

TAP Review of the R-Package submitted by Indonesia¹

September 2017

¹ This TAP Expert Review consisted of a desk study of Indonesia's R-package report and of review of additional documentation on Indonesia's REDD+ readiness process. The review was carried out by Simon Rietbergen, independent TAP Expert, between August 24th and September 11th 2017.

Table of Contents

CORE TASKS OF THE TAP EXPERT REVIEW	3
METHODS APPLIED FOR THE TAP EXPERT REVIEW	3
TAP REVIEW PART A: REVIEW OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND THE DOCUMENTATION	6
TAP REVIEW PART B: SUMMARY OF THE REDD+ PROCESSES – STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE R PACKAGE AS HIGHLIGHTED BY INDONESIA’S SELF-ASSESSMENT.....	13
COMPONENT 1: READINESS, ORGANIZATION AND CONSULTATION.....	15
COMPONENT 2: REDD+ STRATEGY PREPARATION	19
COMPONENT 3: REFERENCE LEVELS/EMISSION REFERENCE LEVELS (CRITERIA 26-28, READINESS SCORE: GREEN)	28
COMPONENT 4: MONITORING SYSTEMS FOR FORESTS AND SAFEGUARDS	30
TAP REVIEW PART C: SUMMARY ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE PC.....	33

Core Tasks of the TAP Expert Review

1. The present document contains the independent review by the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) of the Self-Assessment Process of the R-Package² undertaken by Indonesia through a participatory multi-stakeholder consultation process. The purpose of the review is to assess both progress and achievements of REDD+ Readiness in the country, as well as the remaining challenges (if any) that will need to be addressed to make the transition from Readiness to implementation of performance-based REDD+ activities.
2. The TAP-review is a background document for the Participants Committee (PC) in its decision-making process on the endorsement of the R-Package. The endorsement of the R-Package is a prerequisite for the formal submission of Indonesia's Emissions Reduction Program Document (ER-PD) to the PC. Indonesia's ER Program is planned for implementation at sub-national level, through the East Kalimantan provincial emission reductions program.³ This program, a revised version of which was submitted to FCPF in April 2016, is planned to deliver 22 million tCO₂eq of emissions reductions to the FCPF Carbon Fund between 2019 and 2024. East Kalimantan Province, together with South Sumatra Province, were selected for performance-based REDD+ activities (and for sub-national REDD+ Readiness assessments in preparation for the R-Package report), because these Provinces have: (i) high forest cover and high biodiversity; (ii) varied REDD+ related programs facilitated by multiple agencies (including the Ministry of Forestry, The Nature Conservancy, the German International Technical Cooperation agency and the World Wildlife Fund; (iii) a need for additional mechanisms to support local government commitments to sustainable natural resource management; and (iv) they were chosen by the REDD+ Task Force in 2010 as pilot provinces for the national REDD+ implementation model.

Methods Applied for the TAP Expert Review

3. This TAP Expert Review of the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process of REDD+ in Indonesia follows the FCPF R-Package Assessment Framework guide and benefits from the experience gained with a number of previous reviews that were done since the first was completed in DR Congo in April 2015. The TORs for the current TAP expert review are as follows:
 - Perform an independent review of Indonesia's self-evaluation of progress in

² The purpose of the R-Package is threefold: (i) Provide an opportunity to REDD Country Participants to self-assess the progress on REDD+ implementation; (ii) Demonstrate a REDD Country Participant's commitment to REDD+ Readiness; and (iii) Generate feedback and guidance to REDD Country Participants through a national multi-stakeholder self-assessment and Participants' Committee (PC) assessment processes (FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework guide June 2013).

³ The full name of the ER Program is "Towards a Greener and Developed East Kalimantan: a provincial emission reductions program in Indonesia. This document can be accessed through <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2016/May/Indonesian%20ER-PIN%2020160429%20Final.pdf>

- REDD+ Readiness, using the methodological framework of the FCPF Assessment Framework for consistency;
- Review Indonesia's documentation of stakeholders' self-assessment, including the process that was used for the self-assessment and the reported outcome;
 - Review key outputs (and the documents that underpin these) referenced in the R-Package, including documents pertaining to the national REDD+ strategy, the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), reference levels and forest monitoring, and national institutional structures;
 - Provide constructive and targeted feedback, highlighting strengths and weaknesses in subcomponents, and propose actions going forward.
4. To perform this task, a simple methodology has been applied which consists of the following steps:
- Step A: Review the self-assessment process of REDD+ Readiness based on Indonesia's R-package report and supporting documentation. Box 1 below provides the outline of Indonesia's R-package report.
 - Step B: Review of the results from the multi-stakeholder R-Package self-assessment process, based on the same report.
 - Step C: Assess what still needs to be done to further the readiness process.
5. The purpose of the TAP's expert review is not to second-guess the outcomes of the country's self-assessment, as this is based on a comprehensive multi-stakeholder process that was guided by the FCPF's readiness assessment framework. The review should rather focus on determining whether a due process and approach was followed while performing the self-assessment, and provide constructive feedback to the FCPF Participants Committee.

Box 1: Outline of Indonesia's R-Package Report:

"REDD+ Readiness Self-Assessment for Indonesia submitted to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)"

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

2. THE REDD+ READINESS IN INDONESIA

2.1 READINESS ORGANIZATION AND CONSULTATION

2.1.1 National REDD+ Management Arrangements

2.1.2 Consultation, participation and outreach

2.2 REDD+ Strategy Preparation

2.2.1 Assessment of land use, land-use change drivers, Forest Law, Policy and Governance

- 2.2.2 REDD+ Strategy options
- 2.2.3 Implementation Framework
- 2.2.4 Social and Environmental Impacts
- 2.2.5 Funding Instruments and Benefit Sharing Mechanisms

2.3 Reference Levels/Emission Reference Levels (RL/ERL)

2.4 Forest Monitoring System and Safeguards

- 2.4.1 National Forest Monitoring System
- 2.4.2 Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance and Safeguards

3. GAP ANALYSIS AND WAY FORWARD

4. PARTICIPATORY SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

- 4.1 Scope and scale
- 4.2 Framework
- 4.3 Processes
 - 4.3.1 Preparing for the Assessment
 - 4.3.2 Conducting the Assessment
 - 4.3.3 Communicating the Assessment Outcome

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

REFERENCES

ANNEXES:

- Annex 1: R Package Assessment Framework
 - Annex 2: R-Package Assessment Results from the East Kalimantan workshop
 - Annex 3: R-Package Assessment from the South Sumatra workshop
 - Annex 4: R-Package Final Assessment Results
-

TAP Review Part A: Review of the Self-Assessment Process and the Documentation

This part of the TAP report provides feedback on the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process, as documented in the R-package report.

5. ***Self-Assessment process conducted according to the R-Package guidelines.***⁴ The multi-stakeholder consultation process for the self-assessment of Indonesia's REDD+ Readiness was undertaken between the beginning of August 2016, when preparations started, and October 25th, when the final validation workshop was held. Following the FCPF guidelines⁵, Indonesia's self-assessment process was divided in three main stages: preparation; conducting the assessment and communicating its outcomes. The process was funded by FCPF and the national budget. The organization chosen to conduct the self-assessment process was the Research Center for Social, Economy, Forest Policy and Climate Change (P3SEKPI), who recruited several consultants for the assignment. P3SEKPI falls under the authority of the Forestry Research, Development and Innovation Agency (BLI) of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK). Preparatory work included organization of the self-assessment team and identification of facilitators, sponsors and stakeholders to be consulted.
6. The inception workshop for the self-assessment was held on September 1st in Jakarta. Its objectives were to: (i) inform relevant stakeholders of Indonesia's REDD+ Readiness activities; (ii) update stakeholders on REDD+ Readiness progress; (iii) identifying and agreeing the self-assessment methodology, including criteria and evidence to be used; and (iv) conducting the Readiness self-assessment. As a result of discussions in the inception workshop, the FCPF assessment methodology was slightly adapted to take account of Indonesia's national circumstances, by adding a new sub-component 2e, Funding Instrument and Benefit Sharing.⁶
7. The assessment was conducted in the form of focus group discussions, with participants divided into four groups.⁷ Each group discussed and assessed the diagnostic questions for the relevant criteria, agreed on a progress indicator (color score) and documented the evidence for the score.⁸ In order to obtain the REDD+ readiness scores for all items at each

⁴ The following account of the assessment process is based on the R-Package report. Reports and other documents from the four stakeholder workshops held are available on the P3SEKPI website on <http://puspijak.org/index.php/front/content/fcpf>

⁵ FCPF 2013. A Guide to the FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework. The World Bank, Washington D.C.

⁶ The criteria used to assess this new sub-component 2e were: Funds management capacity, Availability of funds and Benefit Sharing Mechanism, two of which were developed during the workshop.

⁷ Group 1: National REDD+ Strategy: Policy, Regulation and Governance; Group 2: FREL, NFMS and MRV; Group 3: Funding Instrument and Benefit Sharing Mechanism; Group 4: Safeguard Information System

⁸ The evidence for the color scores of the two sub-national workshops and the final validation workshop is summarized in Annexes 2, 3 and 4 of the R-Package report.

level (diagnostic question, criteria, sub-component and component) of the Readiness Assessment Framework hierarchy, color scores were assigned for each item, starting with the diagnostic questions, and moving up the hierarchy from there. Once all the items at a given level had been scored, the scores were averaged to calculate the readiness score for the related higher-level item in the hierarchy.⁹ These steps were repeated until all the components had been completed. The final result of this analysis was presented in the validation workshop. Some of the diagnostic questions were not scored in the virtual survey or in the validation workshop, because the participants did not have the expertise and other reasons. For these cases, it was assumed that the scores corresponded with those assigned by the inception workshop.

