



Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

PC Review of PNG R-PP

Reviewers: Australia & Germany

Fourteenth Meeting of the Participants Committee (PC14)

Washington, DC

March 19-21

Overall Comments

Excellent response to the feedback on previous review.

- Most comments appropriately considered.
- Scope remains for improvements.
 - Editorial;
 - Clarification.

Of the total 12 standards:

- **7** were considered **met**.
- **5** were considered **largely met**.

Component 1

Component 1	PC review determination
Component 1a	Standard largely met
Component 1b	Standard met
Component 1c	Standard met

Component 1

Component 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:

- It would be useful to provide more information on the role of the provincial governments themselves– the specifics of implementation responsibility remain unclear.
- The need for further information and integration of other sectors is not adequately reflected

Component 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue...

- A reference to an intended communication strategy is still missing.

Component 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

- The work plan could be more detailed and clearly linked to overall activities planned for REDD strategy development.
- It remains unclear on whether R-PP consultation has been planned – if this is not the case, we would strongly recommend this.

Component 2

Component 2	PC review determination
Component 2a	Standard met
Component 2b	Standard met
Component 2c	Standard met
Component 2d	Standard met

Component 2

Component 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Law, Policy...

- Comments have been addressed or gaps and problems in properly addressing issues explained (driver analysis).
- Detail provided and challenges identified in the legal system are useful additions and clarifications.
- Structure of the section is much improved, but the work plan could still benefit from additional work.

Component 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

- It is important to ensure sector policies and plans are assessed and revised, to identify and address inconsistencies.
- This section would also benefit from a link to the SESA process.

Component 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

- Comments have been appropriately considered and addressed.

Component 2.d: Social and Environmental Impacts

- Budget allocation reasoning remains unclear. For example, why do assessments cost less than the drafting of ToRs, and ESMF consultation comes in after its application?

Component 3

Component 3	PC review determination
Component 3	Standard largely met

Component 3:

Develop a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level

- Comments have been addressed, structure has been improved, existing data has been well described and referenced and gaps have been identified.
- Work plan dates should be updated to 2013.

Component 4

Component 4	PC review determination
Component 4a	Standard largely met
Component 4b	Standard largely met

Component 4

Component 4a: National Forest Monitoring System:

- More detailed explanation of existing capacities and the link with UN-REDD would be beneficial, and work plan dates should be updated to 2013.

Component 4b: Designing an Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards

- A clear indication of how criteria and indicators will be established and how information will be collected has been provided.
- There remains a need for further clarity on how existing initiatives will be incorporated into the concept
- More detail on the specific capacity needs of identified institution is required.

Component 5

Component 5	PC review determination
Component 5	Standard met

Component 5: Schedule and Budget

- Overall, the allocated budget lacks specificity, with some tasks not clear and operational. The calculations underpinning the estimates are not transparent and read more as estimates.
- PNG-specific tasks and gaps have not been clearly identified and defined.

Component 6

Component 6	PC review determination
Component 6	Standard largely met

Component 6.

Design a Program M&E Framework

- Amendments to improve transparency could include integrating tables 6a and 6b, so as to show a direct relation between the monitoring activities, budget allocation and time frames, and specifying the means of verification (aspiration) and collection methods (regarding time and frequency of evaluation).



THANK YOU!

www.forestcarbonpartnership.org