

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**

(interim, January 14, 2011 based on Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

For use reviewing R-PPs submitted using version 4 R-PP template in January 2011

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 : Central African Republic (v. 09-19-2011)

Reviewers : AFD, The European Commission (EC)

Date of review : 10 - 10 - 2011

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

Overview

Code of colors:

CAR's R-PP has benefited from three PC reviews, throughout the year 2011.

Comments without any colors are initial comments of the February PC review.

Comments highlighted in yellow are comments raised by the September review.

Comments highlighted in blue are final comments raised by the October review.

The PC reviewers congratulate the R-PP team in the Central African Republic for its work. In this new version of the R-PP, the reviewers note the efforts done by the CAR to respond with meticulous care to the concerns raised by the previous reviews, and the progress made in the new version. Admittedly, some of the standards are still not entirely met as concerns or inconsistencies remain at this stage. One of those important issue relates to FLEGT : the reviewers welcome the objectives of synergies with the FLEGT process that are now mentioned in the R-PP, but think it is important to more precisely indicate the way those synergies will effectively be pursued. That being said, the reviewers consider that it will be possible for CAR to address those issues in close collaboration with the WB before the grant is signed or at the earliest stage of the R-PP implementation, and, in this condition, recommend the approval of a Readiness Preparation Grant by the FCPF Participation Committee.

Table 1: Summary of attainment of standards

Standards	Summary of attainment of the standard: Two previous reviews	Summary of attainment of the standard: October review
Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:	The standard is partially met.	The standard is largely met.
Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholders:	The standard is partially met -> The standard is met subject to consideration of comments.	The standard is met
Standard 1c: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation:	The standard is partially met -> The standard is met subject to consideration of comments, in particular the one on grievance mechanism	The standard is largely met
Standard 2.a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance:	The standard is met, subject to consideration of comments	The standard is met but preliminary a assessment of successes and failures of past initiatives is still missing
Standard 2.b: REDD strategy Options:	The standard is partially met	The standard is largely met
Standard 2.c: REDD implementation framework:	The standard is partially met -> the standard is met subject to consideration of comments	The standard is met
Standard 2.d: Assessment of social and environmental impacts:	The standard is partially met -> the standard is met subject to the presentation of budget and calendar.	the standard is met, subject to clarification on budget
Standard 3: Reference scenario:	The standard is met, subject to consideration of comments	The standard is largely met
Standard 4a: Design a	The standard is partially met -> the standard is	The standard is met

monitoring system:	met, subject to consideration of comments	
Standard 4b: Multiple benefits, other impacts and governance	The standard is partially met.	The standard is partially met.
Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements:	The standard is met, subject to consideration of comments	The standard is met, subject to revisions or corrections of some components' budgets and alignment of calendars.
Standard 6: Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework :	The standard is met, subject to consideration of comments	The standard is partially met

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:

Standard is partially met.

-> **standard is largely met.** Although significant improvements have been made to respond to the comments, capacity building activities are still lacking sufficient consideration (see comment n° 1 below) .

The National Readiness Management Arrangements are generally clear and are well described **and their structures were agreed upon after a consultation process.**

1. Elements where significant technical expertise has been used in the preparation of the R-PP development process and corresponding capacity building needs and proposed activities are not indicated in Chapter 1a. Complements of information are needed on this issue. → This comment is not addressed in the august version of the R-PP. Additional capacity building will also be of particular importance for the CIP REDD+, especially given the rotating presidency of this body (which in itself is a positive thing), and for stakeholders in general. -> Specific capacity building needs on governance related issues are mentioned on p48 and budgeted p61. Admittedly, general capacity building needs are addressed on p16. But, on the one hand, no specific activity nor budget are considered in this way. On the other hand, only reference is made to the technical and institutional bodies that need to be strengthened. This assumes all stakeholders implicitly. The latter could have been make more clear. (Considered as a major issue)