Table 2. Institutional affiliation of participants in the self-assessment¹⁰

NO.	PARTICIPANT	NATIONAL INCEPTION WORKSHOP		SUB-NATIONAL WORKSHOP (East Kalimantan)		SUB-NATIONAL WORKSHOP (South Sumatera)		VALIDATION WORKSHOP	
		Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
1.	Central Government	13	24.5	2	4.8	3	7.3	8	15.7
2.	Provincial Government	0	0.0	17	40.5	10	24.4	3	5.9
3.	District Government	0	0.0	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0
4.	NGO	8	17.0	5	11.9	0	0.0	5	9.8
5.	Research and Academic Institutions	26	49.1	11	26.2	17	41.5	23	45.1
6.	Private Sector	1	1.9	3	7.1	6	14.6	8	15.7
7.	International Institution	5	7.5	1	2.4	1	2.4	4	7.8
8.	Community	0	0.0	2	4.8	3	7.3	0	0.0
	Total	53	100.0	42	100.0	41	100.0	51	100.0
	Male	26	49.1	34	81.0	33	80.5	30	58.82
	Female	27	50.9	8	19.0	8	19.5	21	41.18

8. Twenty-one experts from various REDD+ areas of expertise (policy, FREL/RL, MRV and forest and carbon inventory, social and environmental safeguards, funding and benefit sharing mechanisms) were then invited to complete a virtual survey, from September 26th to October 16th.¹¹ Six

⁹ The numerical boundaries assigned to the four colour scores in order to calculate the average scores were as follows: GREEN (significant process), 3.25-4.00; YELLOW (progressing well, further development required), 2.50-3.25; ORANGE (further development required), 1.75-2.50; RED (not yet demonstrating progress), 1.00-1.75.

¹⁰ This table is from p. 81 of the R-package report. The names of the institutions represented at the four workshops are provided on pp. 81-85 of the report.

¹¹ The list of the 21 experts invited is in Annex 5 of the R-Package report.

experts responded and provided valuable input for the self-assessment results.

9. Subnational workshops were conducted in Samarinda, East Kalimantan Province and in Palembang, South Sumatra Province, on October 7th and 10th, 2016, respectively, to ascertain REDD+ progress and conduct the self-assessment of REDD+ Readiness at sub-national level. The detailed self-assessment results of these workshops are provided in Annexes 2 and 3 of the R-Package report.¹²
10. The final validation workshop of the self-assessment process was conducted on October 25th in Jakarta, inviting all relevant stakeholders from both the national and sub-national levels. All major stakeholder groups were represented at the four workshops, which brought together 187 people – more than 40% of whom were women (see Table 2 above). The final workshop was aimed at “proofing, correcting, validating and creating national agreement on the self-assessment results of the REDD+ Readiness self-assessment for Indonesia”. The final validation workshop also served to start the dissemination of the assessment results.
11. In the process of evaluating progress for assigning the REDD+ Readiness scores, participants at the multi-stakeholder assessment workshops also conducted an extensive discussion of strengths and weaknesses of the country’s progress for each of the sub-components, and came up with many proposed activities to further improve REDD+ readiness. These discussions were summarized in Table 3.1 on pp. 75-81 of the R-Package report, “Strengths and weaknesses analysis and proposed strategy to complete the Readiness Phase”. Finally, the activities and strategies from Table 3.1 were summarized and prioritized in Table 3.2 of the R-Package report, “Timeline and priority setting of improvements” (pp. 81-85), which also indicates responsible entities and possible funding sources. This table will be a useful planning tool for the completion of Indonesia’s REDD+ Readiness phase.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework was used conscientiously during the self-assessment process, in a slightly adapted form to take account of Indonesia’s national circumstances. Holding stakeholder workshops at both national (inception and validation workshops) and provincial level (assessment workshops in East Kalimantan and South Sumatra) allowed for meaningful participation of many stakeholder groups. The validation workshop held with representatives from all stakeholder groups allowed for a thorough consolidation, in a transparent manner, of the many useful conclusions and recommendations of the multi-stakeholder assessment process. The activities and strategies identified for completion of REDD+ Readiness during the assessment process have been summarized and prioritized in the R-Package report. This will be helpful as Indonesia moves towards completion of the REDD+ Readiness phase.*

¹² The detailed answers the participants provided for each of the diagnostic questions are posted on the P3SEKPI website <http://puspijak.org/index.php/front/content/fcpf> (in Indonesian)

12. **Facilitation of the self-assessment consultation process.** The R-Package report provides quite a bit of detail on the stakeholder workshops but there is less information on how the self-assessment process was facilitated, e.g. it is not made clear how the participants in the different consultation workshops were selected. Nevertheless, the consultation process appears to have been well-structured, with the dividing up of the discussions into four focus groups, enabling participants to contribute to the subjects they were most familiar with, and allowing sufficient time for in-depth discussion. All consultation workshops started with thorough information sharing on REDD+ progress, and a transparent scoring system was devised for the self-assessment. DG-CC's decision to task the research body P3SEKPI with the facilitation of the self-assessment process, rather than taking it on themselves, no doubt also helped to make the process facilitation more neutral. In one respect, Indonesia went above and beyond the FCPF's R-package user guide, which states that "producing an R-package will largely entail the compilation and synthesis of previously prepared information, and a national multi-stakeholder exercise." The idea of bringing the self-assessment closer to the field by holding two sub-national REDD+ Readiness assessment workshops was useful in providing a different perspective, and it allowed direct representation of forest communities in the self-assessment discussions.

13. Finally, judging from the critical conclusions and extensive recommendations that resulted from the self-assessment process (as summarized in Annex 2 of the R-Package report), it appears that the four self-assessment workshops were well-facilitated.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Though Indonesia's R-Package report provides limited information on the facilitation of the self-assessment workshops, it is clear that the process was largely transparent and participatory, allowing a diversity of stakeholders to have their say. DG-CC's decision to assign the responsibility for facilitating the self-assessment process to the forest and climate change research agency P3SEKPI – rather than taking it on themselves no doubt also helped to make the process more neutral. The holding of two sub-national stakeholder consultation workshops in addition to the national-level ones brought the self-assessment process closer to the field, and allowed for direct participation of forest community representatives in East Kalimantan and South Sumatra Provinces. Finally, the good quality of the stakeholder inputs made during the self-assessment workshop, as reported in the R-package report, provides additional evidence on the quality of process facilitation.*

14. **Time frame and development of the Readiness Process.**¹³ Indonesia has been carrying out REDD+ related activities since 2006, when the Ministry of Forestry started its collaboration with the Indonesian Forest and Climate Change Alliance (IFCA), to assess how it could reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.¹⁴ In 2007, the

¹³ The following information has been summarized from the R-Package report and from the FCPF website and the documents posted there.

¹⁴ See MoFor 2008. IFCA 2007 Consolidation Report: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Indonesia, published by the Forestry Research and Development Agency of

Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS) solicited inputs on possible climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts from all the sector agencies, for integration into the National Action Plan on Climate Change, to which the Ministry of Forestry also contributed. The country has been engaged in several REDD+ financing mechanisms, through bilateral, regional and international cooperation arrangements, investing in technology development and transfer as well as capacity building. The Indonesia-Norway REDD+ Partnership was formed in May 2009, with a view to achieve significant GHG emissions reductions through reduced deforestation, degradation and peatland conversion. Indonesia also sponsored home-grown innovations, such as the Indonesia Climate Change Trust Fund, which aims to improve national coordination on climate change related grants and funds management. Indonesia formally started collaboration with the FCPF in May 2009, when it submitted its Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) to the FCPF Participants' Committee. In June 2011, Indonesia signed a US\$3.6 million Readiness Grant with the World Bank in June 2011, to fund analytical work, support of the readiness process, REL and MRV, and regional data collection and capacity building. The updated mid-term progress report was completed in May 2014.¹⁵ In October 2014, an initial Emission Reduction Project Idea Note (ER-PIN) for seven districts in four provinces was presented to the FCPF.¹⁶ This was followed by a revised ER-PIN, focusing solely on East Kalimantan Province, in June 2016.¹⁷ In November 2016, an additional US\$5 million additional Readiness grant was signed with the World Bank. The institutional responsibility for leading REDD+ has shifted three times, from the Indonesian National Council on Climate Change (DNPI), which was established in 2008, to the REDD+ Task Force in 2010, to the REDD+ Agency in 2015, and then to the current lead agency, the Directorate-General of Climate Change (DG-CC) in the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. In 2016, the forest reference emissions level (FREL) submitted by Indonesia was verified by the UNFCCC's technical assessment process.¹⁸ In summary, Indonesia is already in transition from the readiness to the investment phase of REDD+, and, following the completion of its R-Package, aims to move to the third REDD+ phase of results-based payments for verified emission reductions from deforestation and forest degradation.

the Ministry of Forestry, accessible through the R-PP May 2009 tab on the Indonesia page on the FCPF website, <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/indonesia>

¹⁵ See

https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2014/May/Mid%20Term%20progress%20Report%20Indonesia%20May%202014_0.pdf

¹⁶ The initial ER-PIN covered an area of 12.5 million ha, with more than 4 million ha of forests in the Provinces of Jambi (Sumatra), Central Kalimantan, East Kalimantan and Central Sulawesi.

¹⁷ The revised ER-PIN covers the entire province of East Kalimantan, with an estimated 6.8 million ha of forests on a total area of 12.7 million ha.

