

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, January 12, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

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

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

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

Synthesis Review of R-PP of (fill in country name): PNG

Reviewers (fill in): Jayant Sathaye co-leading five TAP experts

Date of review (fill in): February 27, 2013

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

A. Overview:

This Fourth TAP Review focused on PNG revised R-PP Final Submission (25 February 2013) that was submitted in late February. It was designed to address the TAP Third Review and earlier comments. The submitted draft addressed almost all the comments on each of the components with only a few minor items that need some attention. Components 1, 2, 4a and 5 reached the Met criteria while Components 3, 4b and 6 could benefit by addressing one or two small but relevant points.

As noted in its Expected Key Results section from the R-PP Implementation Process on page 6, PNG will seek R-PP funds beyond 2013 to continue its UN-REDD program to pursue these items (1) sub-national capacity building, and maximization of REDD+ communication through different mediums, (2) implementation of safeguards and SESA framework, (3) establishment of activities at the sub-national level, and (4) establishment of national MRV system.

In addition, PNG has noted that it would ask UNDP to build on the UN-REDD program through implementation of the R-PP program with FCPF funds. It will seek \$3.8 million FCPF funds for R-PP. In the Final Submission the FCPF funds are targeted only on Components 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, and 6. Funding for the other components, 2d, 3 and 4, will be sought and provided by the PNG government and UN-REDD.

B. TAP General Comments

PNG's response to the Third TAP Review (6 February 2013) was very well drafted. It addressed virtually all the comments that were put together in review that included some Third TAP Review comments and also earlier comments that had not yet been addressed. A few comments that were not yet addressed focused on Components 3 and 4b who's funding is not sought through FCPF. Component 6 would benefit by including the submission of progress to be achieved by project implementers on a regular basis, e.g. meetings every three months to learn about implementation challenges and subsequent activities.

The text and inclusion of tables and figures in the overall document is now significantly improved. It is much easier now to read and understand the text.

The table below shows whether each sub-component meets R-PP standard. Components 1, 2 and 5 meet all the criteria and TAP comments on First, Second and Third Drafts. Components 3 and 4b, for which FCPF funding is not sought, would benefit with some simple responses.

The TAP assessment of the standards for each section is summarized in the table below.

Components	First Draft R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 13	Second Revised Draft R-PP submitted for assessment in PC13	Third Revised Draft R-PP submitted for assessment in PC14	Fourth Revised R-PP submitted for assessment in PC14
1a	Not met	Partially met	<i>Largely Met</i>	<i>Met</i>
1b	Partially met	Largely met	<i>Met</i>	<i>Met</i>
1c	Partially met	Largely met	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>
2a	Partially met	Partially met	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
2b	Partially met	Partially met	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
2c	Partially met	Partially met	Partially met	<i>Met</i>
2d	Partially met	Partially met	<i>Met</i>	<i>Met</i>
3	Partially met	Partially met	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Largely met</i>
4a	Partially met	Partially met	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>
4b	Partially met	Largely met	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Largely met</i>
5	Not met	Not met	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Met</i>
6	Not met	Not met	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Largely met</i>

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

C. Overview:

This Third TAP Review focused on PNG revised R-PP (Version 11 Final Working Draft) that was submitted in late January. It was designed to address the TAP Second Review comments. The submitted draft addressed some of the comments on Components 1, 2a,2b, 2c, 5 and 6, but it did not address the comments on Components 2d, 3 and 4.

As noted in its Expected Key Results section from the R-PP Implementation Process on page 6, PNG is seeking R-PP funds beyond 2013 to continue its UN-REDD program to pursue these items (1) sub-national capacity building, and maximization of REDD+ communication through different mediums, (2) implementation of safeguards and SESA framework, (3) establishment of activities at the sub-national level, and (4) establishment of national MRV system.

In addition, PNG has noted that it would ask UNDP to build on the UN-REDD program through implementation of the R-PP program with FCPF funds. It will seek \$3.8 million FCPF funds for R-PP. In the "Volume 11: Final Working Draft" the FCPF funds are targeted only to Components 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, and 6. Funding for the other components, 2d, 3 and 4, will be provided by the PNG government and UN-REDD.

