

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, January 10, 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.

Updated PC Review of R-PP of UGANDA (v. May 30th 2011)

Reviewer : AFD (lead), Canada, Nepal

Date of review : 2011 - 06 - 06

This June review updates previous reviews of February 14th, 2011 (undertaken by Spain (lead), Guatemala and Denmark) and May 13th, 2011 (undertaken by AFD, Canada and Nepal).

Clarification on codes of colours:

Comments in blue are comments raised by the February PC review, **comments in black** are comments raised by the May PC review and **underlined comments in black** are the updated comments of the June PC review.

Comments highlighted grey are previous comments that the June update review considers still not being properly addressed.

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

The draft R-PP is clearly not yet “completed” and focuses largely on what has been done so far in terms of REDD+ consultations in Uganda, rather than on the plans for the work in the readiness phase from 2012-14; Compared to the amount of information provided in the first sections of the RPP, sections 4, 5 and 6 seem incomplete. There have been major improvements since the previous review of February. Seven of the standards are about to be completed, as long as some minor improvements are achieved. Standards 2b, 3, 4b and 5 need some clarifications and further developments to be met. Only Standard 2c is not yet met. We appreciated the systematic and detailed responses provided by Uganda on all the comments that were raised by the May PC review. Overall all the major issues that are required by the standards, have been tackled in this updated version. However, they are sometimes not really addressed in the document, even succinctly, but instead planned to be addressed later during the implementation phase as analytical work. The R-PP is mainly based on some independent studies that have been carried out by advisory companies, NGOs or consultants, and that deal with all the components of the R-PP. They are provided in eleven appendixes. Given both the length of the body of the document (150 pages whereas a maximum of 100 pages is highly recommended) and the length of those studies (around 75 pages each), we have focused our review on the body of the document and on the annexes, since we consider that all the relevant information should be reported there. According to us, all the standards, but one, are met, depending on some limited but important clarifications. Only standard 2c is assessed as partially met. In summary, remaining issues to clarify are related to: the rules of procedure of the REDD+ arrangement (component 1a), the build-up area (components 2a and 2b), the impact of the new government structure on institutional arrangements (component 2c), the collection of data for adjusting historical trends (component 3), the activities and budgets of components 4a and 4b which are identical (components 4a, 4b and 5) and the counterpart funding from three unknown agencies for the balance of the R-PP's budget (component 5).

N.B. : In the Budget section (5), given the short review timelines, the PC review would look to the FMT to ensure that summary financial tables are tabulated correctly in the cases where the supporting component tables from previous sections were updated.

- there appears to be a rather “bureaucratic” approach proposed for the readiness process, which may require further refinement in order to streamline the design and reduce the costs;
- As in other countries, it will be very important to ensure that the readiness process is aligned with government policies and legislation in the forestry sector and with respect to environmental legislation in general; Addressed. Refer to section 1.9 and 1.11
- Strengthening the rights of forest dwellers and communities must be fully taken into account throughout the readiness process.
- The document makes references to annexes or appendix constantly, most of the times when it refers to relevant information that should be included in the main body of the RPP.
- There is more information to what can be digested in the time provided for the review. We suggest including all the relevant information in the main text, focusing in what is really needed for the RPP to be complete, and avoid references to appendixes. The information has well been moved from the annex into the body text. The concern is now that the length of the body is twice the length recommended by the guidelines for preparing an R-PP (75 pages) and the total length is near 200 pages whereas the guidance ask for a maximum of 150 pages. So it is important to avoid

repetitions (such as those in the introduction and in the component 1a) and as far as possible to provide in the body summaries of some sections which are maybe not essential there and might be moved into the annex.

- The units in budget tables seem to be wrong. Titles should say K\$ and not \$. This has been corrected except in component 6. Addressed.

C1a: Standard is met, subject to the consideration of the comment in bold (May: Standard is met, subject to the consideration of the comments that have been made, **February : standard is partially met**)

C1b: Standard is met (May: Standard is met, **February: standard is not met**)

C1c: Standard is met

C2a: Standard is met, subject to consideration of the comments in bold (May: Standard is met, subject to consideration of the comments, **February : standard is partially met**)

C2b: Standard is met, subject to consideration of the comment in bold (May: Standard is partially met, **February : standard is partially met**)

C2c: Standard is partially met (May: Standard is not met, **February: Standard is not met**)

C2d: Standard is met (May: Standard is met, subject to minor considerations, **February: Standard is not met**)

C3: Standard is met (May: Standard is partially met, **February : standard is not met**).

C4a: Standard is met, subject to consideration of the comment in bold (May: Standard is met, subject to consideration and clarification of the issues that have been raised, **February : standard is partially met**)

C4b: standard is met, subject to consideration of the comment in bold (May : Standard is partially met, **February : standard is not met**).