¹⁸ The FREL submission can be accessed on

http://redd.unfccc.int/files/frel_submission_by_indonesia_final.pdf

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the timeline and milestones of Indonesia's REDD+ preparation and readiness activities since 2007 are not systematically explained in the R-package report, therefore the TAP review has briefly summarized them from the R-Package report and the FCPF website. Many of the elements needed for performance-based REDD+ emissions reductions payments are now in place, including a FREL verified by UNFCCC. Going forward, the R-package report does provide a thorough assessment of the current level of Readiness of each of the sub-components and a time-bound work program for the remaining activities needed to consolidate the REDD+ Readiness Phase, which is of course the main purpose of the R-Package report.*

15. **Stepwise approach to implementation of REDD+.** Indonesia has chosen to adopt a stepwise approach to REDD+ implementation, working on REDD+ Readiness nationally, but at the same time developing sub-national Emissions Reduction Programs in various regions, of which the East Kalimantan Province one, for which an ER-PIN was submitted to FCPF in late 2016, is among the most advanced. The choice of the East Kalimantan Province is justified by its high forest cover – and related considerable potential for emissions reductions - and its outstanding biodiversity, among others.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: adopting a step-wise approach to developing Indonesia's FREL and ER Program, improving the quality of forest data progressively and expanding the scale of the ER Program to national over time, appears justified by the circumstances of the country. Indonesia's REDD+ program is attractive, due to the combination of considerable greenhouse gas emissions reductions potential and sizable non-carbon benefits (especially biodiversity).*

16. The quality of Indonesia's R-Package report largely met the expectations of the TAP reviewer, though in some instances the R-package text did not do justice to the progress documented in the many high-quality source documents available on the country's three REDD+ websites, as highlighted under (sub-) components 2b and 3.¹⁹ Notwithstanding the brevity of the description of the multi-stakeholder assessment process, it is clear that it was conducted in a participatory and transparent manner. Furthermore, the R-Package report provides a reasonably comprehensive account of the substantive results of the self-assessment process conducted, and of the work that remains to be done to consolidate the REDD Readiness phase.²⁰ Contrary to the situation at the Mid-Term Review in 2014, the readiness scores are now in majority green and yellow, indicating that the REDD+ Readiness process has made considerable progress in recent years.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the Indonesia R-package report provides a representative overview of the advancement of REDD+ Readiness in the country. While the description of the conduct of the multi-stakeholder self-assessment process was somewhat lacking in detail, it was clear the*

¹⁹ It might be worthwhile consolidating these three sites into one single website to reduce the chance of confusion with the general public.

²⁰ For the latter, see Table 3.1 and 3.2 on pages 74-81 and 81-85 of the R-Package report, respectively.

process was participatory and transparent. The conclusions and recommendations of the stakeholder process on how to address remaining gaps in REDD+ Readiness are well-summarized in the R-Package report, and will provide valuable inputs for the remainder of the REDD+ Readiness phase.

TAP Review Part B: summary of the REDD+ Processes – Strengths and Weaknesses of the R-Package as highlighted by Indonesia’s self-assessment

This part of the TAP review focuses on the self-assessment results; progress indicators (color scores) for the ten subcomponents²¹, significant achievements and areas requiring further development.

17. The R-Package report and the documents referenced therein provide sufficient documentation to assess Indonesia’s progress with REDD+ Readiness, as well as progress achieved and challenges remaining.
18. The Executive Summary of the R-Package report briefly explains the self-assessment process, summarizes the color scores for each of the REDD+ Readiness components (2 green, 1 yellow and 1 orange) and highlights key achievements since the Mid-Term Review in 2014. For each of the components, it also highlights some key tasks remaining, such as the necessary intensification of cross-sectoral coordination and the development of the REDD+ Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) under Component 1, the necessary adjustment of the 2012 national REDD+ strategy, the land rights assessment, and the acceleration of the development of laws, regulations and technical decrees under Component 2, the development of a standard for the correlation between national and sub-national FRELs under Component 3, and the development of additional permanent sample plots (PSP) and the improvement of land cover data to detect forest regrowth as well as degradation under Component 4,
19. The chapters describing progress achieved for each of the REDD+ Readiness sub-components start with a short description of the current state of affairs, followed by a table scoring the criteria and diagnostic questions for each of the REDD+ Readiness sub-components and providing the evidence used for attributing the color score. In many chapters, the main text duplicates partially or wholly with the text inserted in the tables, thus making the document somewhat longer than was strictly necessary. Fortunately, most of the key reports documenting REDD+ progress are hyperlinked under the respective chapters. In the following, progress with each of the different REDD+ Readiness components and sub-components is reviewed on the basis of the Indonesia’s self-assessment report.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the R-Package report, in combination with the documents referenced in it, gives a reasonably comprehensive overview of REDD+ Readiness progress in Indonesia.*

20. The overall Readiness assessment in Table 1 of the R-package report, reproduced below, contrasts the color scores for each of the REDD+

²¹ Indonesia added a sub-component 2e called “Funding instruments and Benefit Sharing Mechanisms

Readiness sub-components at the MTR in 2014 (third column), with the average color scores from the R-package report (fourth column). Although one sub-component, “1b Consultation, Participation and Outreach”, scores worse than at MTR, it is clear that significant progress has been achieved since the MTR, with four green, four yellow and two orange scores for the ten sub-components scored, compared to only one green, three yellow and five orange out of the nine sub-components that were scored for the MTR.²²

Table 1. Progress summary at sub-component level at MTR and R-Package²³

COMPONENTS	SUB-COMPONENTS	STATUS AT MTR 2014	STATUS AT R-PACKAGE
1.Readiness Organization and Consultation			Orange
	1a. National REDD+ Management Arrangements	Yellow	Yellow
	1b. Consultation, Participation and Outreach	Green	Orange
2.REDD+ Strategy Preparation			Yellow
	2a. Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change drivers, forest law, policy and governance	Yellow	Green
	2b. REDD+ Strategy options	Orange	Green
	2c. Implementation framework	Orange	Orange
	2d. Social and Environmental Impacts	Orange	Yellow
	2e. Funding instruments and Benefit Sharing Mechanisms	n.a.	Yellow
3.Reference emission level/reference level		Yellow	Green
4.Monitoring system for forests and safeguards			Green
	4a. National Forest Monitoring System	Orange	Yellow
	4b. Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance and Safeguards	Orange	Green

21. For the purpose of preparing the R-Package report, Indonesia also carried

²² As noted above, a new sub-component 2e, Funding instruments and benefit sharing mechanism was added for the purpose of Indonesia’s Readiness self-assessment. This area used to come under 2c, implementation framework. No color scores were assigned at component level at MTR.

²³ This table is summarized from Annex 6, pp. 160-62 of the R-Package report.

out two sub-national self-assessment workshops, in South Sumatra and East Kalimantan provinces, respectively. From these assessments, it appears that REDD+ Readiness in East Kalimantan has achieved much more progress than either in South Sumatra Province or at the national level, with the sub-components receiving 6 green, 3 yellow and 1 orange score. From the material presented in the R-Package report, it is not possible to assess whether the perceptions of the different stakeholder groups diverged significantly or not, as the self-assessment workshops provided only consolidated scores for the diagnostic questions, criteria, sub-component and components across all stakeholder groups.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the documentation provided does not allow the TAP review to assess any potential differences in the perceptions on REDD+ Readiness of different stakeholder groups, as the readiness scores were attributed by consensus in the workshops.*

Component 1: Readiness, Organization and Consultation

Sub-Component 1a: National REDD+ Management Arrangements (Criteria 1-6, Readiness score: yellow)

22. Operationalization of REDD+ management arrangements. There are two agencies in Indonesia's Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) with climate change related mandates: the Directorate General of Climate Change (DG-CC), which is responsible for the national REDD+ management arrangements, and the Centre for Research and Development in Social, Economy, Policy and Climate Change (known under its Indonesian acronym P3SEKPI), which supports DG-CC. A number of other forest-related Directorates-General under MoEF also provide support for REDD+ to DG-CC. For the management of REDD+ at sub-national (provincial) level, no final decision has yet been taken whether this will be led by the DG-CC's Technical Implementation Unit (UPT), or by a provincial entity such as the REDD+ Working Groups, or another relevant institution established by the provincial Governor. In East Kalimantan province, REDD+ is currently overseen by the East Kalimantan Regional Council on Climate Change, whereas in South Sumatra, it is the REDD+ Working Group. The responsibility for national REDD+ management arrangements has shifted many times in recent years, from the Indonesian National Council of Climate Change (DNPI) in 2008 to the REDD+ Task Force in 2010, to the REDD+ Agency established by Presidential Regulation in 2013 and to DG-CC, which falls under the authority of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, since 2015.²⁴ The DG-CC has the overall leadership over REDD+ in Indonesia, and has coordinated and collaborated with various other national stakeholders, including the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Finance, the National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS), the National Forestry

²⁴ The Presidential regulation No 16/2015 concerning Ministry of Environment and Forestry (and establishing DG-CC) can be accessed at: http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/reddplus/images/resources/peraturan/Perpres_16_Tahun_2015-KLHK.pdf

Council (DKN), the Indonesian National Council on Climate Change (DNPI), universities, NGOs, the private sector, as well as communities.