D. TAP General Comments

PNG's response to many October 2012 TAP reviews is relatively limited and most of them are focused on two items -- Work Plans that are reported at the end of each Component and the FCPF and other budget requests noted for selected tasks.

The activities presented in most budget tables are very broad and without specific measures of outcomes. Each of these activities should have an attachment providing more details including at least three detailed sub-activities for each item.

The responses in Volume 11: Final Working Draft does not explicitly address the First and Second TAP review comments. The TAP list of comments is normally addressed by every country that has submitted and modified its R-PP document. As a result, TAP members have listed the comments that they conclude have not been addressed in the main Component text.

In the Components read by TAP members, they have noted several mistaken write-ups. Figure and Table numbers are flawed, language requires a careful reading and adjustment, not all pictures are numbered and some are poorly cited. It would be helpful if the next draft were carefully reviewed and re-written to provide an easily readable and consistent document.

The table below shows whether each sub-component meets R-PP standard. The first sub-component 1a was recognized as an improved text and given a Largely Met criteria and the other one 1c retained the same criteria. Components 2a, 2b and 2c continue to be at the partially met level and so does component 4a. Component 4b also meets the Largely Met criteria. Components 5 and 6 are significantly improved and both get a Largely Met ranking.

Component 1. Organize and Consult

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process.

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the remaining comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items and also addressed the three Recommendations and Questions that are noted below.

Component 1a meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the remaining comments that were noted in the Second TAP Review. It has provided more basis for capacity building activities and budgets. The detailed comments are not yet completely addressed. Responding to them would improve the language and written material. The comments that were not addressed or provided incomplete coverage are noted below.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *The document provides a background, and then discusses directly each of the institutions, without providing an overall structure. It makes it hard to understand, particularly for non-experts.*
2. *Figure 1 is not in the document. Figure 2 is not numbered in Component 1, and the first figure in Component 1b is numbered 2. Please include and cite figures and tables correctly.*
3. *Clarify further the role of Provincial Governments. Confirm whether a jurisdictional or project based approach will be taken in PNG.*

Component 1a largely meets the standard.

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

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

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has provided additional information on various items.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. It has addressed the one Recommendation and Question that is noted below. It is missing representation of Eastman Highlands (21) in Figure 5. Please include it if possible.

Component 1b meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has addressed the comments that were noted in the Second TAP Review. The addition of resources for raising awareness with and by Provincial governments and NGOs is welcomed. The comments that were not addressed or provided incomplete coverage are noted below.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. On Figure 4 page 23, the numbering of Enga, Southern Highlands and Eastern Highlands do not correspond to numbering on the map.

Component 1b meets the standard

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP; (v) and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has noted that the component has been reassessed and its focus is centered on the changes done and not in new areas. In other words, it is restricted to the key gaps identified.

Recommendations and Questions:

Component 1c meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has addressed most of the comments that were noted in the Second TAP Review. The comments that were not addressed or provided incomplete coverage are noted below.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. Add information on past consultation actions, a summary of results, how these have influenced adaptation of current practice and how proposed future actions flow on from these.

Component 1c largely meets the standard

³ Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Program Steering Committee).

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

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

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has either responded to the comments or removed irrelevant text if it was not possible to address the comment.

Component 2a meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has addressed some of the comments that were noted in the Second TAP Review. Please respond to unaddressed comments, and additional ones that are noted below.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *Comments noted in First TAP Review that are yet to be addressed are listed below.*
2. *You may want to shorten the timeframe for production of the drivers analysis as this is a foundational element for defining abatement options and mitigation actions.*
3. *In the section on ILG and land law clearly explain that the current R-PP is not yet recommending a particular approach for recognizing carbon ownership and entitlements but that this will be an outcome of the proposed review.*
4. *Explanation on how the issue of carbon rights would be resolved during Readiness preparation would be helpful.*
5. *You may want to adopt a jurisdictional approach to REDD+ in PNG based on wards or districts to ensure that planning for REDD+ project follows existing administrative and land tenure guidelines in PNG law.*

Comments Noted in First TAP Review that are yet to be addressed:

