



FCPF Technical Advisory Panel

Democratic Republic of Congo Draft R-PP: Comments by the TAP

March 22-25, 2010
FCPF Participants Committee
La Lope, Gabon

DRC TAP review team leader: Stephen Cobb

Overall Summary of the Review: 1

Strengths of the revised RPP:

This is an extremely impressive R-PP, with an admirable mix of the broad sweep and the meticulous detail. It is well organized, well researched and is a credit to DRC and its team of contributors.

The level of attainment of standards has been generally very high:

- The six Standards in Components 1 and 2 have between 1 and 3 recommendations each; once these have been dealt with (mostly editorial rather than fundamental matters), the Standards will have been met
- Components 3 and 4 are more challenging; they have between 4 and 6 recommendations, which will need to be dealt with before their Standards have been met.
- Components 5 and 6 are very straightforward: after rather superficial changes, they will both meet the standard.

All in all, this is very satisfactory progress.

Overall Summary of the Review: 2

Issues in the revised R-PP:

- The enormous challenges of: capacity-building; the decentralisation process (first to 11 and soon after to 26 provinces); establishing a credible and flexible institutional structure; gathering adequate, replicable, statistically justifiable and believable data.
- The obstacles to implementation of REDD+ posed by a busy agenda of non-REDD+ developments in rural areas, e.g. re-installation of displaced persons, the resumption on a heroic scale of industrial agriculture schemes
- The constant difficulties posed by the need to involve all stakeholders: forest dwellers; indigenous peoples; local community groups; rural farmers; forest industry practitioners and more. All have a legitimate voice and enormous experience, justifiable uncertainties and as-yet unmet aspirations.

Overall Summary of the Review: 3

Recommendations for development of the R-PP:

There are 23 recommendations, spread fairly evenly throughout the R-PP.

The scale of the undertaking is very large and it is worth remembering that the production of the R-PP is but the first of a long sequence of steps over the coming years towards achieving a national REDD Strategy and Capacity.

A note about process

The original TAP reviews were conducted on the version submitted to FCPF on 11th January 2010. Two subsequent revisions have been submitted by DRC. In addition there have been exchanges between TAP and DRC in the last week that have clarified a number of the concerns of reviewers and in some cases eliminated the need for recommendations, as have some of the revisions to the basic R-PP text. The text which follows responds to these updates and exchanges, though so as not to confuse, all the recommendations have been left in place, even though some are already redundant

R-PP Component 1: Organize and consult

Standard 1a

National Readiness Management Arrangements

Assessment:

Overall, this section is well prepared and the proposed structures are well organized.

Multiple platforms were established for cross-sectoral engagement within the government, at national and provincial level. and with a range of civil society, NGO, academic and private sector groups,

Outreach and training at provincial and local level could be extraordinarily difficult

Sectoral goals often clash with the goal of a REDD+ program, and should be sorted out during the Readiness Preparation process.

DRC has an opportunity, through a low-carbon economy, to play a key role in the evolution of REDD+.

Standard 1a is largely met, subject to the recommendation

R-PP Component 1: Organize and consult

Standard 1b

Stakeholder Consultation and Participation

Assessment:

MECNT has done a good job with the limited resources available in reaching out at national and provincial capital levels to raise awareness about the REDD initiative. Understandably it has been less effective in building deep public understanding about what REDD is and how it will affect the lives of stakeholders.

A major challenge under the participation plans will be outreach to stakeholders not reached by traditional meetings and communication media. The size and complexity of the country make this an enormous challenge, and would benefit by establishing early on a broad range of partnerships with CSOs and IPOs, especially those with specialist mediation experience.

Recommendations:

- The consultation plan should be further developed to assure that future activities would be genuinely consultative and participative, particularly amongst the most affected communities.

Standard 1b is largely met, subject to the recommendation

R-PP Component 2: Prepare the REDD Strategy

Standard 2a

Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance

Assessment:

The R-PP does a good job in highlighting the relevant governance and land tenure factors that might be at play against scenarios of increased access to natural resources via infrastructure and agricultural development, mining and logging.

Recommendations:

- Explain how to correct data gaps by mobilizing the large range of NGOs and academic institutions.
- Provide a summary of the (interim) conclusions of the different studies on drivers of deforestation.

Standard 2a is largely met, subject to the recommendations

R-PP Component 2: Prepare the REDD Strategy

Standard 2b

REDD Strategy Options

Assessment:

The REDD strategy focuses on reducing emissions and poverty simultaneously, which will require deep socioeconomic transformation of the country.

Selection of pilot REDD programs will be guided by the McKinsey Cost Curve, which may not account for the transaction and implementation costs.

More innovative thinking is needed for private sector involvement & rural revenue sharing.