23. In addition to these line management and coordination arrangements, various networks have been set up to further the consultation and participation of diverse stakeholders in the REDD+ Readiness process, at both national and sub-national level. An example of such networks is the Network of Indonesian Researchers and Scientists on Forests and Climate Change (APIK), which provides scientific support for Indonesia's work on climate change, including REDD+. In addition, networks of implementers have been built at district level in various parts of the country.
24. Unlike many other REDD+ countries, Indonesia does not appear to have a formal cross-sectoral coordination body with a named institutional membership. Instead, this cross-sectoral coordination role falls to the DG-CC, as part of the mandate enshrined by Presidential Regulation 16/2015.²⁵ The R-Package report notes that there is regular coordination and collaboration between DG-CC and other key agencies for decisions on forests and land use such as the Ministry of Finance, BAPPENAS and the Ministry of Agriculture, but does not elaborate on the frequency of such interaction, nor on the issues addressed. DG-CC has a staff complement of 218 officers in national and local offices to lead and supervise REDD+ Readiness activities. However, an additional 81 officers are needed at national level, and 226 officers at local level. There are also 1,755 staff with Manggala Agni, the Fire Rescue Team, posted across the country.
25. **Accountability and transparency.** DG-CC obtains its own budget from the National Budget and Expenditure System (APBN), as per the above-mentioned Presidential Regulation. DG-CC has a highly experienced finance division that manages national budgets as well as donor funds allocated to DG-CC, including those for REDD+. REDD+ expenditure falls under the Ministry of Finance's financial control system, which includes internal and external independent auditors charged with ensuring that expenditure is effective and efficient. DG-CC also provides an online platform for enhanced accountability and transparency.²⁶ Indonesia's REDD+ related information (e.g., study reports, REDD+ consultation meeting minutes and participants lists, public notices) is currently spread over a number of different websites, which makes it hard for outside observers to get a quick overview of progress made with different elements of REDD+ Readiness.²⁷ However, all the stakeholder groups acknowledged that information-sharing with local communities (including women, who are still under-represented) and the private sector

²⁵ The text of this regulation, in Indonesian, can be accessed on http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/reddplus/images/resources/peraturan/Perpres_16_Tahun_2015-KLHK.pdf

²⁶ This platform can be accessed through <http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/>

²⁷ These websites include <http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/> http <http://www.reddplus.go.id/> and Forestry Department websites on the NFMS and the Safeguards Information System CHECK THESE 2

has to be stepped up.

26. Feedback and grievance redress mechanism (criterion 6). The Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) for REDD+ is still in the early stages of development, with very limited implementation experience – at least little feedback or compensation proposals have been received from impacted communities. Currently, the Directorate of Conflict Management, under the Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership (PSKL) is the only part of MoEF that handles feedback and grievances from the public on some topics, but not others – such as forest and land fire, and land conflict, issues that will be key in the implementation of REDD+. There are, however, dedicated web-based systems for complaints on hot spots/forest fires and on land tenure conflicts.²⁸ According to the R-Package report, the FGRM is expected to be completed by 2019.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Indonesia has made significant progress in establishing the REDD+ management arrangements at national level and in some provinces. This translated in a yellow score for sub-component 1a overall, but only one criterion – Operating mandate and budget – had a green score, so the other criteria will require significant work. The mechanisms for multi-sector coordination and cross-sectoral collaboration, as well as the reporting of their results, would benefit from increased transparency, and the feedback and grievance redress mechanism will require a significant effort before it can be considered operational, as noted in the R-Package report. These issues will be revisited under part C of the TAP review report.*

Sub-Component 1b: Consultation, Participation and Outreach (criteria 7-10, Readiness score: orange)

27. Inclusion of stakeholders through an extended consultation, information and participation process (criteria 7, 8 and 10). Stakeholder consultation, information and participation poses special challenges in an archipelago country with 34 Provinces and 514 Districts. The Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), in coordination with other ministries and agencies, has conducted a self-selection process at national level to determine the relevant stakeholders. At sub-national level, self-selection process has been conducted by MoEF, assisted by District or Provincial Forestry Service and other local agencies.²⁹ The R-Package report highlights the four main REDD+ elements on which extensive stakeholder consultations were held. These are: (i) REDD+ Strategy Development, in 2011-2012 in all 34 Provinces; (ii) FREL development, in 2014-2016 at national level; (iii) SIS-REDD+ development

²⁸ These complaints systems are accessible through, respectively, <http://sipongi.menlhk.go.id/home/main> and <http://pskl.menlhk.go.id/pktha/pengaduan/frontend/web/index.php?r=site%2Ftatacara>

²⁹ The procedures for REDD, including stakeholder consultation, are described in the Minister of Forestry Regulation No. P.30/Menhut-II/200930 /Menhut-II/20092009 regarding the Procedure for REDD (*Tata Cara Pengurangan Emisi dari Deforestasi dan Degradasi Hutan (REDD)*)

in 2011-2016 in East Kalimantan, South Sumatra and West Kalimantan Provinces: and (iv) NDC development, ongoing since 2015, in 34 Provinces.³⁰ The stakeholders involved in these consultations were highly diverse, including national government bodies such as the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Planning Agency; academics and research institutions³¹; NGOs³²; and provincial and local government. The outcomes of these consultations have been integrated in the REDD+ management arrangements, strategy development, FREL and NFMS.

28. An information sharing system was developed at both national and sub-national levels, to disseminate general information about REDD+ and climate change, but also more specific REDD+ Readiness information covering policy and strategy, REL and MRV, funding and benefit sharing mechanisms, and social and environmental safeguards. Target audiences were reached through film, books and booklets, leaflets, magazines and newspapers, both on-line and printed – many of these financed by the two FCPF grants. Seminars, workshops and focus group discussions were organized for face-to-face awareness-raising.³³

29. At sub-national level, REDD+ task forces involve multiple stakeholders – including villagers, forest management units, logging companies, district forestry offices – in REDD+ readiness and mitigation measures as well as SFM activities. REDD+ demonstration activities at local level also use participatory mechanisms to reach out to stakeholders. Indigenous peoples have been involved in REDD+ consultations through AMAN³⁴, at national and provincial levels, as well as through informal indigenous peoples' institutions at village level.

30. Quality of stakeholder participation. Yet, while Indonesia has made significant efforts to reach out to REDD+ stakeholders, the R-Package report concludes that these efforts are still falling short of stakeholders' information needs, due to technological limitations, the large area concerned and the complexity of the stakeholders affected by REDD+. Wider participation by women and youth, and local communities more generally, will be essential. A number of strategies have been developed to address these challenges, including (i) coordination with local government agencies and NGOs; (ii) establishment of provincial and district REDD+ working groups; and (iii) establishment of local-level climate change networks. A more effective communications strategy and guidelines for stakeholder consultation processes will also be needed. For

³⁰ See overview table on p.26 of the R-Package report.

³¹ These included FORDA, IPB and ITB (national), and CIFOR and ICRAF (international); NGOs such as AMAN, CI, FFI, TNC, WRI and WWF

³² AMAN, CI, FFI, TNC, WRI and WWF

³³ Active REDD+ projects that contributed to useful information sharing and consultative processes are listed in Annex 5 of the R-Package report.

³⁴ Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago (*Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara/AMAN*), is a formal institution representing indigenous peoples at national level and in some of the provinces.

the purpose of the REDD+ Readiness assessment, it would have been helpful if some more synthetic information on stakeholder consultations (e.g., most frequent concerns expressed in different regions) could have been included in the R-package report.

- 31. Information sharing and accessibility of information (criteria 9).** In addition to the extensive face-to-face consultations and the publication of documents in print and on-line, Indonesia has also reached out to the public through TV and radio programs. But as noted above, even though there are many publication and dissemination activities, the stakeholders in some regions have difficulty accessing REDD+ related information.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: The average score for sub-component 1b was orange, even though Indonesia has invested considerable energy and resources to enable a variety of key stakeholders to have a say in the development of REDD+ Readiness. The R-Package report concluded that efforts should be stepped up to engage local communities, and especially women, youth and indigenous peoples, more fully in the REDD+ process. The R-Package report lays out a number of strategies for doing this, and also signals the need for additional guidelines in this respect. The TAP review notes that the main concerns about REDD+ expressed by stakeholders during the consultation process were not summarized in the R-Package report, and recommends that this information be made available to encourage wider stakeholder participation.*

Component 2: REDD+ Strategy Preparation

Sub-Component 2a: Assessment of land use, land use change drivers, forest law, policy and governance (criteria 11-15, Readiness score: green)

- 32. Assessment of land use trends and analysis of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.** This sub-component has made significant progress since the early assessment work by the Indonesian Forest Carbon Alliance (IFCA), started in 2007.³⁵ Since then, central and local governments, NGOs and private institutions have conducted various assessments and analyses on this topic. REDD+ demonstration activities and projects have also conducted assessment regarding land use changes, (as well as forest laws, policy and governance) to support their implementation, and contribute to the REDD+ strategy overall as well as to support broader purposes beyond projects. Since 2011, Indonesia has used the FCPF grant to support additional assessments, including analysis of deforestation drivers from a development perspective, land use

³⁵ The work on the IFCA report was led by the Ministry of Forestry, and supported by the World Bank, DFID, APCO, Australian Department of Climate Change, CERINDO, CIFOR, ODI, Ecosciences, GTZ, ICRAF, Max Planck Institute, South Dakota State University, TNC, URS, Wetland International, World Resources Institute and WWF. The report is accessible through <http://www.unredd.net/documents/un-redd-partner-countries-181/asia-the-pacific-333/a-p-partner-countries/indonesia-187/national-un-redd-programme-management-including-tors-2778/studies-publications-resources-by-other-initiatives-1543/studies-and-publications-on-redd-1676/1027-indonesia-2008-ifca-consolidation-report-1027.html>

demands and demographics development, as well as identification of priority investments to reduce deforestation and forest degradation, including in East Kalimantan, South Sumatra and Papua Provinces.³⁶