1. *Jobs are provided to only 9000 persons. 2.8 million log volume harvested in 2009 goes up and down consistent with global demand as affected by global economy. A major goal is to increase reforested area from 62,000 ha in 2008 to 240,000 ha by 2030. This seems too small to make a dent on carbon emissions since the annual deforestation rate was at 427 thousand ha between 2005-2010. Would this be enough to support the 2030 and 2050 plans?*
2. *Forestry and Climate Change Framework for Action 2009-2015 is set to outline the priorities regarding sustainable development in the forestry sector. Seems like a daunting challenge to address the large deforestation rate (DR). Plus the goals that have been set for 2030 appear too low to reduce the DR. One question is how much funding does PNG receive from the exports and is there a way to compensate that through logging in reforested areas or requiring that after deforestation the exposed land be reharvested with trees that have faster growth rates?*
3. *About documenting past successes and failures, there are indications scattered in the document, but a summary*

could be useful (possibly in a Box?).

4. *PNG passed two pieces of land legislation in 2009 which came into effect in March 2012. However, OCCD does not appear to have accounted for the land reform laws that have taken place in March 2009. Thus the office is referring to out dated land laws. Please check the new land reforms and reformulate the land use and ownership discussion.*

Details:

Forest inventory and deforestation and forest degradation

1. *'The cumulative change (which is in line with the annual rate of deforestation reported by PNG to FAO) has been further elaborated with a socio-economic model to support the definition of a forest loss trend which report for 2002 a combined annual rate of deforestation and degradation of 1.41 percent (p27)' – what socio-economic model?*
2. *'Additional conclusions of the report.. (p27) – what report?*
3. *'While further studies are needed, the main drivers of this deforestation and forest degradation are..(p27) – this could be a section on its own with more detail given (with % too), in addition to reference.*

Lease leaseback arrangements: agriculture leases

5. *For consistency, there needs to be a section detailing also this form of alienation*

The forestry sector

6. *Sources of information are missing, in particular for: 'Of the country's total logs harvested, 80 percent is exported as round logs while 20 percent or less is processed locally (p 30)'*
7. *'Reforestation (p 35)' is not listed among 'Commercial Operations,' so it's not clear what it refers to Policy and Legal framework for REDD+*

Overview of PNG Legal system

8. *'Tribal conflicts are a major cause of tensions in the highlands region and often related to resource developments' (p 36)- what does 'resource developments' refer to? Lack of access to development? Exploitation of resources?*

Natural resource use and management

1. *'In September 2009, for example, the Minister for Forests announced that no new FMA timber concessions would be allocated with round log export entitlements (p 39) – reference needed: was it a moratorium? Is it still in force? Is it enforced?*
2. *'All are likely to have major impact on timber supply markets in general and in timber producing countries like Papua New Guinea in particular (p 40) – in what sense? Is it related to the fact that the above mentioned round log export ban is not enforced?*

Component 2a partially meets the standard.

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD-plus strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and a summary of the emerging REDD-plus strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD-plus strategy options. This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy; consideration of environmental and social issues; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD-plus strategy; and a plan of how to assess the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits. The assessments included in the R-PP eventually should result in an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD-plus strategy over time.

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has either responded to the comments or removed irrelevant text if it was not possible to address the comment.

Component 2b meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has addressed few comments that were noted in the First TAP Review. The comments that were not addressed or provided incomplete coverage and some Additional Comments are noted below. Please respond to them.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *Comments noted in First TAP Review that are yet to be addressed are listed below*
 - I. *The relation between the four major policies/plans (Vision 2050, CCDS, IAP, and NCCDP) is not clear – why are there three of them? What makes them different one from the other? An initial list of the policies would be useful.*
 - II. *P. 50: ‘The number of jobs created in new sectors, such as tourism and forest management, should more than outweigh those lost in the traditional logging sector’ – this is potentially a sensitive statement. If there is no reference, it needs to be made clear that additional studies are needed, and possibly included in the R-PP*
 - III. *You may want to consider applying a standard of independently verified certification of sustainable forest management (e.g. Forest Stewardship Council) in order to meet UNFCCC guidelines, to ensure compliance with Lacey and FLEGT requirements and to overcome negative perceptions of PNG forest management.*
 - *‘The NEC has endorsed the main elements of the national CCDS..(p 46)’ – Why ‘main elements’? Wouldn’t the NEC have indorsed the entire CCDS?*
 - *Stopping deforestation from agriculture leases (p 49) – this section doesn’t appear consistent with the part in the previous chapter on the Commission of Enquiry*

Additional Comments:

2. Please find below some additional comments.

- p28: PNG population (Section 2a.1). The population the mid-2011 census was 7.0 million; The pop growth rate for the periods 1980-2000 and 2000-2011 was almost identical (2.7-2.8% pa). So the estimated mid-2012 PNG population is 7.2 million; and the estimated mid-2013 population would be 7.4 million.

