



# FCPF External Technical Advisory Panel

## **TAP's Summary Report - Colombia**

June 20-22, 2011  
9<sup>th</sup> FCPF Participants Committee Meeting  
Oslo, Norway

# Strengths of the RPP

- **The R-PP is very well written, very rich in information, consistent and responds to most of the key issues required by the FCPF**
- **The proposed institutional arrangement responds to three government strategies related to Climate change. It is solid, based on a hierarchical approach and includes government institutions, and main stakeholders related to deforestation and forest management**
- **Both, early consultation process and consultation plan are comprehensive and engage most of the stakeholders that may be involved in the REDD+ process.**
- **The REDD+ strategy addresses the seven most important drivers of deforestation and forest loss. It is presented in a very organized way and recognizes properly the underlying causes of deforestation**
- **The estimation of historical deforestation rates, based on remote sensing techniques is consistent and well worked**

# Further work

- **Though 1a has improved it still needs more details on how the proposed arrangement may overlap or conflict, and how this will be solved, with actual Institutions and their mandates.**
- **The R-PP could be improved considerably by describing with more detail how the strategy options will address the specific drivers of D& D (2b).**
- **A lot of new information and details are presented in the new draft with respect to SESA implementation (2d). More information is needed with respect to different institutional roles in this process.**

# Further work

- **It would be appropriate to include a table or scheme showing a work plan for the estimation of the reference level (3).**
- **The proposed work plan to develop a MRV (4) system should be worked out more deeply. More details should be provided with respect to capacity building for this component**
- **The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework is at the present insufficient and should be further developed (6)**



- **In May, TAP comments pointed the lack of a full acronym list and the lack of legends for most of the maps. These points were improved in the June 3 version.**
  
- **In summary, Colombia has shown a lot of improvements in the last version of the R-PP, when compared to the first document launched in May. For most of the components, the June version has improved its scores in relation to the accomplishment of the standards. Some further work needs to be done, but the overall impression is that, with modest amount of effort, the new version could easily meet the standards**



# Overall summary

	May 2011	June 2011
<b>Component 1a</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard largely met</b>
<b>Component 1b</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard met</b>
<b>Component 1c</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard met</b>
<b>Component 2a</b>	<b>Standard not met</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>
<b>Component 2b</b>	<b>Standard not met</b>	<b>Standard met</b>
<b>Component 2c</b>	<b>Standard not met</b>	<b>Standard largely met</b>
<b>Component 2d</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard largely met</b>
<b>Component 3</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>
<b>Component 4a</b>	<b>Standard not met</b>	<b>Standard not met</b>
<b>Component 4b</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>
<b>Component 5</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>
<b>Component 6</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>	<b>Standard partially met</b>