C5: Standard is met, subject to consideration of the comment in bold (May: Standard is partially met).

C6: Standard is met (May: Standard is met, subject to minor considerations)

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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

Very useful and through information on what has been done and what is going to be done to arrange national readiness. Information well structured, explaining roles, compositions, and functions of the different bodies involved in REDD+.

This section has greatly improved compared to the previous ones (February and March 2011). All

the previous comments raised by the PC review have been addressed (see below). We suggest some further minor areas for improvement :

Comments:

- more details should be provided on the implementing agencies/implementing institutions. While the section dealing with the implementing agencies (1.6 d) was improved in the March version of the R-PP, it has not been modified greatly since then. It is not clear what type of details on the implementing institutions should be included in the text. That being said, the R-PP does clearly state that implementing institutions will be specified later when the REDD-plus Strategies have been confirmed (p.27). This seems to limit the amount of detail that can be provided at this time. Nevertheless, we can wonder what type of institution will be decided (theme-based institutions or any other?).

- the steering committee is a body with a crucial role in the REDD+ implementation framework, and its details should be better explained in the main text of the RPP. A table enumerating the members of the REDD-plus Steering Committee is included (p.26); this was in an annex in the version of March 2011.

- Information on the political and legal frameworks for RPP implementation for 2012-2014 is important for the RPP understanding, and should be included in the main text, not in an appendix. This happens through the entire document. The March and April versions of the R-PP include rich detail on the policy and legal frameworks for R-PP implementation, as well as on the institutional framework for R-PP implementation.

1- Regarding the risks associated with this governance structure and the way they could be mitigated, Section 1.10 (page 31) recognizes some risks but does not identify a process to address them. While Uganda considers this issue is addressed by annexes 2a and 2c, the PC review still considers that information should be given on how those identified risks will be addressed.

2- It is said that the Steering Committee has been formed in June 2010 (p17), and that it will itself adopt its rules of procedures (p27). But nothing is said about them. Thus, if it has effectively adopted them, it would be great to have them presented in the R-PP. Uganda informs that those rules of procedures have not yet been established. Please explain why and what is needed or expected to adopt them.

3- Figure 2 under chapter 1.7 is not very clear and might be improved.

4- Both the body of the document and this component are very long (respectively: 150 pages and 17 pages). In this component, some of the information provided, either is already provided in others sections of the R-PP (in particular in the introduction), or might be, according to us, more suitable in other components. So, please consider if you find appropriate the following suggestions. To move :

- the information provided in parts 1.1 to 1.4., into the introduction (delete any repetitions),
- the information provided in parts 1.9 to 1.11, into the component 2a (delete any repetitions),
- the information provided in part 1.5, into the annex or the component 1b (delete any repetitions), No changes have been made because the suggestions were found inappropriate.

Standard partially met

Standard is met, subject to the consideration of the above mentioned comments

Standard is met, subject to the consideration of the above mentioned comment in bold

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

<p>Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:</p> <p><u>Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:</u></p> <p>The component has improved a lot since the February review. The concerns that were previously raised are now addressed (see below). The use of sex-disaggregated figures for the Forest Dependent People/Communities/Special groups participants in the stakeholder consultations (p. 39) is appreciated. Consider the last two following minor areas for improvement :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As in other parts of the document, this section focus on what has been done, and there is not enough information on what Uganda will do in 2012-2014 in SCP. This is the main part of this section, and should be improved to meet the standard. The active involvement of stakeholders ins mentioned, but little detail is provided on how this will be done. <p>The April 2011 version of the R-PP includes two separate sub-sections for Standard 1b of Component 1: the first deals with information sharing and early dialogue with stakeholders during the R-PP formulation phase (1B), and the second deals with the forward-looking consultation and participation process in the implementation phase (1C). This clearly draws a distinction between the R-PP formulation/backward looking aspect of consultation and participation and the R-PP implementation/forward looking aspect of consultation and participation; the latter has been significantly expanded:</p> <p>In section 1C, two new sections have been included: one on Consultations and Feedback into REDD-Plus Strategies and a second on Conflict Resolution and Grievances Management System during R-PP implementation (pp. 47-50). These sections effectively outline how concerns expressed by stakeholders in prior consultations will be considered by the Government of Uganda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- There is some inconsistency with the numbering of sections (p. 38): 1.6.1. 3 should be 1.14.1. 3. <u>Addressed.</u>- Reports from the stakeholder consultations (original and expanded) described on page 38 and in the Annexes should be included in R-PP document, with assertion that the R-PP has addressed, or will address in the implementation, the issues identified in these reports. It would be helpful to have copies of the reports available to affirm the considerations have been addressed in the R-PP.