2. It is not clear whether the CN REDD+, the CIM REDD+, the CT REDD+ and its 5 thematic groups are already active or whether they still need to be put in place. If they are already in place, adding official documents setting in place these different groups would be a useful addition to the document. This is clarified p57 , but it would be useful to the reader to get this clearly stated in the text as soon as the CN REDD+, the CIM REDD+ and the CT REDD+ are introduced. --> This comment is addressed in the new version of the R-PP. See p.65: « Il est à noter que ce cadre institutionnel n'est pas encore mis en place. Il sera mis en place après la session du Comité des participants du mois de mars. » However, it would be useful to clarify the state of play as of August 2011. ->not addressed (but considered as minor). We also note the simplification of the institutional structure

by the elimination of the CIM REDD. It is therefore important that interministerial coordination takes place in the CN-REDD (It might serve as an example for FLEGT, which faces the same kind of challenge of inter-ministerial coordination). ->This comment is not addressed. There are no amendments to the R-PP that highlight the importance of interministerial coordination (but considered as minor)

3. Stakeholders play an important role in the design and implementation of a REDD+ strategy. We note the increased role of stakeholders in the CN-REDD. However, it is not clear which role will be devolved to stakeholders in the design of technical components of the REDD+ strategy (such as MRV, information and communication, tenure issues,...). Would it be interesting to involve NGOs in some thematic groups of the CTC-REDD (in addition to the 2 experts)? -> Addressed on p 15. There will be collaboration between the CTC-REDD and other appropriate institutions (p15): « *La stratégie du gouvernement est que tous les groupes thématiques de la Coordination Technique travaillent étroitement avec les autres institutions techniques et spécialisées, les secteurs privés ainsi que les organisations non gouvernementales qui vont faire un travail énorme dans la composante 1c et dans les autres composantes* ». Stakeholders are now explicitly mentioned as partners in the technical discussion of the Coordination Technique. However, it remains unclear whether they are part of the Coordination Technique or just work with the Coordination Technique.

4. It would be useful to provide information on the composition of the CNEDD (Commission Nationale de l'Environnement du Développement Durable) or at least state to what extent it differs or is similar to the composition of the CN REDD. Some additional information on the mandate of the CNEDD, the way it functions, the way the CNREDD relates to it would also be useful.

→Comment addressed on p. 13. However it remains unclear how the CNEDD relates to the CN-REDD+. -> The role of the CNEDD and its relationship to the CN-REDD+ are now clarified in the R-PP (p13). It is said that the CNEDD « *traite toutes les questions liées à l'environnement et le développement durable en république Centrafricaine dont la REDD+. [...] Cette Commission sert de plate forme de discussions. le CN REDD+ qui est présidé par le premier ministre peut utiliser les résultats des délibérations du CNEDD pour alimenter ses discussions et éventuellement ses décisions* ». But, if the difference between the two arrangements is clearer, it remains questioning to what extent there will not overlap

4.5. In the CN REDD+, we note the presence of representatives from the Ministries of Water and Forestry, Agriculture, Finance, Planning but not from mining and energy, urbanism, equipment, which are members of the CIM REDD+. This seems strange since some disagreement may emerge in the CIM REDD+ that will need to be resolved by the CN REDD+ and would therefore need the same administrative competencies to be represented both in the CN REDD+ and the CIM REDD+. -> This comment is addressed in the new version of the R-PP on p.12-13 regarding 1) the representation of mining, energy, urbanism and equipment and 2) through the merging of the CIM REDD+ and CN-REDD+ (see above): « *Tous les autres départements ministériels impliqués dans le processus REDD+ tels que : le commerce, l'urbanisme, les mines et énergies, l'administration du territoire, la justice, l'équipement, la défense, l'éducation nationale, le tourisme, la famille et affaire sociale et la communication peuvent être invités et/ou consultés par le CN REDD+ en cas de nécessité* ». However, according to the importance of such sectors outlined in the assessments of drivers in components 2a, we wonder whether a permanent representation would not be suitable. Also, as policy enforcement is likely to be a major challenge, it could be useful to consider a more permanent representation of the ministries responsible for enforcement such as justice, defense, and police.

