option is proposed which aims at eliminating incentives leading to unsustainable land uses, but it is unclear from the budget how this initial idea is going to be further expanded and integrated in the REDD+ strategy.
6. A workplan that outlines responsibilities and a timeline for integrating the planned studies with SESA and the consultation of the final REDD+ strategy would be appreciated.
7. The impact of current financial policies as drivers of deforestation - eg., if any subsidies or financial benefits are given to ranchers - may be underestimated here, compared to the problems caused by unclear land titling (admittedly lack of titling is a major driver). It may be useful to look a little more closely at the subsidies, incentives, relative prices that drive deforestation as well.
- 8.

Further comments on fine-tuning the document:

9. In Table 18: other potential economic benefits from the implementation of REDD+ could include less damage to existing infrastructure from weather related natural disasters like flooding and land slides, and also less costs related to disaster relief and reconstruction.
10. Recent revisions to the R-PP include a brief mention of a regionalized watershed delineated approach (6 regions and 16 subregions) for advancing planning and policy development related to reducing deforestation in a national REDD+ framework. However, what appears to be lacking is a description of how this approach will be used and/or integrated with several different activities, programs, policies and consistent and logical manner.

11. On p. 96-97: information provided for “7. Estrategia Nacional de Biodiversidad” and for “9. Plan Estrategico del ICF” are incomplete.
12. In Table 17, p. 97: it may be useful to describe the size of the funds described in No. 1 and 2.
13. More explanation would be needed about why the privatization of control posts would be an adequate strategy option for addressing illegal logging and corruption.

Conclusion: Standard Partially Met

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

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

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

The proposed process for defining the REDD+ implementation framework appears adequate and fulfilling standards required. The standard is **partially met**, and the reviewers recommend Honduras to consider the following:

1. The issue of indigenous communities’ carbon rights should be further clarified, as the R-PP reiterates on this point that their rights are established in art. 45 of the LFAPVS, which however only recognizes their right on lands where they are traditionally located, and does not explicitly mention the issue of carbon rights or other benefits from the forests. It would be useful to attach terms of reference of the study which has been recently launched on legal and institutional framework, carbon ownership and land tenure.
2. The proposal to assign carbon rights to land owners or to forest management contractors is welcome and will be beneficial for fair benefit-sharing. However, some consideration should also be given to the responsibilities of public institutions (e.g. forest control, land use planning, agricultural extension services) or the forest stewardship services provided by customary land users without formal titles or forest management contracts. The concept of benefit-sharing may not be limited to PES schemes with land owners, but could include all actors effectively contributing to reducing deforestation, forest degradation, conserving or enhancing forest carbon stocks.
3. It appears from section 2c.1 that the ICF is the main government agency tasked with elaborating and communicating the national REDD+ strategy. It is not clear if they are also the ones tasked with implementation, but this appears to be the assumption. Apart from ICF, it is not clear which government agencies might be involved in REDD+ implementation and what roles and responsibilities each will have. It is also not clear how different government agencies will work together and by whose authority they will be directed to do so. The component could be strengthened by a work plan linking proposed activities to current institutions.
4. There is little to no consideration given to the potential need for a REDD+ registry or the institutional set-up for REDD+ financial mechanism (e.g. Trust Fund).

5. On p. 108, the four primary objectives of the La Visión de País and their associated targets could be included in section 2c.1.

Conclusion: Standard Partially Met

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

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence 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:

The R-PP provides a generic description of the SESA process, focusing on its objectives and failing to outline in detail the steps foreseen. The standard is **partially met**:

1. It is not clear how the ex-ante study to evaluate social and environmental impacts of REDD+ is going to feed back into the finalization of the REDD+ strategy options discussed in 2.b. A workplan with responsibilities and a timeline for integrating SESA with the process of the elaboration of the REDD+ strategy and the monitoring system would be appreciated.
2. This section testifies the commitment of the government of Honduras to assess ex-ante and monitor ex-post the social and environmental impacts of REDD+. More detailed information and budgets on SESA are to be found in component 4b) - which would be better placed here. It would be useful to include ToRs for the ex-ante study.
3. The ex-post monitoring of impacts would be covered by component 4b), based on SESA results.
4. We welcome the positive approach taken by Honduras in anchoring the SESA tool in the national legislation on environmental and social issues. It would also be necessary to clarify which consequences the ESMF will have if not legal consequences similar to those of environmental impact studies, as is stated on page 118.