As indicated by Uganda, the Appendices 5e (National Expanded Consultations report), provides with the information resulting from the consultations. Sections 1.15.1 and 1.15.2 (p43-44) deal with the consideration of " the concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders" (standard 1.c) in general.

Standard not met

Standard 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 far¹ (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:

Comments of the May and June PC review :

see above.

Standard is met

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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review :

There is a complete analysis of drivers for DD in Uganda. Also there is an overview of key policies and laws relevant to REDD+. The efforts 1) to link the drivers of deforestation and the types of

¹ 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).

land on which it occurs, 2) to quantify the deforestation, as well as 3) to identify the related stakeholders, are very much welcome. The summary tables make the reading easier. We appreciate the presentation of Biodiversity in Uganda's Forests which is a good point of departure to take into account this aspect in the design of the REDD strategy. That being said, we noticed that half of the comments raised by the previous PC review have been addressed. However, the build-up area appears insufficiently taken into account in the diagnosis (see above). In addition to those two points, some remaining needs for clarification and some minor areas for improvement are :

- In the list of underlying causes of deforestation, build up area is not included, and, in %, it seems to be an important cause of deforestation, that should be considered, or at least, the trend could be analyzed. Whereas human settlement, urbanization and oil exploration are also referred as major drivers of deforestation (p 62), there is insufficient information on their impacts (p 72) and no complementary studies are considered to establish their impacts and whether they can be addressed through REDD-Plus (p 85). Uganda considers having addressed this issue in the TORs (Annex 2a) through in-depth analysis of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, but to us it is still not clear that such kind of in-depth analysis is planned and that those particular drivers will be more documented.

- More details on the legal description of instruments and tools used in the management and land tenure issues should be provided. A new sub-section has been included (2.3.1) which outlines in detail the Policy, Legal and Institutional frameworks for REDD-plus. An additional section (2.3.2) has been included on Addressing legal gaps in forest management.

- It is recommended to analyze the processes for forest dependent peoples, due to the sensitivity of the cultural aspects and the link with REDD+. This is important when Uganda has ratified ILO convention 169, in particular, the issue of free, prior and informed consent. Paragraph 2.1.3 (p58) deals with the "Implications of deforestation and forest degradation on forest dependent people" and mostly refer to the implementation of the SESA. But it was already present in the previous versions of the R-PP, and there is no improvement on this issue. The Convention 169 is still not mentioned in the R-PP. Addressed in table 25 p88 (and rectification : Uganda has not ratified the Convention ILO 169).

- Budget should be included here. The budget has been included in this section (p. 85).

- To get a better picture of the type of underlying factors at stake, please consider if you find relevant to classify the underlying causes related to each direct driver into: policy, economic, technological, and demographical factors instead of listing them all together. No changes have been made in the revised document (31st of May). Uganda plans to do that in the implementation phase (Annex 2a). But according to us, as the annex is written currently it is not explicit that this concern will be addressed. It should be elaborated more explicitly.

- Population growth is referred as a direct driver (same title level as agriculture and charcoal) (p 63, § 2.2.4.2), whereas it seems to be an underlying factor (in particular for agriculture expansion) "*The primary cause of agricultural expansion is the demand for more land to meet the increasing demand for food for a growing population ...*" (p63). So it might be better to refer to it as an underlying cause. No changes have been made in the revised document (31st of May), since Uganda considers population growth as both a direct driver and an indirect driver.

- It seems that the option " b) Developing Strategy and guidelines for nationwide Tree planting and forest land restoration and for Plantation establishment in forest reserves", p 64, is not a specific option to address agriculture based drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, so maybe it might be refer as a transversal option. No changes have been made in the present

document. They are planned to be done during the implementation phase (Annex 2a). But according to us, as the annex is written currently it is not explicit that this concern will be addressed.

- To improve clarity and logical order, and support actions summarized in Table 25 of component 2b, please consider bringing into this next component 2b, the potential REDD strategy options that are currently included in component 2a. In fact this component 2a identifies and describes what the problems are and/or may be, and component 2b describes options for addressing them. No changes have been done since Uganda considers this information is appropriate in this section.

- Link and consistency between both figures of page 61's last paragraph and figures of table 18 (same page), are not obvious. Please explain better the differences which are observed for the regions *Hoima* and *Kibaale* or harmonize the figures. Addressed.

- This part is very long (25 pages), but all the sub-sections are interesting. The last ones might be moved into the annex? No changes have been considered relevant

Standard has been partially met.