5.6. The CIP REDD+ is a multi-stakeholder structure as well. However, the mining sector is not represented nor is there a possibility to invite ad hoc expertise related to some local drivers of deforestation and forest degradation or other challenges for successful REDD+ implementation. In addition we note that the 4 CIP-REDD have the same composition, whereas drivers of

deforestation are not the same throughout the country (cf 2.a). For instance, is it relevant to have representatives of breeders or employers in all the CIP-REDD? For some areas, would not it be more appropriate to have representative from some groups directly concerned by deforestation or degradation issues? -> The comment is partially addressed. The composition can change depending on the region and its local circumstances : "there will be flexibility and the composition will match the ecological specificities of the regions and the present IP groups" - see p 14. But, it remains unclear who will then be represented in the CIP-REDD+ in addition to the normal members. The R-PP mentions the indigenous peoples and the private sector as an example, but is this also valid for local departments of the governments (e.g. local mining administration)?

6.7. We observe that the level of stakeholder involvement in preparing the R-PP is very high. Please explain or clarify if, these institutional frameworks described under this element, are the ones who have prepared this R-PP and, if in addition to this responsibility they will be the ones responsible for the implementation of the R-PP actions. If the latter be the case, could you clarify whether the structures for continued stakeholder participation shall need to be reviewed and confirmed during R-PP implementation? → The comment is not addressed in the new version of the R-PP but we note significant improvements regarding stakeholder consultations on p. 26-27.

7.8. It is stated that the Comité National de Trésorerie (CNT) supervises the management of all funds, including the Fonds National pour l'Environnement (FNE), p14. The FNE is placed under the supervision of the Ministry of Environment but the Ministry of Environment does not seem to be represented in the CNT. This may translate into a lack of relevant information of the CNT about the functioning of the FNE. Has any specific measure been taken to mitigate this potential lack of information? Additional clarification on this issue would be appreciated. → This comment is addressed in the new version of the R-PP. It is now considered that the FNE will be systematically conveyed by the CNT. However it would be useful to have some clarifications about how the FNE has been funded till now, and what is its current budget, to have a better idea of the potential importance of this instrument. -> its budget is 1,6 millions \$ (p15).

9. Please consider this minor question, in addition to the previous comments: Is the President of the CN REDD member? In such a case, there would be 21 members. -> The President nor the secretary are considered as member, in contrary to the vice-presidents, who are (p12).

Standard 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation

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:

The standard is partially met > standard is met, subject to the consideration of the above comments.

-> The standard is met

We appreciate the summary table reporting the concerns and recommendations raised during the consultations. According to the document, all those remarks should have been taken into account in

the R-PP or will be addressed during the implementation phase (p26-32).

The regional consultations according to the CIP REDD+ in order to better fit the local context is a good idea.

1. The R-PP presents evidence that the government has undertaken efforts to ensure dissemination of information and transparency about the preparation of the R-PP. An early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process has taken place. However, the description of stakeholder participation could include an indication of the process of national ownership and endorsement of the R-PP. → The consultation efforts undertaken so far show that the CAR has initiated a credible national-scale consultation process that lays the foundations for a participatory implementation of the REDD+ strategy. The CAR is encouraged to continue the stakeholder consultations as foreseen in the R-PP.

1. The 6 targeted groups of stakeholders (p16) adequately cover all stakeholders interested in REDD+. However, there is no mention of the method used to select the representatives and interviewed persons in each stakeholder group: on which basis has it been done? Have government agencies used existing lists of stakeholder? Has the FLEGT multi-stakeholder platform been used for this purpose? Has a specific study been launched to identify relevant contacts? → The comment is addressed in the new version of the R-PP on p.19.