Conclusion: Standard Partially Met

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:

Component 3 appears solid and fulfilling standards required. A sub-national approach is proposed, as a transitory measure towards a national approach. The steps required for the development of a reference level, as well as the institutions involved, existing capacity and additional requirements are clearly identified in the proposal. The standard is **met**. However, the reviewers would like to make the following recommendations for RPP implementation:

1. Within the suggested work plan, it is important to take into account the results of the national consultation and coordination process.
2. It is not quite clear how much the modeling of projected future deforestation will impact the reference level. The text outlines several activities, but the budget seems to cover it only marginally. Considering the country context (high historical deforestation) and high costs for filling data gaps, international expertise and capacity building, constructing a simpler reference level based on historical data only might be more recommendable.
3. Capacity building requirements for several government institutions and academia are listed but don't seem to be covered in the budget. Sufficiently covered under component 4a)? Hardware needs are covered only for ICF not for the other institutions involved. The standards should not be set too high in order to make the system more transparent and sustainable for the whole country.

Conclusion: Standard Met

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 component is a great step forward from the version included in the December 2011 draft of the R-PP, and is now fulfilling standards required. The ambitious proposal extensively discusses data requirements and early ideas on the development of a measurement, reporting and verification system for REDD+. It also clearly identifies the actors involved and the steps to be taken, and suggests a system that appropriately integrates participatory approaches by forest stakeholders. The standard is **met**. However, the reviewers recommend Honduras to consider the following:

1. Given the challenge of implementing such an ambitious strategy for the development of a measurement, reporting and verification system for REDD+, it cannot be overemphasized to consider existing capacities and capacity requirements not only as regards short-term trainings, but also, to make the system more sustainable, long-term needs, such as university training, should be considered as well. (If understood correctly, Honduras suggests to also monitor indicators related to capacity building and the implementation of the REDD+ strategy. This comprehensive approach to monitoring is very welcome. It would be helpful to include references to table 30 under component 4b) and component 6)).
2. Might want to rethink forest definition with regards to a cost-benefit analysis for MRV requirements. Larger forest area (everything with 10 % crown closure) also means higher costs for MRV.

Conclusion: Standard Met

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:

The standard is largely met:

1. The last version of the draft provides an extensive description of the SESA process, which would be more appropriate under 2.d. Equally, the budget items on SESA and ESMF should be moved to section 2d).
2. While information on planned monitoring of social, environmental and other impacts is provided in detail, it is recommended to explore synergies with existing data collection (national statistics, research) in order to prevent over-burdening the social and biodiversity impact monitoring system and hence make it more sustainable. The R-PP does not yet provide an adequate account of plans to monitor, report and verify the governance impacts of REDD+.
3. Some questions related to the budget: It is not clear why the budget for environmental baseline data is so much higher than for social baseline data. Budget item for the proposed studies on co-benefits in selected areas seems to be missing. The mentioned capacity building requirements for government institutions as well as stakeholders (participatory monitoring) don't seem to be reflected in the budget. The largest budget item (Design and implementation of a monitoring plan) is included twice, accounting 117000 \$ each.

Conclusion: Standard Largely Met

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

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

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

It is impressive how far Honduras has come already without any FCPF funding to date. This section provides very helpful tables of the aggregated budget items as well as a timeline for the implementation of RPP components.

All individual budgets need to be revised carefully in order to make sure they correspond to what is stated in the texts. Other funding sources should be made more explicit wherever information is available and state whether the anticipated financial contributions from other donors have been already secured. This will also help to improve donor-coordination and identify financing gaps.

It would also be helpful to have some indication of which items are priorities for funding by outside donors. Many of the excellent plans in the document simply cannot happen if they don't get funded. Which of the actions are critical to the Government of Honduras? Perhaps some exercise could be carried out to indicate priorities for funding.

Conclusion: Standard Largely Met

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6: The R-PP adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.

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

The standard is largely met:

1. The M&E Framework is largely based on input and output indicators, e.g. workshops held or studies carried out. More consideration should be given to the desired outcomes. For example there is no indicator on whether a national REDD+ strategy has been approved, or whether a national registry and Grievance Mechanism are operational.
2. A budget for this component is missing.
1. The R-PP does not discuss how the evaluation framework and possible corrective measures are going to be implemented.

Conclusion: Standard Largely Met