33. There was no easily accessible information in the R-Package report or on the various Indonesian REDD+ websites on the different studies done on drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, or on the Provinces where deforestation and forest degradation are the highest.
34. The R-Package report did not prioritize, or even just list, the direct drivers and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. Indonesia's national REDD+ Strategy document - in many countries a good source of information on these issues - does not contain any systematic information on drivers either.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: The R-package report does not provide a summary of the quantitative findings of the studies on direct drivers and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation in Indonesia, nor do these seem to be available on any of the three REDD+ website. The TAP review recommends that DG-CC upload the reports on a more accessible site as soon as possible. The R-Package report does not explain the methodology used for the analysis and prioritization of direct drivers and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, which makes it hard to assess the relevance of the REDD+ Strategy.*

35. **Natural resources rights, land tenure, governance and implications for forest laws and policies.** These issues were addressed in a 2015 CIFOR report entitled "Forest and land-use governance in a decentralized Indonesia: A legal and policy review".³⁷ The conclusions and recommendations concerning the legal and institutional gaps for REDD+ implementation in Indonesia are not summarized in the R-Package report, but they are highly relevant to REDD+ implementation. Over the past two decades, indigenous peoples' rights and customary laws ("adat") have gained increasing legal recognition – including from the Constitutional Court and the Forest Law – but there are many steps required to map boundaries of indigenous territories, identify land and natural resource management conflicts, and devise local regulations to clarify and define indigenous peoples' rights. This is essential as many government officials, especially those from the National Land Agency (BPN)³⁸ are only willing

³⁶ Many of these recent analyses were consolidated in: Dwiprabowo, H., Djaenudin, D., Alviya, I., and Wicaksono, D. 2014. The Dynamics of Socio-Economic Factors and Land Cover. Center for Climate Change and Forest Policy Research and Development Forestry Research and Development Agency, Bogor, Indonesia, which is accessible through <http://puspijak.org/uploads/buku/Dynamic.pdf>

³⁷ See Ardiansyah F, Marthen AA and Amalia N. 2015. Forest and land-use governance in a decentralized Indonesia: A legal and policy review. Occasional Paper 132. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR, accessible through <http://www.redd-indonesia.org/index.php/publikasi/daftar-publikasi/12914-forest-and-land-use-governance-in-a-decentralized-indonesia-a-legal-and-policy-review>

³⁸ The BPN (Badan Pertahanan Nasional) is part of the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning.

to endorse indigenous rights to lands and forests if these are recognized by local regulations. This would seem to be a key element for Indonesia's evolving REDD+ strategy.

36. The R-Package report mentions the existence of detailed action plans to address natural resource rights, land tenure and governance for the short, medium and long term at both national and sub-national level, including human, technology and financial resources required for their implementation, but does not elaborate on the thematic content of these plans – so it is not clear whether the above-mentioned indigenous peoples' rights issues are covered. The R-Package report also mentions the need for adjusting the REDD+ national strategy – following institutional changes and the GoI's ratification of the NDC – and for improving some sub-national strategies, such as the one for West Kalimantan Province. It also documents some recent legal progress, including the extension of the logging ban in peatland forests and the issuing of regulations by the Ministry of Environment and Forests on the management of forests and land fire and on the Climate Village Program.³⁹
37. The R-Package report refers to REDD+ National and Provincial Strategy documents (which focused on Provinces with large forests and peatland areas) for action plans to address natural resource rights, land tenure and governance, but notes that the clarification of tenure rights as foreseen by the One Map Policy, is a key enabling condition to support the implementation of land use regulations.⁴⁰ The 2012 REDD+ Strategy highlights a number of key legal and regulatory reforms that are relevant in this respect: (i) review and revise the legal framework for resolution of issues relating to land ownership, reclassification and land swaps; (ii) review and revise the legal framework relating to incentives for regions; (iii) accelerate the resolution of spatial planning; (iv) improve law enforcement for the prevention of corruption; (v) strengthen forest governance, including issuance of permits and changes in land use; and (vi) review the legal framework and incentives/disincentives for the private sector.
38. **Carbon rights.** The issue of carbon rights is not mentioned in the R-Package report. Some REDD+ projects are already under implementation in Indonesia, so the issue might have been addressed in the meantime. It is not clear whether the issue of carbon rights *per se* requires further work in the context of REDD+ Readiness – though the issue of the underlying rights to own and use forests is of major concern for REDD+

³⁹ Ministerial Regulations No. P.32/Menlhk/Setjen/Kum.1/3/2016 concerning the Management of Forest and Land Fire, as well as No. P.84/Menlhk/Setjen/Kum.1/11/2016 concerning Climate Village Program.

⁴⁰ The One Map Policy, which is included in Act No.4/2011 on Geospatial information, aims to provide a single, legal recognition of forest and land rights nationwide. As noted in the R-Package report, an interesting case study on the application of this policy is available on [https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/case-study Indonesia One-Map-Policy.pdf](https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/case-study%20Indonesia%20One-Map-Policy.pdf)

implementation, as highlighted above.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: The average score for sub-component 2a is green, but the criteria concerning necessary policy and legal reforms were scored yellow (see below). The issues of governance, land tenure and related resource use rights were addressed in a study entitled “Forest and land-use governance in a decentralized Indonesia: A legal and policy review” published by CIFOR 2015. Neither the legal reforms proposed in the CIFOR study, nor the key policy and legal reforms included in the 2012 National REDD+ Strategy are systematically mentioned in the R-Package report. The R-Package report gives some information on legal progress that has been achieved recently, but it does not provide a broader assessment of the challenge the outstanding legal and policy reforms will pose to REDD+ implementation. The corresponding criterion 14, “Action plans to address natural resource rights, land tenure, governance” is one of the two criteria under sub-component 2a to have been scored yellow, so clearly more work is needed to achieve Readiness on this point. Given the central importance of land and forest use rights for developing incentives and benefit-sharing mechanisms for REDD+, it would be helpful if progress with key reforms on land and forest ownership and use rights since 2015 could be clarified. The R-Package report does not discuss the issues of carbon rights, but this issue may have been addressed in the various ongoing forest carbon emissions reduction projects in Indonesia. It is currently not clear whether any new laws or modifications of existing laws are required to address carbon rights.*

Sub-Component 2b: REDD+ Strategy options (criteria 16-18, Readiness score: green)

39. **REDD+ Strategy.** Indonesia’s National REDD+ Strategy, which was published in 2012, aims to achieve four long-term goals: (i) a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions originating from Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF); (ii) an increase in carbon stocks; (iii) improvement of the preservation of biodiversity; and (iv) an increase in the value and sustainability of the forest’s economic functions. The REDD+ program framework for implementation of the REDD+ strategy consists of five strategic pillars: (i) Development of an Institutional System for REDD+; (ii) Policies and Regulations Reviewed and Strengthened; (iii) Strategic Programs; (iv) Changes to Work Paradigms and Culture; and (v) Stakeholder participation.⁴¹

40. Indonesia’s 2012 REDD+ Strategy was to be implemented over a period of 18 years, with a short, a medium and a long-term goal, as follows: Short-term Goal (2012-2014): focusing on the strategic improvement of institutions and governance systems, as well as of spatial plans and the investment climate, in order to fulfil Indonesia’s commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while maintaining economic growth; Medium-term Goal (2012 – 2020): focusing on the implementation of governance systems in line with policies and procedures developed by forest and peatland management institutions, and their application to the spatial and financial mechanisms developed and established in the previous phase, to

⁴¹ Figure 2.5 on page 36 of the R-Package Framework provides a useful diagram of how the five pillars will work together to achieve the four long-term goals.

achieve the targeted 26-41 percent reduction in emissions by 2020; and Long-term Goal (2012-2030): for Indonesia's forests and land areas to become a net carbon sink by 2030 as a result of the implementation of appropriate policies for sustaining economic and ecosystem service functions of forests.⁴²

41. According to the R-Package report, the REDD+ strategy options were selected via transparent and participatory processes, such as public consultations, workshops, seminars, focus group discussions and other methods, involving national and sub-national entities throughout the country.⁴³ Their social, environmental and political feasibility has been assessed and resulting priorities determined, but they will need increased support from local politics for implementation.⁴⁴ The expected emissions reduction potentials of the proposed REDD+ interventions were not directly estimated because they were difficult to assess. Minor inconsistencies between the priority REDD+ strategy options and other sectoral policies and programs affecting forests (e.g., transportation, mining, agriculture, plantation expansion) appear to have been identified⁴⁵, but the programs put in place to resolve these inconsistencies need higher-level political support to become effective.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the R-package report clearly describes the four long-term goals and the five strategic pillars of Indonesia's REDD+ Strategy, but does not discuss the individual REDD+ strategy options nor on the risks inherent in the strategy. These options and risks, however, are well-explained in the 2012 REDD+ Strategy. Although the overall score assigned to this sub-component was green, two out of the three criteria were scored yellow, confirming that considerable work remains to be done on the REDD+ strategy options – especially on getting buy-in for the REDD+ Strategy and its implementation from other sectors and from local government.*

Sub-Component 2c: Implementation Framework (criteria 19-22, Readiness score: orange)

42. Adoption, and guidelines for implementation, of legislation/regulations (criteria 19 and 20). Since Indonesia first

⁴² This description of the short, medium and long term goals of the REDD+ strategy is not included in the R-Package report, but is taken from pages 4-5 of the REDD+ Strategy, accessible through <http://www.unredd.net/documents/un-redd-partner-countries-181/asia-the-pacific-333/a-p-partner-countries/indonesia-187/15078-indonesia-redd-national-strategy.html> (NB the hyperlink for the Indonesian language version of the National REDD+ Strategy provided in the R-Package report does not work).