1.2. The R-PP contains now also a description of the consultations methods used and stakeholders invited. Although it is stated that they learned from previous consultation processes (such as for the development of the FLEGT VPA and the DSRP process) it seems that this could be improved and that more active exchanges between FLEGT and REDD+ might happen on the ground to take advantage of the scarce resources instead of being in competition. → This comment is not addressed. The CAR indicates that they have learned from the FLEGT process regarding the consultation methods, but it doesn't seem that they have undertaken action to avoid duplication with the FLEGT process.

2.3. Recommendations resulted from the Bimbo workshop (July 2011) are reported in the document (p23). It would be interesting to do similarly for the other workshops, or to report all in the annexes for symmetry reasons. A table summarising all the comments as well as the responses of the REDD coordination might be an interesting way to compile the whole. → a highly appreciated synthesising table has been added (p26-32). It reports the recommendations and concerns raised during the workshops. According to the CN-REDD (final column), all those comments are supposed to have been taken into account in the R-PP or they will be addressed during the implementation phase.

3.4. Two identical paragraphs are repeated p24 (C1b) and p26 (C1c). Moreover syntax and spelling would deserve some revision. → not addressed (p33 & 35).

4.5. Figure 3, p34 needs to be re-edited (final line is not readable)

5.6. The reports presented in Annexes 1b1 to 1b10 (p103 to 127) are very useful to understand the context in which the consultations were carried out and should be commended. Nonetheless, 2 comments:

a. The basis on which the consultations were conducted is not clear: according to p16 and 17, it seems that consultations were conducted on the basis of the 8 questions quoted on p17. These are complete and cover the whole range of issues dealt with in the R-PP but require a minimum level of understanding of the REDD process. Were explanatory background documents distributed to the groups ahead of the meetings? and if yes, what were they?

b. Based on the consultations conducted so far, it would be useful to provide an assessment of the level of knowledge and ownership of the R-PP process by the different stakeholders groups that could be the basis for the next consultation phase to be conducted from 2011 to 2013. Currently, chapter 3 (p20-21) describes how the consultations will be carried out but lack information on what the scope of these consultations will be.

--> These comments are moved and addressed under section 1c (see below).

8. There is intention to develop an Awareness and communications strategy as well as Consultations and Participation strategy. These intentions could be elaborated further.

--> This comment is addressed and taken up in section 1c (see below).

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 far; (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.

This standard is met, subject to the consideration of the above comments, in particular the one on grievance mechanism.

-> This standard is largely met because some questions remain around the recourse mechanism and the participation of stakeholders to decision-making.

Component 1b contains references to consultation process conducted so far. Reports of these consultations meetings are taken up in the annexes 1b1 to 1b14, contributing to the transparency of the consultation process so far.

The organization of specific workshops for indigenous peoples allows them to take part in the consultation process on their own rhythm and in a comfortable setting. Again, it's important that their views will also be taken into account in the design and implementation of the R-PP afterwards.

We note and welcome the significant additions made on p. 26 and 27 regarding the consultations methods and respective roles of national and local NGOs.

Please consider the following comments:

1. The reports presented in Annexes 1b1 to 1b14 are very useful to understand the context in which the consultations were carried out and should be commended. Nonetheless, 2 comments:

a. It remains unclear whether explanatory background documents were distributed to the groups ahead of the meetings? and if so, what were they? → This comment is partially addressed in the new version of the R-PP through the paragraph on p 19: « Il est à noter que lors de tous ses ateliers de consultations, tous les consultants qui ont participé à la l'élaboration du document ont présentés leur composante et la coordination REDD+ a présenté en conséquence les arrangements nationaux pour la gestion de la préparation de la REDD+ afin de recueillir l'avis des parties prenantes. » -> This

remains partially addressed, as no additional information was added to the new version of the R-PP

b. Based on the consultations conducted so far, it would be useful to provide an assessment of the level of knowledge and ownership of the R-PP process by the different stakeholders groups that could be the basis for the next consultation phase to be conducted from 2011 to 2014. → this comment is not addressed in the new version of the R-PP. → This minor comment is not addressed