Standard is met, subject to consideration of the above mentioned comment

Standard is met, subject to consideration of the above mentioned comment in bold

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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

Complete assessment of strategy options. The presentation in a table provides a friendly way of reading the relevant information, and additional information can be found in the appendix if needed. Table 25 is very clear and provides a useful amount of details to help understand the direction of the REDD+ strategy. That being said, we notice that significant issues raised by the previous PC review have still not been addressed (see below). In particular, it is not clear how the issues outlined in the guidance have been addressed in this version: cost-benefit estimates, feasibility of emerging REDD-plus strategy and cross-sectoral synergies. So please consider the still accurate comments below as well as the following areas for improvements :

- Some of the relevant issues listed in the guidance are not included here (risk of leakage, integration with other policies and strategies, cost and benefits,...) and should be considered. Through Strategic Option #11 ("*Develop and apply measures for minimizing Carbon leakages*")

(p90), leakages are now taken into consideration. But potential strategies impacting or involving other sectors still need to be identified. This would be useful to have this clarified in the presentation to PC9 in Oslo. According to Uganda, annex 2a addresses those concerns. Although being generally written, action d) of Annex 2a: " Review policy, legal and institutional arrangements in relation to REDD-Plus issues and needs" effectively deals with related-sectoral policies. Appendix 2 (section2.8), which deals with major thematic studies, addresses this issue too. But as appendixes are numerous and long, important information should be reported in the body of the document and in the terms of reference.

- The process for finalizing the REDD+ strategies (page 90) and the Summary Table 26 describes the proposed analytic work, including an economic analysis to determine cost effectiveness of the proposed REDD+ strategies on a national scale. However, the standard calls for "*early estimates of cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy*" but no estimates are provided. It would also be useful to have this clarified in the presentation to PC9 in Oslo. It is clear that Uganda's REDD Strategy is at an early stage of development and they have determined that key information must be collected before early estimates of cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy can be provided. Therefore, this comment has been adequately addressed.

- information on areas of intervention for plight of forest dependent people should be provided in the table. Information on the plight of forest dependent peoples has been included in table 25 (p. 87) and is now addressed.

- All the plans are for 2012-2014, but in this section, the development and assessment of strategy options will be undertaking during 2011-2013, but budget is for 2012-2014. Is this a mistake in dates? The budget has been corrected for 2012-14.

- Some pilot strategies are mentioned, but more information on these strategies should be provided: who is implementing them, how are leakage addressed, how they will undertake the consultation process, how the stakeholders will participate,... More information is provided. Still information on who is implementing them is missing. No changes have been made in the present document. It is planned to be addressed during the implementation phase.

- We recommend integrating a component of improving the livelihoods of forest dependent people in order to make REDD strategy and instrument that should lead to development. Table 25 raises the issues of "*Plight of Forest Dependent People*" (p88) and provides more information on this point than the previous versions did. Nevertheless the related-potential strategy and areas for intervention do not elaborate on improvement of livelihoods, neither does the component 4b. Only the "Uganda's Forest Sector Guiding Principles as derived from the Forestry Policy (2001)" (p103, C2d) refers to "the improvement of people's livelihoods [as] a major goal in all the strategies and actions for the development of the forest sector [...]".

- It is recommended that section 2.3.3. is considered in "REDD+ framework", because of decentralization in the management of resources. This would strengthen these institutions and the monitoring capacity of central institutions. No changes have been made in the present document. Uganda considers it is appropriate as it is, to meet the C2a standard, because forestry resources management in Uganda is broader than REDD+.

- As previously said, it would improve clarity and logical order, and support the actions summarized in Table 25, to bring into this component 2b, the potential REDD strategy options that are currently included in component 2a. There are benefits to such a structure in addition to improved clarity, including opportunities to identify options that address multiple drivers, and to prioritize further development of specific strategy options. No change has been done in the

present document and Uganda considers that the relevant information of Component 2a is already embedded in the table 25. This was not a high priority comment. However, Uganda should be aware that problems regarding clarity of the RPP could create problems in its implementation where external agencies (and their interpretation of the plan) are required.

- Whereas human settlement and urbanization are referred as major drivers (p 62), there are no measures that address them. Uganda refers to TORs Annex 2a supposed to analyse more in depth the drivers of deforestation. Even if too little information is so far known about this driver to design preliminary strategic options, it might nevertheless be reported in the table as one area where to design strategic options.

- The strategic options seem to be mostly technological. Political measures to respond to policy underlying factors appear to be very limited, whereas it was stressed that "the government is not able to address the current problems of governance" (p74). In fact, there are only two measures aiming at addressing policy and governance challenges, both reported in very general terms (Strategic Option 2 related to charcoal : Strengthening enforcement and compliance (p87) & Strategic Option 12 : Strengthen Legal, Policy and Institutional frameworks for REDD-Plus and regulating Carbon market in Uganda in place (p 90)). It would be welcomed if you could precise what kind of political and governance measures are going to be considered. This concern is considered by Uganda as being addressed through "Reviewing the policy, legal and institutional framework for suitability for implementing the proposed strategies" (R-PP, p91).