DRC's national approach to baseline & monitoring will be a challenge to implement but will address additionality and leakage.

Recommendations:

- The transaction and implementation costs should be included in the cost curve.
- Explore the potential threat from biofuel/ oil palm production.
- Provide more information about the 10+ early demonstration projects being considered

Standard 2b is largely met, subject to the recommendations

R-PP Component 2: Prepare the REDD Strategy

Standard 2c

REDD Implementation Framework

Assessment:

Reviewers are concerned about the potential proliferation of new institutions, though they have subsequently been assured that existing ones will be used where possible.

The intention of the “pole of excellence” is unclear; strengthening existing centres of excellence such as OFAC for remote sensing could be better developed.

Recommendations:

- Encourage greater progress on decentralized management & decision making while recognizing the challenges indicated previously of building provincial capacity.
- Increase representation of forest dependent community leadership and civil society institutions, whose composition and legitimacy would need to be determined.
- Build on existing institutions and structures wherever possible

Standard 2c is partially met – will vary by province

R-PP Component 2: Prepare the REDD Strategy

Standard 2d

Assessment of Social and Environmental Impacts

Assessment

The stated commitment to comply with the World Bank's safeguard policies should, if honored, allow definition of acceptable practice. The approach to monitoring implementation and providing feedback should be clarified in the SESA ToR. Capacity building should be implemented under the NEA framework, with the passage of the Environmental Law, and this process needs to be speeded up. The SESA should focus on the potential consequences of the preferred strategies that emerge from the RPP process.

Recommendations:

- At this stage the focus should be on defining clear terms of reference that define the scope of SESA work to be done in line with WB Safeguards and National laws and regulations..

Standard 2d is largely met, subject to the recommendation

R-PP Component 3: Develop a Reference Scenario

Standard 3

Reference scenario

Assessment

The R-PP comprehensively describes essential factors for creating meaningful reference levels, but not how to account for them, or existing data, capacities and gaps.

Existing data on carbon stocks do not qualify for IPCC tier 2 or 3 estimates.

The R-PP will consider all 5 carbon pools; the data gaps require a stepwise approach.

Capacity building and data collection should be prioritized in relation to the drivers of DD

Both regional and sub-national approaches need consideration.

The model building and innovative prospective approaches differ from earlier text.

Recommendations:

- Capacity building activities for community based carbon monitoring should receive significantly more attention.
- Recognition of existing monitoring and measurement programs should be acknowledged.
- Better explain how regional cooperation might develop the reference scenario

Standard 3 is partially met but work is underway with FAO to define a stepwise approach to measuring carbon pools and increased precision of driver monitoring

R-PP Component 4: Design a monitoring system

Standard 4

Design a monitoring system

Assessment

The section on monitoring of emissions & removals exhibits a good knowledge of the issues, capabilities and limits on available technologies and a realistic assessment of investments needed to acquire and maintain the needed level of capacity.

The link between national policy and associated MRV requirements should be much more closely aligned with MRV-system development and capacity building requirements.

The R-PP only makes a short statement about participatory approaches..

Recommendations:

- **Increase attention to civil society, local communities, NGOs & private sector in MRV.**
- Explicitly include monitoring the drivers of deforestation as a separate assessment.
- Clarify existing capacity, gaps and the establishment of long-term capacity in MRV.

Standard 4 requires further definition of the implementation plans

R-PP Component 5: Schedule and Budget

Standard 5

Completeness of information and resource requirements

Assessment:

The format of the work schedule and budget is excellent. The budget also provides clear information and detail on possible funding sources and technical assistance.

The plan is ambitious and probably overoptimistic, given the very real capacity limitations of DRC. The true costs of some activities appear to be underestimated.

There are some unanswered questions: Would the much bigger funding sought from non-FCPF funds delay the start of the Readiness activity? Would FCPF funding be used to fill this gap?

Recommendations:

- Sequence and prioritize the investments from the two named sources to avoid the risk of weak performance from critical budget gaps. Do a “critical path” assessment for the deployment of funding to design a “fallback” strategy in the event that supplementary funding is delayed or not forthcoming..

Standard 5 is met

R-PP Component 6: Design Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard

Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Assessment:

The outline provides a very clear and impressive M&E system and indicators to be monitored. The remaining question is whether this M&E system can be implemented successfully in DRC with its many governance challenges.

The program would benefit from a workshop/ analysis that addressed the “SMART” indicators built around the four major program components.

The elements of “timeliness” and transparency will be crucial in this program, not the least because of the large mix of donors expected to participate in addition to the FCPF and UNREDD mechanisms.

A funding facility would be useful to buffer against delays of funding from different individual donors.

Recommendations:

- The indicators require further detailing but this could be achieved in revision of this document without too much challenge.

Standard 6 is largely met, subject to this recommendation