

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, December 13, 2012, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

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

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

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

Review of R-PP of: Sudan

Reviewer: UK, Mozambique (Lead)

Date of review: 25/11/13

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6:)

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, 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:

1. Would be useful to clarify the identity and roles of the mentioned NGOs, CSOs and private sector actors.
2. The TAP has made a good analysis of this section and we **agree with their findings**, no further comment.
3. Under Institutional arrangement, the participation of stakeholders is highlighted but commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness must be well addressed.
4. The Task Force II should continue do help the Sudan REDD+ Programme implementation body.
5. Capacity Building activities are included and significant external technical expertise (Task Force I and II) participated and played a very important role.
6. I found very useful the information given on the Grievance Resolution Mechanism because this strengthen the roles of weak and marginalized communities' members and thus allow them to participate in the forest management program.

7. Standard 1a is met

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

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

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

1. Mentions feedback from stakeholder groups but provides less detail on their identities, in particular there is no mention of consultation with IPs.
2. Agree with TAP.

3. This R-PP version shows that the Government took an exercise to identify key stakeholders during its preparation and the national scale information took place.
4. As SUDAN has many ethnic groups it is very important to bring those who constitute the minority to the process so that their voice can be heard.
5. The translation of available Jargon from English into Arabic shows that the Govern is concerned to hear the voice of many ethnic groups and it is a very important tool. Using this tool allow indigenous people and other dwellers, forest dependents to participate in the process.
6. **Standard 1b is met**

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

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

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

1. Meets the standard.
2. The R-PP shows the Government Ownership and the dissemination involves different stakeholders.
3. This R-Pp also show that all stakeholders will be affected in transparency and equitable manner what will allow to make the process trusted.
4. **Standard 1c is met**

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, 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

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).

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:

1. Agree with TAP that it *partially meets the standard*.
2. Pg 58: it is unclear what the source of figures for the rates of forest loss are, nor the source of the reference for the 2001-2010 figure.
3. Better links could be drawn between Box II.1 on the major causes of deforestation and forest degradation (pg. 58) and Table II.8 (pg. 59).
4. Gaps for Budgeting section in Table II.8 could be strengthened, some of the gaps, do not seem to adequately address the causes and consequences section of the table. As the TAP suggest presenting D and FD in the contexts of direct and underlying forces should address this. Linking these to the needs assessment would also make implementation strategy clearer.
5. The TAP recommendation:

“Sudan, in this sub-component, should make a strong business case for its contributions to REDD+. Examples of issues that could be used are: expansion of gum arabic plantations to provide products and services, afforestation in appropriate sites, conservation of woodlands to improve tree cover, controlled use of fire in land management, combatting desertification through agro-forestry. Others could be sustainable range management and energy efficiency.”

is particularly pertinent. Indicating the need to couple activities for reducing deforestation through shifting of energy uses for example with incentives for reforestation or agroforestry would strengthen the impact of these interventions.

6. The major Land uses are identified and the ecological classification will help to ensure more efforts on that Land which more effort is necessary but it will be better to describe more about the ecological classification.
7. **2a Standard partially met**

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:

1. Agree with TAP. No further comments.
2. I found the use of integrated approach to reduce deforestation and degradation namely capacity building costs and on-going cost as a very important tool because it will be more effective.
3. The country sector strategies in forest, agriculture, transport will be envisioned on REDD+ strategy and it will help to consolidate the sustainability and thus achieve many goals and benefits.
4. Many activities were recommended and they will play a very important role helping understand how the Strategy will be addressed.
5. **Standard 2b is met**

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

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

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

1. Agree with TAP that the R-PP doesn’t provide enough clarity on the framework conditions such as policies, mandates, procedures, participatory structures, financing etc. especially as the *“institutional and legal arrangements necessary to implement the REDD+ strategy are not clear yet”* further details on how this is going to be addressed would be useful - perhaps elaborating from table 2c.
2. In general this section meets the standards and concerned with implementation framework, the activities are well described and the work plan for institutional

arrangements is present.

3. **Standard 2c partially met**

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

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence in the form of an assessment of environmental and social risks and impacts as part of the SESA process. It also provides a description of safeguard issues that are relevant to the country's readiness preparation efforts. For FCPF countries, a simple work plan is presented for conducting the SESA process, cross referencing other components of the R-PP as appropriate, , and for preparing the ESMF.