Standard partially met.

Standard is partially met

Standard is met, subject to consideration of the comment in bold

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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

Although this component has improved a lot in comparison to the February version, some requirements to meet the standard are still not taken into consideration. Very few information and early ideas are provided. Most of the work is planned but overall vaguely presented. In fact, "The primary reason for not finalizing the implementation framework is the need to tailor the implementation framework to the approved REDD-Plus Strategies so that most suitable arrangements can be defined at that point. Therefore, it is envisaged that the Uganda REDD-Plus Implementation Framework will be finalized and approved alongside the REDD-Strategy itself" (P97-98).

The standard for this section is not yet met as the existing institutional context is missing or

merely refers to the description in section 1.6. Given the level of detail provided in the rest of the R-PP, this section needs to more clearly identify the functions of the various agencies/actors involved in implementing the R-PP and the associated gaps and capacity building needs. It appears that this information exists; including in Section 1 and Section 2.3.1.1, so this should not be a major problem to resolve. Uganda has addressed the comment adequately : Uganda concurs with the observation above and elaborate on the reasons for that ("Under section 1.6, description of the institutional arrangements for the R-PP (2012-2014) is provided because it was evident that these institutions and the described arrangements would be valid/applicable. By time of completing the R-PP preparation, information at hand coupled with the ongoing government restructuring rendered the process incapable of defining the long-term institutional arrangement hence the TORs"). According to Uganda, it should be possible to update the description when the new government structure is revealed, and later, when the REDD Strategies have been defined. Given the importance of this issue, the PC review considers the issue/response should be highlighted for the consideration of the PC in Oslo in determining if and how the Standard is/can be met in the context of a PC resolution.

Consider the following areas for improvement :

- It is recommended to develop incentives for co-benefits as part of the REDD strategy and analyze the adjustments to the existing mechanisms to contribute to the implementation of this strategy. More information is needed

- It is only a list of the steps to establish the framework for REDD+ implementation. At least detailed ToR with a timeframe should be included. The component has been expanded and terms of reference are provided (p185)

- From Component 5: This implementation strategy does not identify how to articulate local and national levels of governance, and the scattered government forest related institutions. We recommend the reconciliation of work responsibilities between institutions, including monitoring and verification mechanisms at local levels. This is not addressed in this Component. According to Uganda, the TOR of Annex 2c provide for defining institutional arrangements between and among central government (ministries), Lead Agencies, Districts and other non-state actors, but we do not find this information.

- The standard for this section requires a description of activities and a work plan; however, it is not clear how the main activity of Developing a REDD Implementation Framework (and its related sub-activities) (section 2.11) will be undertaken in the context of the various implementation strategies, capacity needs, funding arrangements, accountability measures, and risks, (section 2.9, pp. 95-97). Perhaps it is a matter of more clearly identifying and further unpacking the activities included under section 2.9. Addressed under section 2.10 (p99), and in greater detail in the appendix 2 (section3).

- No early ideas are presented on how externally funded activities of the R-PP implementation budget will be received, managed and accounted, as well as how systems for regular reporting, communication and participatory planning will be developed and applied so as to ensure transparency in funds allocation and utilization (p 96). Those issues are effectively mentioned, but they are planed for the implementation phase and no early ideas are given in the document.

- The Key questions that the Template recommends to address are taken up as they are and reported in the annex, referred as "areas of concern [that] shall be considered during the process of defining the Implementation framework". It might have been expected that some preliminary thinking on that be already provided in the R-PP.

Standard not met.
Standard is not met
Standard is 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 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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

The component has been considerably improved since the February version. A comprehensive action plan has been added to the component. Only one of the recommendations made by the previous PC review has still to be addressed.

- Following the guidance in the RPP template, the RPP should include a work plan on how to cope with Wb's safeguard policies. SGs policies are listed, but an explanation on how they will be considered is not included. The R-PP includes a section on how to cope with the World Bank's safeguard policies: Procedures for considering the WB safeguard standards (2.12.2, p. 101). Furthermore, the Action Plan (p. 105) addresses how challenges in preparing an ESMF will be taken into account, by who, how, when and what outcomes will be achieved.

- Basic elements for ToR are listed, but more detail is needed on how the SESA will be developed, including how SESA will be linked to the MRV system. Details on how the SESA will be developed are provided in the TOR in Annex 2(b) (p. 188), which includes how the SESA will be linked to the MRV system. A comprehensive action plan to guide the process of formulating an ESMF is presented (p105).

- The R-PP should include the methodology on how the information required for this assessment will be compiled and analyzed. The Action Plan (p. 105) identifies methods for addressing gaps and challenges in developing the ESMF, this includes the methodology for completing these actions.