- p31: 97% of PNG land is in customary ownership still is questioned by the SABL disbursements. See discussion by Filer et al on this.

- p39: The full citation for Bourke and Harwood (2009) is:

Bourke, R.M. and Harwood, T. (eds) (2009). *Food and Agriculture in Papua New Guinea*. ANU E Press, The Australian National University, Canberra.

http://epress.anu.edu.au/food_agriculture_citation.html

http://ips.cap.anu.edu.au/ssgm/resource_documents/lmg/png_ag_tables/

Note that the published is ANUE E Press, not ANU Press.

-p39: Note that it is Bourke and Harwood, Not Bourke and Hardwood. Give the page numbers for the information that they are citing, as this is a long (ca 650 page) book.

- The document should be updated to take into account the new draft National Forest Plan.

- The absence of a coherent drivers of DFD analysis is a serious shortcoming of the document. This could be remedied by adopting the 2009 report on drivers by Filer commissioned by DEC.

- p54: Study by NARI on alternative livelihoods options for forest-dependent communities (\$530,000). Studies on alternatives to forest-based fallows have been conducted in PNG since 1954. So far, no alternative has yet been found. Intensifying land use in the lowlands is possible but comes at a cost-increasing labor inputs per unit output of food. There is very little likelihood that NARI could come up with a realistic alternative proposal.

- p61: The proposed mitigation action to reduce DFD by agricultural outreach is bordering on the absurd. There is currently no effective agricultural outreach in PNG, aside from a couple of consulting teams employed by mining companies. There is very little effective agricultural research, aside from some ACIAR funded projects. And furthermore there is no clear demonstration of how outreach, if effectively applied would reduce deforestation.

Component 2b standard is still partially met since many comments are yet to be addressed.

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

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

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has either responded to the comments or removed irrelevant text if it was not possible to address the comment.

Component 2c meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has addressed few comments that were noted in the First TAP Review. The comments that were not addressed or provided incomplete coverage and Additional Comments are noted below. Please respond to them.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *Section (b) European Union on page 62 may be misleading. European Union funding of Remote Sensing Centre at UPNG is for national interest in GIS training purposes while Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) is an ITTO funded project under PNGFA and has nothing to do with EU and UPNG. This item should be deleted from the document.*
2. *The two proposed Activities seem to be far from sufficient to provide for the “Development of a Nation REDD+ Framework”. Unless the activity noted below is being done through UN-REDD program, please include an Activity to prepare a national REDD+ Framework including addressing: scale, jurisdictions, locations, and agents. Show the relationship of these approaches to national action on climate adaptation and low carbon growth.*

Comments noted in First TAP Review that are yet to be addressed are listed below:

1. *Table 5 shows the way REDD+ relates to sectoral/regional demonstration activities in PNG. To what extent do these proposed activities address the 2030 goals described in Figures 8 and 9? This is important in order to ensure that PNG gets to learn the opportunities and potential for implementing each of the items, e.g., is halting deforestation from agricultural leases, secondary forest management or fire management listed in 2b covered in 2c?*
2. *Adjust activities to support concrete actions to address identified drivers. These might include the preparation of sectoral REDD+ activities under voluntary or compliance markets to secure payments in response to emission reductions from actions taken as a consequence of these reviews.*
4. *Table 9 needs to include a column of institutions responsible for the sub-activities.*

Details:

Sub-national capacity building for REDD+ readiness

1. *‘One of the main objectives..climate change (p 54) – the sentence is not clear*
2. *‘Pilot and demonstration activities complementing REDD+ readiness activities will be carried out with the full and effective participation of landowners and local level government (p 49) – how would all landowners be consulted? Some reference to FPIC may be needed, in particular due to the very complex land tenure system in PNG*