2. There is intention to develop an Awareness and communications strategy as well as Consultations and Participation strategy. These intentions could be elaborated further. → This comment is addressed in the new version of the R-PP on p. 26-29. In order to integrate the concerns, ideas and preoccupations of different stakeholders the CAR is foreseeing a large consultation process, accompanied by an information campaign. The structure of this consultation process is set out in the R-PP. The focus seems to be strongly on the dissemination of information. This is obviously an crucial element, however it is important to also collect the views from stakeholders that result from the consultation process and ensure that they are reflected in the decision-making process. → previous. → this major concern is partially addressed on p 36. The role of the stakeholders and how they will take part in decision-making will be part of the consultations

3. Although a mechanism for addressing grievance is mentioned in the context of the CN-REDD on p.12 and in the context of the stakeholder consultation process on p. 27, it deserves further elaboration. → the concern remains. In fact, an additional statement p36 addresses the recourse mechanism but it does not provide the additional expected information.

Component 2. Prepare the REDD Strategy

Standard 2.a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest 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.

The standard is met > The standard is met subject to consideration of the above comments.

→ the standard is met, but a preliminary analysis of the past and current environmental and sectoral programs in terms of success and failure is still missing (see comment n° 3 below). It would be very important and useful to do it at the earliest stage of the R-PP implementation.

Also, the role of poor governance (and tenure) in relation to deforestation and forest degradation remains unclear. The R-PP doesn't provide an answer to that.

We commend the way the drivers for deforestation have been well elaborated. The documentation of past and ongoing policies and projects addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation both on the positive and negative sides is well substantiated. We note the effort to assess how ongoing policies, initiatives and projects such as PNAE, DSRP, FLEGT VPA, PARPAF, CDF, OEFB etc... can support the development of the REDD+ strategy and identify specific areas for synergies between them.

1. The proposed studies to collect additional information on drivers will be very useful in fine-tuning the strategic options. Also the governance analysis on p. 36 - 38 is very helpful to that extent. It is recommended that these studies be identified and launched in close collaboration with the FLEGT-implementation, as there are many over-laps between the need of both processes. -> The R-PP states that all the studies will be launched in collaboration with FLEGT (p58). The REDD experts of the CAR are therefore invited to reach out to the FLEGT expert in order to make sure that collaboration happens and does not remain a principle on paper.

2. This component misses a state of play on land tenure and access rights to natural resources (it is taken up though in component 2.c on p. 69). Note that these aspects of these issues will be treated under the FLEGT implementation measures. From the analysis of direct and indirect drivers it is not explained whether unclear land tenure is a cause (direct or indirect) of deforestation and forest degradation. -> This comment remains not very well addressed. Tenure is now recognized an indirect driver of deforestation, however of minor importance for the time being (p51).

3. In addition to listing exhaustively environmental and sectoral policies and projects (p43-46), it would be useful to highlight difficulties and challenges faced during their implementation to help better design the REDD strategic options.-> this major concern still remain

4. Regarding « anarchical logging and collection of NWFP » (p53), it would be helpful to have an idea of where it occurs (in the zone under concessions or in the south east?). Also, it is not very clear if it is only a question of illegal recollection of NWFP and energy wood (what the paragraph suggests) or if illegal timber is also at stake, as mentioned in the governance statement p47. In this case, it should be written more explicitly. -> some clarifications related to the location are given: traditional (illegal) logging occurs around Bangui, but also in the south west in the area under logging concessions (p54).

5. We note that governance problems are not included in the section dealing with underlying factors, so that there are eventually not taken into account *per se* in the section 2b (none of the strategic option address them specifically). -> This is still not clear whether poor governance is a direct or indirect driver of deforestation and degradation. However there is now a sub option 4.4 on capacity building around governance issues (see p 70).