- Compiling information relevant to social and environmental impacts can be one difficult aspect of undertaking a Social and Environmental Impact Assessment. This point is not addressed in this component, neither is it in the component 4b (see below). Please take it into consideration in at least one of the two components. Uganda considers that the already planned "setting up of a multi-disciplinary team, capacity building, and data collection from selected sites/respondents and participatory approach to data collection and validation" respond to the concern for data collection.

- This section does not include specific requirements to mitigate the risks of REDD+. On risks, the R-PP notes that the process for identifying negative impacts and suggesting mitigation measures will be integrated in the course of preparation of the other components of the R-PP (p. 100)

<p>Standard not met</p> <p>Standard is met</p>
<p>Component 3. Develop a Reference Level</p> <p>Standard 3: Reference Level:</p> <p>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).</p> <p>(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.)</p>
<p>Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:</p> <p>Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:</p> <p>Reference to principles supporting the design of the REL is welcome.</p> <p>The description of this component of the R-PP appears confused in the relationship between the process of developing a reference level and MRV system design. While the design and implementation of a robust forest monitoring system will contribute to the development of a reference level, they are two distinct components or tasks. In the implementation of the R-PP, care must be taken to avoid duplication of effort and costs for these two components. In addition, there are some factual misrepresentations of UNFCCC COP decisions regarding the definition of forests and methodological guidance (see above). According to the new PC review, several of the PC comments made previously have not been properly addressed (see below). Please consider them as well as the couple of additional comments reported below. <u>This component has been improved by adding a work plan and terms of reference (in the annex). Most of the concerns are now addressed.</u></p> <p>- For the establishment of the reference level it is important to decide which will be the forest definition used. Given the current state of forest information and monitoring system in Uganda, as described in the R-PP, the proposal to determine the appropriate (or "applicable") definition as part of the R-PP implementation is wise. But, the section on possible forest definitions, page 111, presents an incorrect version of the UNFCCC CDM definition unless Uganda has previously selected these parameter values. This section should acknowledge the definition contained in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (AFOLU section), in accordance with the Decision 4/CP15. <u>Addressed.</u></p> <p>- Clearer information should be provided on existing data, existing sources of data that could be useful and gaps of information. The R-PPs section on Activity and Emission Data in Uganda (3.2, p. 112) outlines the existing data and several gaps for: activity data, carbon emission data, and historical emissions. The table showing Emission Data Requirements and Adequacy is under an easy readable format. However, there is no information on availability or gaps for data that will be used for the adjustment of the historical trends (see next point). <u>"Annex 3 (a): Terms of Reference for Reference level" (p193) has been added, which addresses this concern.</u></p>

- The possible influence of the evolution of identified drivers in future emissions and removals should be considered. The reference to identified drivers, their trends and available related-data is quite poor ("*take into account changes in REDD-Plus deforestation/degradation drivers related to socio-economic changes*" (p115) & "*robust socio-economic data e.g. rural/urban population growth, infrastructure development including energy infrastructure investments, rural employment and business development etc. are required*" (p117)). In relation to that, we suggest:
 - 1) to refer in the activities' summary table (p117) to the Compilation and creation of data for adjusting historical trends (or to make it more explicit if it is already reported, maybe under the activity designated by "*Acquisition of remote sensing data*"?). No clarification have been provided in the activities' summary table.
 - 2) to consider adding bio-physical parameters (such as remoteness of the forest, fertility of the soil...) to socio-economic drivers as potential critical parameters for the evolution of deforestation rates, if this is relevant in the Uganda's context; *We would like Uganda to have clarified this point for PC9.* In the new "*Annex 3 (a): Terms of Reference for Reference level*" (p193) there is a mention of "*national socio-economic and/or climatic conditions*", which addresses partially the concern.
- Information on how stakeholders are going to be involved in the establishment of the RL should be provided. Specially, the link with private sector should be explained (in annex 4 it is said that 64% of forests are private forests). Analytical and field capacities of private sector and communities is not considered, and can be helpful in different stages of this process. The linkage to the design future MRV system is also missing. There is not extensive mention of stakeholder involvement in establishment of the Reference Level however the involvement of stakeholders, including private forest owners, is described in Section 3.4.2, page 116. The analytical and field capacities of the various stakeholders are described in Component 4. Section 3.3.3 (p. 115) deals with Uganda's capacity gaps, and identified ways of building capacity or addressing some gaps (cooperating with international NGOs, training and guidance by external experts, and ensuring appropriate funding levels). In addition, the budget includes a line item for capacity building (p. 117).
- The National Biomass Study is really useful, but, if emissions from deforestation are not estimated from NBS, it would be useful to explain how this is going to be done. What kind of variables are going to be used and who is going to be in charge of these estimations. Uganda ensures this will be done by the task force in charge of establishing the reference level, during the implementation phase.
- The process to calculate the deforestation rate should be better explained. This will have to be done by the task force that will be in charge of establishing the reference level.
- Work with sub-national reference levels can be more specific, but also requires a lot of researches about the drivers, funds and precision for all the estimations done in different areas. The "Selection of hot spots and development of 1-2 sub-national reference levels" is considered an activity (p118)
- Try to describe all the processes recognizing Uganda's capacities and gaps. For the gaps, it is important to provide with possible solutions and ask for specific support to cover these needs. The R-PP does a good job at describing, in Section 3.3.3 (page 115), how gaps will be addressed. However, the identification of these gaps is spread throughout the Section 3 and in Table 31. It might be helpful to use the list of actions on page 116 as the headings under which specific gaps could be summarized.