Strategy and policy development (p 55)

3. *This section makes more sense in the component before, where harmonization between climate change policies and national and sub-national plans is detailed*
4. *‘it is foreseen that two REDD+ related projects are launched in 2011’ – information is outdated.*
5. *ITTO Project Proposal National Training Program to Promote the Adoption of Reduced Impact Logging (RIL) in Papua New Guinea’ (p 61) There is no indication of a timeframe for this programme: when was it submitted? What is the status? Forest Research Institute (FRI) and University of PNG (UPNG) – Remote Sensing Centre (p 64)*

Some additional Comments:

1. *There is a need for creating a position or desk within TWG to be fully funded by OCCD or under REDD+ to deal only with this major initiative. The proposal for joint training and awareness activities between members TWG at local level with sub-national officials is highly recommended. This will help OCCD as most PNG Government Departments has great policies but lack resources to conduct their programs. This is especially urgent priority for sub-national level activities. The 5 proposed REDD+ pilot project areas will benefit from this support to participate at all basic infrastructures since it is currently poor or non-existent.*
2. *On models for funds distribution and benefit sharing, there are locally grown models or a model for PES which OCCD is yet to acknowledge. A group of PNG National Experts Consultative Group (ECG) on PES has worked for last 4 years to produce a model for PNG. The ECG has presented the model at 4 regional and various other OCCD and national conferences and workshops, which is currently being tested with success in East New Britain Province. You may want to consider Usefulness and applicability of this model since it may displace the need to “develop” a new model when this has been already done by PNG experts in field of law, forestry, conservation, community development, environment, local level government and business.*

Component 2c partially meets the standard.

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

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the World Bank’s or UN-REDD Programme’s safeguard policies, including methods to evaluate how to address those impacts via studies, consultations, and specific mitigation measures aimed at preventing or minimizing adverse effects. For countries receiving funding via the World Bank, a simple work plan is presented for how the SESA process will be followed, and for preparation of the ESMF.

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has either responded to the comments or removed irrelevant text if it was not possible to address the comment.

Component 2d meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has addressed the most of TAP comment that was noted in the First TAP Review.

Component 2d Meets the standard.

Component 3. Develop a Reference Level

Standard 3: Reference Level:

Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design).

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

The revised R-PP is not seeking funds from FCPF for this component. Also, the R-PP will be implemented by the UNDP, which is already putting together the program for UNREDD. As a result, it should be able to put together a joint program in the future. We have noted recommendations and questions below since such information may make it easier for non-FCPF entities to undertake this work. These are similar to the ones noted in Third TAP Review since no responses were received to this component.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *Section 2c describes goals that will be achieved by 2030 and 2050 in Figures 8 and 9. How do these match with the proposed shares of each activity in this Component 3? A brief explanation on this would be useful.*
2. *Component should add activities to synthesize data and produce a national RL/REL and demonstrate linkages to design a full carbon monitoring system.*

Component 3: The standard has been largely met.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP is not seeking funds from FCPF for this component. Also, the R-PP will be implemented by the UNDP which is already putting together the program for UNREDD. As a result, it should be able to put together a joint program in the future. We have noted recommendations and questions below since such information may make it easier for non-FCPF entities to undertake this work.

Recommendations and Questions:

3. *Section 2c describes goals that will be achieved by 2030 and 2050 in Figures 8 and 9. How do these match with the proposed shares of each activity in this Component 3? A brief explanation on this would be useful.*
4. *Component should add activities to synthesize data and produce a national RL/REL and demonstrate linkages to design a full carbon monitoring system.*

Component 3: The standard has been largely met.

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:

The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD-plus strategy in the forest sector.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

The revised R-PP is not seeking funds from FCPF for this component. Also, the R-PP will be implemented by the UNDP, which is already putting together the program for UNREDD. As a result, it should be able to put together a joint program in the future. We have noted recommendations and questions below since such information may make it easier for non-FCPF entities to undertake this work. These are similar to the ones noted in Third TAP Review since no responses were received to this component.

About the TAP comment on allocating funds for MRV system, PNG has noted that they have initiated a MRV system already and that they plan to collect better data from ongoing UNREDD program before assigning more funds for the MRV activity.