6. Section 5.2, p42 focuses on slash and burn agriculture, whereas cash crops, such as cotton, are also referred as current or future drivers of deforestation. Thus, it seems appropriate to modify the title of the section to better reflect its content. -> This comment is not addressed since the modified title still points out slash and burn agriculture.

Standard 2.b: REDD 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:

The Standard is partially met

-> **the standard is largely met** as there remains a lack of clarity around the pilot projects, as well as an easy reference to component 2a when it comes to the link of the options to the drivers.

1. There is a very rich and unique analysis of the potential strategy options as presented. Likewise, the strategic options are well prioritized and described. However the link to drivers explained in 2.a would deserve to be more explicit instead of only referring to section 2a (supra).

-> This comment is not addressed. However the answers are elsewhere in the R-PP, but it would have been easier if those bits and pieces were repeated here.

2. Strategic option 1 and sub strategic options 1.1 (p45): the description of Strategic option 1 and the title of sub strategic option 1.1 (zoning of the complete territory) point to an objective of zoning the complete national territory ie not only forests but also agriculture land, mines, infrastructure, which is clearly a very interesting idea since it would allow to better capture external pressures on the forest. However, the description of sub strategic option 1.1 seems to limit the zoning approach to forests only and not other lands. It would be useful to clarify the exact scope of the zoning foreseen under Strategic option 1. → This comment is addressed in the new version of the R-PP on p. 53

3. The process for identifying and implementing pilot activities could be made clearer.

→ This comment is not addressed in the current version of the R-PP. It would be useful if the R-PP could already identify the topics (and possibly also the ToRs) of some of the pilot projects, as well as the criteria for selection. That would allow to have better idea of what the pilot projects will contribute too and what aspects need to be field tested. -> This major concern remains. In addition, the significant budget of 1,8 millions \$, allocated to the « *Sélection des offres (en moyenne 4/semestre entre juin 2012 et décembre 2013) et attribution d'une subvention de 200 kUSD/projet x 3* » (p74) deserves some clarifications. In fact, it seems inconsistent with the statement that there will be one pilot project per sub-options (p74), that is 13.

Also, note that in the executive summary p6 as well as in the summary budget table p117, the cost of the pilot projects should be corrected as it does not account for the entirety of component 2b 's budget but for 2400 US dollars.

4. Governance problems highlighted in the component 2a seem to be only partially tackled. It might be relevant to strengthen the environmental administration in charge of carrying out the impacts studies as well as the services in charge of collecting logging taxes. -> there is a new strategic option (4.4) devoted to the strengthening of the environmental administration (p70) and option 4.2 aims at supporting the Ministry in charge of forests. Note that the new option 4.4 should be reported in the summary table p62 and particularly in the budget p72.

Also, it has to be noticed that although the R-PP refers to section 2a to make the link with the drivers, poor governance is not mentioned as a driver under 2a.

5. The critical analyses which attempt to attribute a score to each of the strategic options in terms of costs and feasibility are welcomed. However, some of the scores seem to be inappropriate (while the comment suggest that costs are expected to be high, the score in fact shows the contrary). We recommend revising options 4.2, 4.3. -> It seems that option 4.2 (p69-70) still needs to be revised in terms of scoring.

Standard 2.c: REDD 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:

Standard is partially met -> The standard is met, but subject to the insertion of the missing calendar and budget.

-> The standard is met. But the reviewers would like to stress the extremely important issue of the lack of vision on how to take forward the debate and policy reforms on tenure issues

1. The proposed process for defining and putting in place the REDD+ implementation framework seems adequate. This component provides an adequate overview of the legal REDD+ framework and the rationale and content of the future REDD+ law. The calendar gives an indication of the timing. However, this could be better elaborated in the text. -> This comment is addressed on p 76.

2. However, is it possible then, that the proposed action to "legalize" the institutional arrangements described in section 1a could wait until REDD+ implementation arrangements are confirmed after REDD+ Strategies have been developed and approved by the country? -> This comment is not addressed in the current version of the R-PP. -> The decree for the creation of the CN-REDD has just been accepted by the Ministers and needs to be signed by the President (p37).