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

1. It would be useful for the R-PP to draw on past social and environmental safeguard issues and to put these in the context of REDD, if appropriate, and comment on how these will be mitigated / addressed.
2. Pg. 87 - Specific impacts of activities are not discussed in the context of women - perhaps relevant for charcoal production / energy switching interventions.
3. As many studies, consultations and measures are planned to be undertaken there are created conditions to assess the Social and Environmental Impacts.
4. Therefore, steps, responsible entities are present and well endorsed. Also a simple work plan is presented showing how the SESA process will be followed.
5. **Standard on 2d is met**

Component 3. Develop a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level

Standard 3: a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest 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 (monitoring 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:

1. Agree with all of TAPs comments, particularly the point around the missing work-plan and specificity of the activities.
2. The budget seems quite low given that the country almost needs to start from zero and has very little information available. This might become more obvious if they outline more clearly all the individual activities and associate costs with them.
3. Making a review of this R-PP I dare to say that REL need to be further elaborated and reviewed. A close collaboration with Universities and research centers, as mentioned, will help to develop the methodology to collect the REL data.
4. **3a does not meet the standard**

Component 4. Design Systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards

Standard 4a: National Forest Monitoring System:

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:

1. Does not meet the standard.
2. Although the description of the monitoring data requirements and methodological framework on reporting of emissions shows some understanding of the technical capacity requirements of a monitoring system is provided (page 113-14), it is not clear what existing capacity for monitoring is available.
3. Perhaps further information on the three technical pillars or building blocks of the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) that are essential to support its MRV function can be illustrated/demonstrated in terms of what capacity is available to achieve the following (in

line with UN-REDD NFMS guiding principles):

- a) Pillar 1- Satellite Land Monitoring System - to collect and assess over time the activity data (AD) related to forest land, areas and changes in forest areas/land use.
 - b) Pillar 2 - National Forest Inventory - to collect information on forest carbon stocks and changes, relevant for estimating E/R and provide emissions factors (EF).
 - c) Pillar 3 - Development of a national GHG inventory as a tool for reporting anthropogenic E/R.
4. Greater clarity on the technical capacity to carry out a stratification of land cover and description of sampling framework.
 5. Not clear whether Sudan have capacity to report at tier 1 including all carbon pools, land use types and key categories.
 6. Overall, the distinction between use of high and medium resolution satellite systems to monitor changes in carbon stocks is appropriate, however, emphasis on a data needs assessment is essential to first identify where the monitoring gaps are, in data requirements, technical capacity and institutional set up.
 7. There is also a lack of clarity on a separate budget statement, planned activities, deliverables and timelines which are also highlighted in the TAP Review.
 8. During the Review I didn't understand how will the Monitoring System operate (Who, how, information fluxes?
 9. **4a does not meet the standard**

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

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:

1. Agree with TAP.
2. Recognizing the potential co-benefits and risks is very important for understanding the impact of REDD+ on the social and environmental conditions so further elaboration is needed.
3. **4b meet the standards**

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:

1. Agree with TAP's comments.
2. Further, some items under section 2a seem to be very high, e.g. \$0.8m for a study on demand for forest products.
3. I also came across the fact that studies on very specific renewable energy projects are financed under this. While I can see this as part of a proper options analysis, I struggle to see its direct connection to deforestation. I'd see this study maybe as an outcome from a drivers analysis, but feel like this is possibly per-empting the outcome of the analysis of drivers.
4. As mentioned above, I think the expenditure on the reference level is quite low given the data availability. For example, I'd expect them to spend more on a methodological assessment than just 15k.
5. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP. A budget and schedule for funding are summarized by year and by donor reflecting the R-PP proposes but it needs to be further analyzed.
6. **Standard 5 partially 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:

1. Table 6-1 in the annex gives a quite ambitious and comprehensive overview of planned activities.
2. All of them are planned in 2014-2015 - it would be useful to give indication on when exactly these will be done. It would be also good to see an update halfway through which of these have been completed.

3. A lot of work planned on capacity building and communication activities but I did not see anything on agreeing on indicators. This is mentioned in the text on co-benefits that social and economic benefits will be measured through three types of indicators (policy, process and outcome). The M&E framework should provide a list of these after agreeing them with the stakeholders and taking into consideration what data source/collection methods/frequency will be used.
4. I am not sure who will manage and coordinate these activities, was wondering if this budget of \$145,000 is sufficient. They have plenty of studies in the pipeline - do they expect to complete them with this budget on top of all other activities planned?
5. Although presented on the section 5 the values for Monitoring and Evaluation Framework are well endorsed therefore further elaboration in other to put more information available is needed.
6. **Standard 6 partially met**