Recommendations and Questions:

Component 4a: The standard has been met.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has not added any new text in the document to address the comments that were noted in the Second TAP Review. It has noted that the funding would increase with support from the PNG government with no funding requested from FCPF for this component. We have noted recommendations and questions below since such information may make it easier for non-FCPF entities to undertake this work.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *Accountabilities for the steps in preparing the national MRV system are clear. However no budget is included for activities that should be added.*

Component 4a: At this time, the 4a standard largely meets the standard.

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

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities), for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

(The FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has not added any new text in the document to address the comments that were noted in the Second TAP Review. It has noted that the funding would increase with support from the PNG government with no funding requested from FCPF for this component. We have noted recommendations and questions below since such information may make it easier for non-FCPF entities to undertake this work.

Regarding our comments below, PNG has noted that it plans to address each issue through a step wise approach after gaining information from UNREDD programs delivery of specific community MRV activities. It intends to initiate this after the system at the national level becomes well established.

TAP recommendations related to 4b were not addressed. However, PNG noted that it relies on UNREDD program activity to deliver both Components 3 and 4 whose funds are yet to be fully implemented.

Recommendations and Questions:

- 1. The Revised R-PP with expanded version tried to address the issues raised by the First TAP Review. However, these expanded versions only concentrated on the information systems without elaborating much on the multiple benefits, impacts, governance and safeguards. There were also no discussion on the specific institutions and their capacity building needs.*
- 2. The Revised R-PP still does not address the comments raised by the Second TAP Review. The activities and sub-activities are very technical in nature and as such institutions responsible should be identified and shown in the Table 4a&b.*

Component 4b: At this time, the 4b standard continues to be largely met

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

The revised R-PP has not added any new text in the document to address the comments that were noted in the Second TAP Review. It has noted that the funding would increase with support from the PNG government with no funding requested from FCPF for this component. We have noted recommendations and questions below since such information may make it easier for non-FCPF entities to undertake this work.

Recommendations and Questions:

- 3. The Revised R-PP with expanded version tried to address the issues raised by the First TAP Review. However, these expanded versions only concentrated on the information systems without elaborating much on the multiple benefits, impacts, governance and safeguards. There were also no discussion on the specific institutions and their capacity building needs.*

4. *The Revised R-PP still does not address the comments raised by the Second TAP Review. The activities and sub-activities are very technical in nature and as such institutions responsible should be identified and shown in the Table 4a&b.*

Component 4b: At this time, the 4b standard continues to be largely met.

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

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

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has responded to the comment.

Component 5 meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *The revised R-PP has made changes to the earlier document. It provides a list of funds that is requested from FCPF only. It would be useful to add the complete list of funds and the activities that will be undertaken in each component including the ones that are not funded by FCPF.*

Component 5: Noting this deficiency, the standard is largely met.

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

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

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

Fourth TAP Review (27 February 2013):

Revised R-PP has made further progress in addressing the comments that were noted in the Third TAP Review. It has not fully responded to the comment noted below.

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *Table 6b contains a column "Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)". That column does not have consistent information on this item except in Column 1a. It includes "Bi-monthly for each TWG meetings and Quarterly for NCCC, sometimes on needs basis." A similar approach listed in other sub-components can significantly improve the tracking of and changes to the implementation of each sub-component.*

Component 6 largely meets the standard.

Third TAP Review (6 February 2013):

Recommendations and Questions:

1. *The revised R-PP has made changes to the earlier document. The Revised R-PP tried to address the comments raised in the First and Second TAP Reviews. However, it would be better if Tables 6a&6b are combined as one to show clear links between the activities, budgets, expected outcomes, indicators, means of verifications, timeframes, responsibilities, and risks and assumptions. Two separate tables caused obscure in the information and lack transparency in the accountability and responsibilities.*
2. *Information about how often and where the evaluation will be done for each sub-component will be useful in ensuring continued response and viability of the implemented activity. Please add a " Potential Evaluation dates and locations" column to the Table.*

Component 6: Noting this deficiency, the standard is largely met.