- The reference level has to be estimated with a methodology that could be used in the future, it is really important that all data are comparable and consistent, and that more details are provided in component 4. The need to ensure that data are comparable and consistent appears to be accommodated by the staged approach to developing the reference level, by focussing first on improving information and developing an MRV system.

- Table 31 (p117) requires correction *before grant agreement can be approved* : Missing column headings for years (2012-13-14) and row and column totals are incorrect. Addressed

- The box entitled "The development of Uganda Reference level shall apply the following principles" (p116) should be renamed since it does not present principles but activities. Addressed

- While several steps are set out regarding the establishment of historical trends, no steps are presented to adjust them (p116). Some basic steps should be at least specified. The issue is addressed in general terms in section 3.4.2.c (p119).

Standard not met

Standard is partially met.

Standard is 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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

The comments raised by the previous PC review have been overall well addressed. However, some minor clarifications are still needed :

- The treatment of leakage, especially if Uganda is going to focus MRV in hotspots, needs to be defined. This version addresses the monitoring of leakage indirectly. The R-PP describes a "national forest monitoring system" and therefore leakage resulting from sub-national REDD+ activities (e.g. to address deforestation hotspots) should be picked up by the national system. In addition, the mitigation of national leakages is raised in section 2b (p90). Domestic leakage, incl.

leakage from hotspots, should be recognized as a threat of deforestation and forest degradation, as described in Section 4.1.3 on page 122.

- Some of the information included in appendix 4 should be included in the main body of the RPP. Table 33 (p. 128) details MRV requirements for multiple benefits, other impacts and governance. The monitoring for social and environmental benefits and impacts has been previously identified in earlier Components. These linkages are identified on page 128. Additional early ideas could be provided on how the different monitoring tasks in Table 32 & 33 will be addressed institutionally (see below). Planned to be done later during the implementation phase.

- It needs to be confirmed that the activity data and emission factors are adequate for tier 3 estimations. There is the risk of being too ambitious. Uganda should be encouraged to move towards developing Tier 3, country- or regionally-specific emissions factors and other relevant parameter estimates (following the latest IPCC Guidance). However, some consideration of cost/benefit would be appropriate in order to effectively prioritize actions and investments. Not addressed, neither in section 4.1.3 nor in section 4.3.

- Consistency of national and subnational guidelines needs to be ensured. Section 4.1.5 (page 123) identifies the appropriate need for consistency between national and sub-national monitoring systems and the associated guidance. As far as possible, the general statements ("*The national guidelines for sub-national REDD-Plus monitoring will basically refer to existing REDD-Plus standards and methodologies*" (p 123) & "*requirements for data management and data sharing will be provided, as well as standards that will enable to integrate sub-national monitoring data into the national monitoring system*") would clearly benefit from a few more details on which existing REDD-Plus standards and methodologies are considered.

- Budget and planed activities of this component 4a are identical to those of component 4b. Please, before grant agreement is approved, specify the activities according to each component, and make explicit whether or not this is a common budget table (which seems not to be the case since the previous total budget was 1230\$ and the current one for each component 4a and 4b is 530\$). The activities and budget summary table are still identical to the ones of component 4b. Also no correction has been done on "Development of monitoring plan: Develop set of indicators and measurement methodologies for monitoring of ecological and social co-benefits", which is still planned for a budget of 100 000 \$ under this component 4a whereas it is related to component 4b.

Standard 4.a. partially met.

Standard is met, subject to consideration of the above comments

Standard is met, subject to consideration of the above comment in bold

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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

Some elements added in the March version (monitoring of the drivers, specification of the kind of social and environmental aspects to be monitored) have been unfortunately removed from this new version. Although a working plan is given in the annex and some general aspects to be monitored are referred, very few early ideas are provided about what this MRV of co-benefits and governance will look like. The PC review asks for considering the following points :

- MRV requirements for other benefits and impacts need to be detailed. No enough information is provided on this. While a working plan is effectively given in the annex, no early idea is provided and all is considered to be carried out during the implementation phase. Some gap analysis of existing data or some preliminary ideas on what will be monitor would be suitable. The kind of co-benefits that will be monitored is given in the annex (p197): rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services, and other environmental and social benefits. Gap analysis of existing data is planned to be done during the implementation phase.