⁴³ This statement could not be validated by the TAP review as the 2012 National REDD+ Strategy document contains no references to any consultation processes, nor are any such reports referenced in the R-Package report.

⁴⁴ Again, this statement could not be validated by the TAP review as the R-package report did not refer to any such prioritization processes, nor did the 2012 National REDD+ Strategy document contains any references to such processes.

⁴⁵ Again, the TAP review was unable to validate this statement, as no references to supporting documents were provided in the R-Package report.

engaged on REDD+ in 2007, the country has enacted a number of laws and regulations designed to enable REDD+ programs and activities, including the Presidential Instruction No 10/2011 on Moratorium for New Licenses and Improving Forest Governance of Primary Forests and Peatland, a regulation on forest fire management⁴⁶, and a peatland rehabilitation program, focusing on provinces with large peatland areas.⁴⁷ The above-mentioned Act No. 4/2011 on Geospatial Information instating the One Map Policy put in place a key enabling condition for sustainable forest management.

43. At a more operational level, a key institutional reform has been the establishment of the Forest Management Unit (FMU), which is designed to help improve forest management and increase accountability to local stakeholders.⁴⁸ By 2019, through support from GIZ, the Forest Investment Program (FIP) and other donor programs, 600 FMUs are expected to be operational, compared to 120 by the end of 2014. For FMUs to become fully operational, a number of challenges will need to be addressed, including the development of long-term forest management plans, the deployment of skilled human resources and the establishment of an operational budget for forest management.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Overall, sub-component 2c was given a “orange” score, indicating that a very considerable amount of work is still needed. While many elements of Indonesia’s legal and regulatory framework for enabling REDD+ implementation are already in place, they will need additional political buy-in from other sectors and from local government to become fully operational. As noted in the above-cited study “Forest and land-use governance in a decentralized Indonesia: A legal and policy review” (CIFOR 2015), translation of the formal national-level legal recognition of indigenous peoples’ rights to land and forests into effective respect of such rights at local level will require concerted efforts over large areas to map boundaries of indigenous territories, identify land and natural resource management conflicts, and devise local regulations to clarify and define indigenous peoples’ rights.*

44. **Benefit sharing mechanism (criterion 21, yellow).**⁴⁹ While Indonesia and its REDD+ partners have done considerable work on analyzing the

⁴⁶ See <http://www.menlhk.go.id/berita-211-pengendalian-kebakaran-hutan-dan-lahan-oleh-tim-terpadu-karhutla-kementerian-lingkungan-hidup-dan-ke.html> for a recent update

⁴⁷ The provinces targeted for peatland restoration are Riau, South Sumatera, Jambi, West Kalimantan, South Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, and Papua, see the 2016-2020 strategic plan on [http://brg.go.id/files/RENSTRA%20BRG%202016-2020%20\(November%202016\).pdf](http://brg.go.id/files/RENSTRA%20BRG%202016-2020%20(November%202016).pdf)

⁴⁸ The concept of the FMU, called KPH in Indonesia, is explained (in Indonesian) on http://kph.menlhk.go.id/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&id=118&Itemid=313

⁴⁹ The Indonesian R-package report has re-numbered the Benefit Sharing Mechanism (BSM) criterion (21 in FCPF’s 2013 Readiness Assessment Framework (RAF)) to become criterion 27, as part of a new sub-component 2e, entitled “Funding Instrument and Benefit Sharing Mechanism”. The TAP review maintains the BSM as criterion 21 here for ease of reference of FCPF PC members familiar with the RAF.

possible modalities for the REDD+ Benefit Sharing Mechanism (BSM) and trying out different BSMs in the context of field projects, the proposed rules are still contentious and are under active discussion. The main challenge is the fact that the MoEF does not have the legal authority to set up such regulations, which are under the purview of the Ministry of Finance. BSMs under consideration include vertical ones, where REDD+ benefits are shared among entities vertically, from national to sub-national⁵⁰, and horizontal ones, where REDD+ benefits are shared horizontally among participating entities, e.g., within communities and households, or between communities⁵¹. Some general principles for the BSM are set out in the “Minister of Forestry Regulation No. 30/2009 about the Procedures of Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation - REDD+” and in the “Presidential Regulation No. 80/2011 on Trust Funds”. The Presidential Regulation on the Environmental Fund that is currently being drafted should clarify the modalities for the BSM.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: further dialogue is needed to agree on the modalities of the national REDD+ Benefit Sharing Mechanism (BSM), and to put in place the means for its implementation. The Readiness score assigned to this criterion was yellow.*

45. National REDD+ registry and system monitoring REDD+ activities (criterion 22, orange). The function of the national REDD+ registry is to provide geo-referenced information on location, ownership, carbon accounting and financial flows for sub-national and national REDD+ programs and projects. In Indonesia, the national REDD+ registry has been conceived as a subset of a wider national registration system (SRN) designed to gather information on all climate change mitigation and adaptation activities, in all sectors.⁵² The SRN appears to have all the functionality required (GIS, system to prevent double counting etc.) for registering REDD+ Emission Reductions. This registry was launched in November 2016, but the guidelines for its use are still under development.⁵³

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Indonesia’s R-Package report provides an excellent summary of progress*

⁵⁰ Vertical BSMs include Fiscal Transfer, Specific Allocation Funds (Dana Alokasi Khusus/DAK), General Allocation Funds (Dana Alokasi Umum/DAU), National Program of Community Empowerment (*Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat/PNPM*), and General Services Agency (*Badan Layanan Umum/BLU*). The BLU of Environmental Financing currently operates under a cooperation arrangement between the Finance Ministry and MoEF.

⁵¹ Horizontal BSMs were tried under a number of donor funded Demonstration Area REDD+ projects, as mentioned on page 50 of the R-Package report. Unfortunately, no references to the BSM outputs of these projects were provided.

⁵² Accessible on <http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/srn/>

⁵³ The public manual for SRN can be accessed through http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/reddplus/images/resources/srn/manual_public_srnl.pdf and the project proponent manual is on http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/reddplus/images/resources/srn/manual_proponen_srnl.pdf

achieved with the national REDD+ Registry. The next step would be to finalize the guidelines for the Registry's use, and to test the Registry system in practice. The orange score for this criterion seems to be on the pessimistic side, given the large amount of work already completed.

Sub-Component 2d: Social and Environmental Impacts (criteria 23-25, Readiness score: yellow)⁵⁴

46. ***Social and Environmental Impacts.*** Indonesia's started the development of the Safeguard Information System for REDD+ (SIS-REDD+) in early 2011, by translating the seven REDD+ safeguards from the COP-16 Decision into the national context. A web-based SIS-REDD+ was developed, consisting of two parts: (i) a SIS-REDD+ database to collect, compile and manage the data and information on REDD+ safeguards implementation; and (ii) a web platform for displaying the information gathered.
47. Indonesia since developed three parallel REDD+ safeguards systems: (i) PRISAI (Prinsip, Kriteria, Indikator Safeguards Indonesia)⁵⁵; (ii) REDD+ SES (Social and Environmental Safeguards) ⁵⁶ and (iii) REDD+ PGA (Participatory Governance Assessment), focusing on transparent and effective governance. These three safeguards systems are currently implemented, or tested, with different purposes, at different levels of government. Further work is needed to ensure coherence between principles, criteria and indicators (PCI) in the three safeguard systems with the PCI of SIS-REDD+.
48. The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility requires the use of Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). The SESA serves to ensure that social and environmental issues are integrated in REDD+ preparation. The ESMF is defined as a guide to the screening of the proposed REDD+ Program interventions to ensure that they do not negatively affect the natural and social environment. It is an essential tool for programs where the precise locations where activities will be implemented are not yet known, as is the case with Indonesia's national and sub-national REDD+ Programs.
49. These safeguard instruments, which have not been completed yet in Indonesia, aim to ensure effective management of social and environmental issues, continuing into the REDD+ Implementation and

⁵⁴ In Indonesia's R-package report, the criteria have been renumbered 22-24. The TAP review maintains the original numbering of the FCPF RAF to prevent confusion.

⁵⁵ PRISAI was developed to prevent social and environmental risks in REDD+ implementation and to endorse improved forest and peatlands policies and governance.

⁵⁶ REDD+ SES is a multi-stakeholder, participatory approach to support SIS development in 13 countries since 2009. Indonesia conducted SES pilots in Central and East Kalimantan Provinces, based on stakeholder consultations at provincial and district level.

Payment for Results phases. There is an urgent need to continue SESA and ESMF development, and to conduct pilot tests of these instruments in East Kalimantan.

50. Indonesia has many instruments to provide social and environmental analysis to support safeguards work, but, as noted in the R-Package report, unfortunately these different instruments are separated in different activities, programs or projects.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Indonesia has been engaged in many different safeguards initiatives: SIS-REDD+, PRISAI, REDD+ SES and REDD+ PGA. The resulting fragmentation of the country's environmental and social safeguards work is identified as a problem by the R-Package report. Some form of consolidation of the different instruments may be required. The SESA and ESMF are safeguard instruments required by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. Their completion is urgent if the East Kalimantan Provincial REDD+ ER Program is to go ahead. This sub-component was scored yellow, indicating good progress, but with significant work remaining.*

Sub-Component 2e: Funding Instruments and Benefit Sharing Mechanism (Readiness score: yellow)⁵⁷

51. To account for national circumstances, Indonesia made a slight adjustment in the Readiness Assessment Framework, introducing a new component 2e, Funding Instruments and Benefit Sharing Mechanism. The three criteria for this component include two new ones: Funds management capacity and Availability of Funds (numbered 25 and 26 in the R-Package report, respectively). The third criterion included in this new sub-component in the Indonesian R-Package report is that of the Benefit Sharing Mechanism. This has been discussed as criteria 21 (the original number of the FCPF's Readiness Assessment Framework) to prevent confusion.