3. In particular to allow for time to elaborate and clarify on the rights to land and by relation the rights to carbon especially by the current majority who only, currently claim their rights through customary means? → This component is not addressed in the current version of the R-PP. Especially in the forest areas, this has heavy implications on the indigenous peoples and their customary rights, protected by the C 169 of the ILO which has been ratified by CAR as the first African country to do so. FLEGT is also addressing some of these issues. -> This important comment does not seem to be addressed

4. The section on carbon financing provides many ideas, concepts and food for thought. It is obvious that some important decisions are yet to be made. But who will take these decisions and will stakeholders be involved in the decision making process? Will the CN REDD play a role in these decisions? -> This comment is addressed on p 78, where the decisional structure is now well explained. According to the revised version of the R-PP, the decision making process would "include all stakeholders". It would start from the CIP-REDD+ and goes through the CT-REDD+ and eventually ends up in the CN-REDD, which will take the final decision (p78).

Standard 2.d: Assessment of social and environmental impacts:

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:

The standard is partially met -> The standard is met, but subject to the insertion of the missing calendar and budget.

-> the standard is met, subject to clarification on budget (see comment n°2)

The preliminary analysis of positive and negative environmental and social impacts is welcomed.

1. The TORs describing how the SESA will be conducted need to be further elaborated to include the foreseen methodologies to cater for processes that will ensure stakeholder participation; including the forest dependent people as well mechanisms for feeding back into the finalization of the REDD+ strategic options. → This comment is not addressed in the august version of the R-PP

-> This minor comment is still not addressed in the September version.

2. The revised R-PP doesn't show the proposed budget as well as the calendar. They should be added. Above all, if the activities are supposed to encompass those of the component 4b. -> This comment is addressed on p 88. But it has to be noted that the costs of the 3 campaigns for data collection (« Collecte des informations dans les 16 Préfectures et 2 postes de contrôle administratifs avec mission de 2 jours par Préfecture ou PCA (36 h)/ experts x 2 experts EESS de la CT REDD+ - prise en charge sous comp 1a + transport avec 50 USD/mission/expert x 18 missions x 2 experts ») have almost tripled without the content of the campaign to be changed. To be consistent, the unitary cost of each campaign should remain at 1.8.

3. According to the calendar reported in component 5 (p118), it seems that the finalisation of the EES is likely to occur after the development of the 13 programs considered in component 2b. As it is critical that the programs be designed according to the results of the SESA, we suggest to revised slightly the calendar so that it be possible. -> it has been addressed.

Component 3. Develop a Reference Scenario

Standard 3 Reference scenario:

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

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

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

The standard is met > The standard is met subject to consideration of the above comment.

-> the standard is largely met as it remains unclear how basic data around conservation and SFM will be collected. This does not appear from part 2a as mentioned in the R-PP.

1.——CAR presents a frank data requirements analysis, and limitations of scenario setting; still there a rich comparison of baseline setting options including the potential for sub national baseline development (of course to be brought as a single datum at national level)

2.——The section also links to the Component 2a, 2b and 4

1. The work plan doesn't explicitly include the collection and use of data related to conservation, sustainable management of forest and enhancement of carbon stocks. On this, the REDD process might benefit from the FLEGT process. It would be helpful to share more information between both processes.

-> An amendment has been made to p 98. However, it remains unclear how component 2a responds to the need for data collection and use. The answer remains unsatisfactory, although the

FLEGT process is mentioned in this paragraph.

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-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The standard is partially met. > the standard is met.

-> The standard is met

The component describes clearly the capacity and data requirements for CAR. It outlines both the steps for the MRV as well as the details of important definitional approaches. It talks of issues that are cross-cutting. It also presents the institutional framework as proposed by the CAR.

1. There is also a plan (4.b) for considering the monitoring of other benefits and impacts. This plan could benefit from further elaboration. The "how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers" is not directly seen.