Appendix 1:

First and Second TAP Review Overview

First TAP Review (12 September 2012):

Background:

PNG submitted a first draft R-PP in August, 2012 for informal consideration by the Participant Committee of the FCPF at PC 13 (October 2012). A TAP Team consisting of six members reviewed the draft R-PP. Members submitted their drafts that were assembled to establish a synthesized review on 6-12 September, which is reported below with a summary of the issues that were described for each component.

Overview:

The R-PP provides strong information for each component. Six TAP reviewers have studied this version. They have concluded that Components 1a, 5 and 6 do not meet the standard while other Components partially meet the standards.

Responses to components are quite complete but there are items that need to be addressed in order to meet the standards set for them, which are noted below. Their inclusion would assist in meeting each component standard.

- A.** Please address these topics that apply to the introduction and an overview of the R-PP.
 1. *Table of contents needs to be updated and formatted*
 2. *Page 4: Under 'Summary of the RPP': Total budget, anticipated sources of funding from FCPF missing. National Government contribution is not clear – is the Recurrent Budget not under national contribution? How much under other sources of PIP?*
 3. *Page 4: Executive summary is not exhaustive*
 4. *Page 5: Expected key results are missing*
 5. *There is no bibliography*
 6. *In general, as probably the R-PP may not be finalized before the end of 2012, does it make sense to include 2012 as implementation year, i.e. to include a budget for it?*
 7. *A general recommendation is to try to structure more the sections, making sure they address all the requirements of the program, to make it easier for the reader to follow. Also, to have an initial paragraph for each section detailing the content that will follow.*

B. Components 1 and 2 appear to require much more effort to meet the Standards.

For **Component 1**, the major concern was of a lack of clear structure being proposed. There is plenty of existing information, but it was not communicated to the readers of the R-PP. The status of the Forestry Authority is not clear nor is the process of consultation. No real consultation appears to have been conducted in preparation of the RPP, so its overall purpose as a policy/project document is very uncertain. There is no clear description of how information has been shared with potential stakeholders.

In general, **Component 2** would benefit from more attention to logical sequence and explanation of the connections between forest loss, underlying causes and necessary mitigation actions. The component moves directly from a detailed description of drivers to elucidating actions with no intermediate discussion of possible pathways or review of the evidence of the success or otherwise of past strategies. There is little research evidence to support proposed abatement actions and significant numerical estimates – for instance on the estimates of carbon stored in PNG forests (4.7 billion tonnes) and carbon emissions from deforestation (926.5 million tonnes) - need to be supported with references and ideally hotlinks to the relevant papers or reports. While Workplan Activities seem to address some of these concerns, it is unclear why a further three years of study is necessary to prepare these options.

C. TAP Recommendations and questions that focus broadly on the R-P presentation are noted under each Sub-component. Responses or questions that refer to the **text** in specific pages under **Comments 1, 2, 3, and 4** are also noted in each Sub-component under the **Details** section.

The TAP assessment of the standards for each section is summarized in the table below.

Second TAP Review (1 October 2012):

This Second TAP Review focused on PNG revised R-PP (Version 9 Working Draft) that was submitted in late September. It was designed to address the TAP First Review comments. The submitted draft addressed some of the comments on Components 1, 2, 3 and 4. It did not address the comments on Components 5 and 6.

Many of the Component 1 comments and those on Component 4b were addressed in the revised R-PP. However, for Component 1a, what is missing is information about the new Ministry of Forest and Climate Change that was set up in August. It would help to provide a better understanding of its role in REDD+ implementation and how it will relate to other ministries since OCCD will no longer report to the PM. Also, there is no coverage of the strong capacity building comments either.

Comments on the other Components 2, 3 and 4a were largely not addressed.

The Overview information noted in First TAP Review above is not addressed except for Component 1, which appears to be covered to a large extent.

The TAP assessment of the standards for each section is summarized in the table below.

Components	First Draft R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 13	Second Revised Draft R-PP submitted for assessment in PC13
1a	Not met	Partially met
1b	Partially met	Largely met
1c	Partially met	Largely met
2a	Partially met	Partially met
2b	Partially met	Partially met
2c	Partially met	Partially met
2d	Partially met	Partially met
3	Partially met	Partially met
4a	Partially met	Partially met
4b	Partially met	Largely met
5	Not met	Not met
6	Not met	Not met