52. ***Funds management capacity.*** The funding institution has not been established, but the arrangement for the funding mechanism has. The latter will be in the form of a General Service Agency (Badan Layanan Umum/BLU) of Environmental Financing. The legal basis for this is Law No 23/2009 on Protection and Environment Management. To implement this mechanism, a Government Regulation on Environmental Economics Instrument (Rancangan OO-IELH) needs to be drafted. MoEF is discussing this Regulation with the National Planning Agency (BAPPENAS) and the Ministry of Finance, but it does not control the outcome of this discussion.

53. ***Availability of Funds.*** There is committed funding for REDD+ payments in Indonesia, for example through bilateral and multilateral agreements, through joint crediting mechanism, and the national budget, among

⁵⁷ In Indonesia's R-package report, a sub-component 2e has been added, with criteria numbered 25-27. The TAP review maintains the original numbering of the FCPF RAF to prevent confusion.

others.⁵⁸ But there is still a considerable shortfall – the R-package report notes that an additional US\$98.3 billion will be needed from other sources for climate change related programs over the 2015-2019 period. Specifically, for REDD+ funding the amount available (US\$1.2 billion) is only 1.2 per cent of the US\$100 billion required.

54. ***Benefit Sharing Mechanism.*** This criterion (the original number 21) has been addressed under sub-component 2c above.

Component 3: Reference Levels/Emission Reference levels (criteria 26-28, Readiness score: green)⁵⁹

55. The Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL, expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent) is the benchmark for assessing a country's performance in the implementation of REDD+ activities.⁶⁰ A FREL is required to access performance-based payments, as the performance of a REDD+ initiative would be measured by comparing actual GHG emissions and removals with a defined level of GHG emissions or removals (historical emission level or the projected business as usual, BAU, scenario).

56. Indonesia has a long history of collecting forest data (going back decades for the National Forest Inventory), enabling the construction of a FREL based on national activity data and emission factors, rather than IPCC default values that must be used in the absence of such local data. The country submitted its first national FREL to UNFCCC in January 2016, after which it underwent review by the UNFCCC secretariat from February to November 2016. The final version of the FREL was slightly modified to address comments received from UNFCCC's technical assessment team.⁶¹ The FREL for deforestation, based on the period 1990-2012 is 293 MtCO₂e/year; the FREL for degradation is 58 MtCO₂e/year and the FREL for peat decomposition 217 MtCO₂e/year. This gives an overall FREL of 0.57 GtCO₂e/year.

57. In the November 2016 technical assessment report of UNFCCC on Indonesia's revised FREL submission, the assessment team notes that "the

⁵⁸ See the publication (in Indonesian) on <http://www.redd-indonesia.org/index.php/publikasi/daftar-publikasi/12919-kepastian-pembiayaan-dalam-keberhasilan-implementasi-redd-di-indonesia> for a more detailed analysis

⁵⁹ In Indonesia's R-package report, the criteria for Component 3 have been renumbered 28-30. The TAP review maintains the original numbering of the FCPF RAF to prevent confusion.

⁶⁰ FREL is the amount of gross emissions from a geographical area estimated within a reference time period. It is used to demonstrate emission reduction from avoided deforestation and forest degradation.

⁶¹ The final FREL is accessible on http://redd.unfccc.int/files/frel_submission_by_indonesia_final.pdf

data and information used by Indonesia in constructing its FREL are transparent and complete, and are in overall accordance with the guidelines contained in the annex to decision 12/CP.17".⁶² This is a good indicator of the excellent progress achieved under this REDD+ Readiness component – which was indeed scored “green”. Indonesia has moved forward simultaneously with the establishment of its national FREL and four regional FREL, one of which will be used for the East Kalimantan emissions reduction Program, for which a US\$50 million Emissions Reduction Payment Agreement is planned with the FCPF Carbon Fund.⁶³

58. The proposed FREL covers all land areas covered by natural forests in the year 1990, which is about 113.2 million hectares or 60 percent of Indonesia’s total land area. The REDD+ activities Deforestation and Degradation (the latter of both forests and peatlands) are included in the FREL submitted to UNFCCC. The FREL takes into account emissions from the above-ground biomass carbon pool (ABG) and also, for deforestation and degradation of forests on peatlands, soil organic carbon (SOC).

59. CO₂ emissions are calculated by multiplying Activity Data (AD) with the appropriate Emissions Factors (EF). ‘Activity data’ refers to the extent (in hectares) of a category of forest loss or afforestation. Practically speaking, therefore, activity data is referred to as area data. ‘Emission factors’, also called carbon-stock-change factors by IPCC, refers to emissions/removals of greenhouse gases per unit area, e.g., tons carbon dioxide emitted per hectare of deforestation. Indonesia’s Activity Data used for the construction of the FREL are land-cover data from the NFMS, which are publicly available on the NFMS website. The Emissions factors were estimated using mainly the National Forest Inventory, complemented by additional research plots for forest types such as mangroves that did not have enough NFI plots.

60. *Validity of the methodology chosen and compliance with IPCC/UNFCCC instructions.* As noted above, Indonesia’s 2016 FREL submission was deemed by the UNFCCC technical assessment report to be in compliance with IPCC and UNFCCC standards. Indonesia has adopted a stepwise approach to development of its FREL, as suggested by UNFCCC. The submission lists a number of areas for technical improvement, such as refining activity data and emission factors, estimating peatland fire emissions and including additional REDD+ activities.

61. *Use of historical data, no adjustment for national circumstances.* For determining the 2013 FREL of around 0.57 GtCO₂e, Indonesia uses the averages of historical deforestation and degradation data, without any adjustment for national circumstances.⁶⁴ Moving forward, however, the

⁶² This refers to the UNFCCC COP17 decision inviting countries voluntarily to submit a FREL/FRL.

⁶³ The grant-funded element of the OFLP, US\$18 million, has already been approved by the World Bank.

⁶⁴ This is also the standard approach required by the FCPF Carbon Fund (CF) Methodological Framework, though it does allow adjusted reference levels under certain circumstances.

FREL increases annually because of accumulating emissions from peat decomposition, thus reaching around 0.59 GtCO₂e in 2020. Indonesia has used the 1990-2012 period as the reference period for determining the FREL, which is acceptable to the UNFCCC, but not to the FCPF Carbon Fund.⁶⁵

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Indonesia has made remarkable progress in establishing a high-quality FREL at national level – as recognized by the UNFCCC technical assessment of the 2016 FREL/FRL submission. It has also started developing sub-national FRELs, but the relationship between national and sub-national FREL will require further work. The various technical issues and methodological choices involved in establishing the FREL were reasonably well-covered in the R-Package report, but the above summary relies in part on the 2016 FREL submission to UNFCCC, which is hyperlinked in the R-package report, and explains the technical constraints faced and choices made regarding inclusion or exclusion of REDD+ activities, greenhouse gases and carbon pools clearly and concisely. The “green” score assigned for this component confirms the excellent progress achieved. Moving forward towards an Emissions Reduction Program with the FCPF Carbon Fund in East Kalimantan, however, may require adjustment of the baseline period chosen for the FREL.*

Component 4: Monitoring systems for forests and safeguards

Sub-Component 4a: National forest monitoring system (criteria 29-31, Readiness score: yellow)⁶⁶

62. Overall framework for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV).

Indonesia's National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS), launched in June 2015, is known as SIMONTANA, Sistem Monitoring Hutan Nasional.⁶⁷ SIMONTANA relies on annual moderate-resolution Landsat images, and the measurement of land cover changes across 23 land cover classes. The first monitoring system on forests was established in 1986, when the Government began its National Forest Inventory (NFI) program. The NFI was originally designed to gather information on standing stock volumes for each type of forest, namely mangroves, peatlands, lowland forests and mountain forests. This has laid the foundation for SIMONTANA, with its four major components: (i) forest resources (status) assessment; (ii) forest resources (change) monitoring; (iii) geographic information system (GIS); and (iv) users' involvement.

63. The REDD+ MRV system will be deployed at both National and Regional levels, with both using the same land cover data and assessment methodology. Indonesia's national forest monitoring system (NFMS) is

⁶⁵ The FCPF CF Methodological Framework requires consistency between national and subnational FRELs, so ideally REDD+ countries interested in concluding ERPA with FCPF CF would use the same approach for both.

⁶⁶ In Indonesia's R-package report, the criteria under sub-component 4a have been renumbered 31-33. The TAP review maintains the original numbering of the FCPF RAF to prevent confusion.

⁶⁷ SIMONTANA is available online at <http://geoportals.menlhk.go.id/arcgis/home/>, coupled with the WebGIS at <http://webgis.dephut.go.id/> for display and viewing.

designed to accomplish three main functions: (i) estimation of Emission Factors (EF); (ii) estimation of Activity Data (AD); and (iii) estimation of Emissions. The national MRV system established has already been used to fulfil these three functions in the construction of the FREL/FRL – though it will need improvement to detect forest degradation and regrowth over shorter time intervals, and it is not yet fit to assess the displacement of emissions (leakage), giving rise to an orange score for criterion 30, “demonstration of early system implementation”.

