



FCPF – External Technical Advisory Panel

TAP Overview Report: Nicaragua, El Salvador, Burkina Faso

TAP team: Steve Cobb, Harrison Kojwang, Tomas Schlichter, Gisela Ulloa

12th FCPF Participants Committee Meeting

Santa Marta, Colombia

June 27-29, 2012





Overview

- **Nicaragua** – presented for formal consideration
- **El Salvador** – presented for informal submission, expected results from today: recommendations for improvements to R-PP with view to future formal submission
- **Burkina Faso** – not an FCPF REDD country participant, however, Burkina Faso is a Forest Investment Program (FIP) pilot country, invited by the PC to follow the FCPF process



Common features

- Institutional aspects
 - Both Nicaragua and El Salvador have REDD+ explicitly embedded in broader strategies of social, economic and environmental management. For example, that of El Salvador is based on their Adaptation-based Mitigation approach to climate impacts and other risks
 - Burkina Faso has focussed on forests, emphasising an ambitious socially-driven re-forestation programme
 - All three countries have placed the leadership of REDD+ approaches in their Environment Ministries: whether these will have the necessary weight in future has yet to be tested



Common features (2)

- Consultation and participation
 - Nicaragua seems to have tackled this well, with all relevant actors, including those responsible for forest loss, included in the dialogue process
 - El Salvador has much work still to do in this domain, to rise to the publicised expectations of highly critical civil society groups
 - Burkina Faso has a strong, long record in participatory forest management and while this is evident in the R-PP, there is room for this to be further improved, for example by specifying how consultations will be planned and reacted to at the village level

Common features (3)

- Land-use, governance and the drivers of D and D
 - Real progress has been made here, by comparison with R-PPs of a year or two ago. All three are well described. Burkina Faso's is particularly good, backed by quantitative data and also provides an excellent chart detailing the problems of forest governance and potential solutions
- Strategic options
 - How to react to the implications of these drivers is more variable: Nicaragua's proposals are good (with a plan for further developing of each of the proposals), El Salvador's need much further work, while Burkina Faso's are between the two (needing to define the project ideas more clearly).
 - This is an interesting reflection on the fact that it is easier to identify the causes of D and D problems, than to solve them

Common features (4)

- Reference levels
 - Nicaragua met the standard 1 year ago, then curiously substituted a revised approach that did not
 - El Salvador has still to write a convincing narrative on this; human resource capacity constraints are a dominant issue
 - Burkina Faso is still rather unclear on what needs to be done, and how, with not enough information on methods to be applied, data requirements and human capacity needs
 - This is one area where outside technical assistance would be of use to two, if not all three of these countries

Common features (5)

- MRV emissions and removals
 - A common feature of this component is the challenge of capacity-building , under the weight of which all 3 countries seem to be struggling;
 - Burkina Faso has strong external support, but has not yet made clear how it would plan its own future capacity needs
 - The TAP notes that few countries (Tanzania being one) have shown an ability to build internal capacity in the methodologies required
- MRV for other benefits
 - Both Nicaragua and El Salvador have described the monitoring of biodiversity benefits in some detail, but are much less clear on socio-economic benefits and how to monitor them
 - Burkina Faso could usefully make a stronger case as to how it would measure the co-benefits (both social and biodiversity)



Some overall comments

- Where have we got over the last two years?
These three R-PPs show, between them, some very strong qualities, which indicate that countries are drawing strength from those who have preceded them in producing R-PPs. These qualities include:
 - determination,
 - imagination and
 - leadership

Some overall comments (2)

- Determination
 - Nicaragua has shown great strength and patience in dealing with the comments of the TAP and the PC, during 4 iterations of its R-PP, to end with a product that is now a radical improvement on the original
- Imagination
 - El Salvador has shown great imagination in the development of its R-PP (in linking it to future scenarios of risk and catastrophe), but has yet to demonstrate that it knows how to make the plan practicable
- Leadership
 - Burkina Faso has shown that it knows what it wants to do and how to marshal the support it has been promised from many donors. It is managing a multiplicity of donors in a seemingly well-coordinated partnership with themselves in charge