→ This comment is moved to section 4b and addressed there.

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:

Standard is partially met.

-> The standard is partially met, as there is no indication on how governance performance will be measured. In addition, it remains unclear why this component does not have a separate budget, given that it is an important part of the future REDD strategy.

This version of the R-PP still links this component with the component 2d, in terms of budget and

activities. It remains unclear for the reviewers why CAR considers that those 2 components might be merged (in particular MRV of governance aspects is not addressed by component 2d). -> concern remains.

1- The plan for considering the monitoring of other benefits and impacts could benefit from further elaboration. The “how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers” is not directly seen.

-> The comment is not addressed in the new version of the R-PP. It is also not very clear how this MRV system interacts with other reporting requirements, e.g. on biodiversity conservation under the CBD. -> There is an attempt to address the comment on p 114. Although the paragraph remains unclear, it confirms the alignment with CBD reporting.

2- Budget of 21 000 dollars (0,3% of the total budget) shared with component 2d, seems insufficient. -> In the September version, the budget is still shared with component 2d. Admittedly, it has increased to 43 000 dollars (up to 07%), but this is not ~~much convincing~~ very significant for this component, as :

- this increase is above all due to the rectification of a wrong figure (organisation of SESA’s workshops for the 3 CIP-REDD) and

- the costs of the 3 campaigns for data collection (« Collecte des informations dans les 16 Préfectures et 2 postes de contrôle administratifs avec mission de 2 jours par Préfecture ou PCA (36 h)/ experts x 2 experts EESS de la CT REDD+ - prise en charge sous comp 1a + transport avec 50 USD/mission/expert x 18 missions x 2 experts ») have almost tripled without the content of the campaign to be changed. To be consistent, the unitary cost of each campaign should remain at 1.8.

3- Monitoring and reporting of governance aspects, an important element of this component 4b, should be considered. Note that this aspect is not tackled by component 2d. -> This important concern is not addressed

4- The parameters that will be monitored and reported are listed (p114). To match the standard, there should be already some early ideas and a work plan for the implementation. -> This important concern is not addressed

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

The standard is met subject to consideration of the above comments

-> **The standard is largely met**, since budget of component 2a should be corrected, calendars should be aligned and the budgets of some activities of components 2b and 2d need clarifications.

1- A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF, as well as from other international sources is prepared (Fig.41). It is commendable that CAR government has already accepted to allocate resources to REDD-plus.

2- For each component, funding expected from the FCPF should be specified, as much as possible.

-> This comment is addressed. The FCPF contribution has been reported in the budget tables

included at the end of each component.

Note that the overall budget has increased, in particular due to the organization of summer universities on baseline and governance. But this is also related to an increase of component 1a's budget of 400 000 dollars : to raise the monthly compensation of the CT REDD members and to contract an international consultant. However, there is no rationale for why this has been done.

3- Whereas the Summary calendar and budget (p117-121) start from the first semester of 2012, all the calendars throughout the R-PP start from the second semester of 2011. These latest should be aligned to the summary calendar which is more realistic.

4- In addition, Budget for the recently planed Summer University on governance is not reported in the component 2a of the Summary budget table (p117).

5- Please also refer to comments n°3 and n°2 on budget consistency in components 2b and 2d, respectively.

6- It should be specified somewhere in the budget : “*1000 \$”. -> this has been addressed

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:

Standard is met subject to consideration of the above comments.

-> This standard is partially met, given the fact that the indicators do not follow the strategic options, the implementation and the pilot projects.

1- It is important that the indicators cover the all scope of the R-PP, in particular Component 2b : the design and the implementation of the strategic options, as well as the selection and implementation of the pilot projects. -> This comment is not addressed

2- To match the standard, the R-PP « should demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources ». -> A sentence has been added to this end (p121)

On this particular component, we recommend CAR to have a look at the Colombia's R-PP, which proposes a particularly well thought and comprehensive evaluation framework.