64. The WebGIS platform (<http://webgis.dephut.go.id/>) will enable transparent disclosure of forest-related data and information as well as performance measures of REDD+ projects and programmes.
65. According to the R-Package report, the integration of participatory monitoring of REDD+ implementation (including safeguards) by local communities in the NFMS is still in the initial phase, as the system has been internal to MoEF thus far. The issue of participatory monitoring will be discussed in more detail under sub-component 4b, Information system for multiple benefits, other impacts, governance and safeguards.
66. **Organizational structure, responsibilities and competencies.** The institutional mandate for national forest monitoring is clear.⁶⁸ Indonesia’s NFMS is led by the Directorate-General of Planology of the Ministry of Environment and Forests. The Forest Inventory and Forest Monitoring Divisions of the Directorate should be able to produce activity data and determine emission factors, with support from the Mapping Division and the Spatial Data Networking Division. The NFMS will have to face a number of challenges in the near future: (i) data validation of Activity Data and Emission Factors will have to be performed regularly, in order to improve data quality; (ii) the web-based forest carbon database system will need to be integrated with the NFMS, and with the GHG measurement activities of the District Planning Agencies (BAPPEDA) and Provincial Planning Agencies. A method for assessing leakage (displacement of emissions)⁶⁹ will also need to be devised.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: the development of the national forest monitoring system (NFMS) has advanced with institutionalization, staffing and equipment of the national MRV Unit, and an extensive capacity building program that is currently implemented with technical assistance from FAO. The NFMS has been used in constructing the FREL/FRL submitted to UNFCCC (see Component 3 above), but it will need to be improved to perform change detection over shorter time intervals, especially of forest degradation and regrowth. Building MRV capacity at the sub-national level will be a major challenge going forward.*

⁶⁸ This mandate is set out in Presidential Regulation No. 16/2015 concerning the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, available at http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/reddplus/images/resources/peraturan/Perpres_16_Tahun_2015-KLHK.pdf

⁶⁹ The East Kalimantan ERPIN contains some analysis on leakage and measures to address it, see <https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/fcp/files/2016/May/Indonesian%20ERPIN%2020160429%20Final.pdf>

Overall, the sub-component has made significant progress, and was scored yellow.

Sub-Component 4b: Information system for multiple benefits, other impacts, governance, and safeguards (criteria 32-34, Readiness score: green)⁷⁰

- 67. Identification of relevant non-carbon aspects, and social and environmental issues (criterion 32).** As noted in the R-package report, Indonesia already had a number of operational instruments to address this point, independent of REDD+, through mandatory requirements for Environmental Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment (KLHS) and Environmental Audit,⁷¹ The intention to make High Conservation Value Forest – which is currently voluntary for oil palm plantation – mandatory would further contribute to the fulfillment of this criterion.
- 68. Monitoring, reporting and information sharing (criterion 33).** Apart from the systems set up under REDD+ (see below), there are several other mechanisms for this in Indonesia, including the GHG Monitoring Evaluation and Reporting function (PEP GRK⁷²) led by the National Planning Agency and the Ministry of Environment and Forestry publishes an annual Statistics of Environment and Forestry book” Specifically related to REDD+, the SIS-REDD+ has been set up as the umbrella mechanism for communicating all the information generated by different REDD+ safeguards implementation instruments (including PRISAI, REDD+ SES, REDD+ PGA). Already, 11 out of 35 Demonstration Area REDD+ projects have been registered to join SIS-REDD+. To the wider community, thus guaranteeing transparency and accountability – in line with the Cancun safeguards principles and indicators. This is a necessary requirement to obtain payment for results.
- 69. Institutional arrangements and capacities (criterion 34).** The institutional architecture for the national forest monitoring system is well-explained in the R-Package report. SIS-REDD+ has been operating since 2014 under the DGCC, which has a clear mandate from the document of the GHG National Action Plan and the Presidential Regulation No 61 concerning GHG National Action Plan Development. A web-based SIS-REDD+ platform has been established and is operational.⁷³ DG-CC has identified the needs for capacity building activities, software/hardware and budget, and these activities have been implemented with government

⁷⁰ In Indonesia’s R-package report, the criteria under sub-component 4b have been renumbered 34-36. The TAP review maintains the original numbering of the FCPF RAF to prevent confusion.

⁷¹ Regulations governing these mechanisms are Government Regulation No. 27/2012 concerning Environmental Licenses, and the Minister of Environment Regulation No. 3/2013 concerning Environmental Audit.

⁷² PEP GRK is available online at <http://www.sekretariat-rangrk.org/beranda/82-bahasa/berita/176-sosialisasi-pep>

⁷³ This is accessible on <http://sisredd.menlhk.go.id/>

and donor funds.

➔ *TAP Conclusion: Even before REDD+ started, Indonesia had many laws and regulations obliging the government to generate and disseminate data on social and environmental issues. The development of the REDD+ information system on multiple benefits, other impacts, governance and safeguards (SIS) is very advanced, and a web-based platform is already available. Currently, however, over two thirds of ongoing REDD+ field projects are not yet registered with SIS-REDD+, so there is room for further improvement. Overall, the sub-component has made good progress and was scored green.*

TAP Review Part C: Summary Assessment and Recommendation to the PC

- 70. Indonesia conscientiously used the FCPF Readiness Assessment Framework, in slightly modified form, to account for national circumstances. Holding stakeholder workshops at both national (inception and validation) and provincial level (assessment workshops in East Kalimantan and South Sumatra) allowed for meaningful participation of many stakeholder groups.** The validation workshop held with representatives from all stakeholder groups allowed for a thorough consolidation, in a transparent manner, of the many useful conclusions and recommendations of the multi-stakeholder assessment process. The East Kalimantan assessment workshop showed REDD+ Readiness to be far ahead, both with regards to the national level and to South Sumatra Province. This is encouraging news for the planned emissions reduction program with the FCPF Carbon Fund.
- 71. There are no references in the R-Package report to supporting documentation on the facilitation of the participatory self-assessment process in Indonesia, for example on how the self-selection process of the participants was conducted. Nevertheless, the process appears to have been well facilitated, as there was a wide range of stakeholder groups represented, who provided useful and timely inputs to assess REDD+ readiness and determine what remains to be done to achieve it.** The quality of inputs received from the workshop participants was excellent, as noted above, and as reported in the R-Package report.⁷⁴
- 72. The R-Package report has documented significant progress achieved since the Mid-term Review (MTR) held in 2014.** Many key REDD+ Readiness elements are now in place: the national REDD+ registry has been launched, the FREL submission validated by UNFCCC, the NFMS designed and institutionalized, among others. It is thus clear that

⁷⁴ See especially Table 3.1pp. 76-81 and Table 3.2, pp. 81-85

significant progress has been achieved since the MTR, with four green, four yellow and two orange scores for the ten sub-components scored, compared to only one green, three yellow and five orange out of the nine sub-components that were scored for the MTR.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, the green scores are still in the minority, so a significant amount of work will be required to complete the Readiness phase.

73. The self-assessment process provided a lot of useful feedback on specific elements of REDD+ Readiness that required further work, which will be helpful as Indonesia moves towards completion of the REDD+ Readiness phase. Multi-stakeholder coordination needs to be improved as well as the ownership of REDD+ policies with key decision makers outside the forestry sector, especially agriculture, and at local government level. Consultations with local communities need to be intensified, and missing pieces such as the national Benefit Sharing Mechanism, and the various legal reforms required need to be designed and operationalized as soon as possible, in order to enable the transition towards full-scale REDD+ implementation.

74. Based on the documents consulted, the TAP reviewer is of the opinion that Indonesia's R-package report provides a reasonably accurate picture of REDD+ readiness progress in the country. A few annotations to this conclusion are in order. For some of the (sub)components, the R-Package report did not do full justice to the rich source materials produced by the REDD+ Readiness process. For example, under sub-component 2b, REDD+ strategy options, the R-package report provided little detail on how the strategic actions were identified and prioritized. For most sub-components, however, additional information was easy to find in the additional REDD+ documentation hyperlinked in the R-package report. The exceptions to this were the Land Use Assessment and REDD+ strategy options (sub-component 2b) where the TAP reviewer was unable to verify a number of the statements about REDD+ Readiness progress included in the R-Package report, as detailed above.

75. One key issue that will need to be resolved during the remainder of the Readiness phase is the outstanding legal and institutional reforms, some of which are outside the control of the forestry sector. The protection of indigenous peoples' rights to land and forests, which has played such an important role in slowing down deforestation in Brazil, is a case in point. Translating their national-level rights into effective protection on the ground will require ample political will to enforce the law – and a sizable budget to enable mapping of the boundaries of indigenous territories and conflict zones as well as drafting of local government regulations (without which local government planning agencies are unwilling to recognize

⁷⁵ As noted above, a new sub-component 2e, Funding instruments and benefit sharing mechanism was added for the purpose of the Readiness self-assessment. This area used to come under 2c, implementation framework. No color scores were assigned at component level at MTR, so the TAP review only considered and compared sub-component scores.

these rights). Some of these outstanding reforms – or the slow implementation of reforms already adopted – may pose significant risks to the delivery of the emissions reductions programs currently under discussion. This state of affairs renders the R-package report recommendation to step up cross-sectoral coordination efforts and increase buy-in to REDD+ of local-level governments and other sector ministries, especially agriculture, even more urgent and important. The TAP review was unable to assess the efficiency – or even the frequency – of the current cross-sectoral consultation mechanisms conducted by DG-CC, as no quantitative information or qualitative assessments were included in the R-Package report.