- As previously said, the budget and the planed activities of this component 4b are identical to those of the component 4a. So, before grant agreement is approved, make explicit what is the specific budget and activities of each of those two components. Uganda confirms the budget and the activities. Yet they are still identical to the ones of component 4a (but for few minor wording changes). Please make clearer the specificities of each of these components or provide explanations for this likeness.

- It is not very clear whether the assessment and review of existing monitoring systems, which are referred in point a) of the annex, are effectively reported in the summary table p159 (maybe under the activity : "*Develop set of indicators and measurement methodologies for monitoring of ecological and social co-benefits*"?). If this is the case, please make it more explicit. If this not the case, it should be added. Addressed (p193)

Note : Why the activities considered under the "*Development of monitoring plan*" have not been carried out earlier? Since they may provide substantial information for he SESA, it might be more appropriate to plan them for 2012. Uganda considers that they have to be completed after the REDD Strategies have been concluded by end of 2012 since they relate to the Strategies.

Standard 4.b. not met.

Standard is partially met.

Standard is met, subject to the consideration of the comment in bold

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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

This is component 6 in the document. Addressed
All the concerns raised by the February review have been addressed.

- There is a section on implementation strategy that would fit better in section 2.c., as it is not related to budget or schedule, but specifically on this subsection. This have been addressed; already in the March version.

- This implementation strategy does not identify how to articulate local and national levels of governance, and the scattered government forest related institutions. We recommend the reconciliation of work responsibilities between institutions, including monitoring and verification mechanisms at local levels. This comment is now related to Component 2c

- In the recommended cross-cutting issues, policies and activities to alleviate poverty related to forest management should be included. This comment is now related to Component 2c

- The subsection on risks and assumptions includes two activities that, from our point of view, are not beyond the control of implementers, the first one is the implementation of RPP with multiple players, and the second one, is the application of REDD+ procedures and standards, both are decisions to be taken by the governing bodies, and the risks can be minimized or eliminated. This comment is now related to Component 2c

Subject to double-checking of the figures after any changes are made in response to issues raised above, the only three aspects for which correction or further explanation are needed are :

- A detailed chronogram for different components independent of the table for budget would be very useful. No detailed chronogram is provided. But the information provided complies with the standard.

- As previously pointed out, budgets and activities of Components 3, 4a and 4b need to be revised for appropriateness and consistency. **Addressed for C3 but not addressed for 4a and 4b.**

- Regarding the scheduling or phasing of activities: How was the breakdown by year for each activity determined? Answer of Uganda: "The Budget provided under this component is an amalgamation of component budget. The scheduling of each activities was determined at component level taking into account the logical sequence of activities". OK. (difficult to assess in the allotted review timelines)

- In regards to the identification of potential partners: Given that 3 have been listed with specific budgets, are provisional funding agreements already in place? Answer of Uganda: " Apart from the FCPF funding which was allocated to Uganda, none of other sources have been confirmed. However, consultations are ongoing". OK, but indicating specific "potential partners" in the budget spreadsheet is potentially misleading. Better to indicate outside the table the potential partners that have been approaches or with which consultations are ongoing.

Standard is partially met

Standard is met, subject to consideration of the above comment in bold

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:

Comments of the February PC review, updates and additional comments from the May review and updates from the June review:

This is component 5 in the document. Addressed.

The monitoring of the implementation of the RPP is an important part of the implementation as such. Significant improvements have been observed in this section since the previous draft. The process for M&E as well as the framework are well designed. Consider the following minor changes:

- Indicators are a crucial instrument for this monitoring, and for the evaluation of how the REDD+ country is acting on REDD+ readiness. Without these indicators, component 6 is not met. Table 36 (p. 147) includes indicators for each output of the M&E framework.
- In table 37, activity: "*Reporting and feedbacks*" (summary of activities and budget, (p153)), it is written twice : "Convene Forums for sharing/learning and feedback into the R-PP Process - national level", probably in place of "- regional level"? Addressed.
- In table 37 (p153), Estimated Cost are in (US\$) in stead of (US\$ "000"). Addressed.
- Designing and implementing this framework is a huge task in itself. A task force may be created to carry out this process, and the National Focal Point would just supervise it. Taken into consideration. It is expected by Uganda that the national focal Point is sufficient to complete the M&E framework for the 2012-2014 period. The M&E for REDD Strategy Implementation shall be developed in participatory manner, involving taskforce as recommended.

Standard is met.