



# PC Review

## CAR's R-PP

European Commission & French Agency for  
Development (lead)

PC10, Berlin, October 2011

# GENERAL COMMENTS

- 3 PC reviews : February 2011 (before draft presentation at PC8), September & October 2011.
- PC reviewers appreciated the efforts made in the last version to address the concerns previously raised.
- Progress towards meeting the standards :
  - ✓ 6 standards are *met* (1b, 2a, 2c, 2d, 4a, 5\*). \* : clarifications needed
  - ✓ 4 standards are *largely met* (1a, 1c, 2b, 3)
  - ✓ 2 standards are still *partially met* (4b and 6)

# STRENGTHS

- ✓ Interesting preliminary assessment of the potential impacts (positive & negative, social & environmental) of the REDD+ options (C. 2d)
- ✓ Capacity building needs on governance issues have been set out more clearly in the REDD+ Sub-options (C. 2b)
- ✓ C. 3 and C. 4a are well elaborated
- ✓ Thorough analysis of the drivers of deforestation (C. 2a)
  - > *but poor forest governance & illegal industrial logging , although referred to, need to be identified as drivers as well*
- ✓ Reference to interaction between FLEGT and REDD+ processes e.g. on drivers, governance challenges and data collection
  - > *however looking forward to see this translated into actions*
- ✓ Capacity building needs better addressed (C. 1a)
  - > *remains a key issue for the implementation phase*

# AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT PENDING ISSUES

## 1. Concerns to be addressed:

- ✓ **No detail on pilot projects** (accounting for 36% of the total budget (2,400 KUS\$)) :

Criteria for selection? Feasibility ? Monitoring? (C. 6 does not cover activities of C. 2b).

- ✓ **MRV system of non-carbon aspects (C. 4b) lacking *a coherent vision* and *a budget* :**

- **No specific budget for C.4b** (budget is shared with C. 2d, which accounts only for 0,7% of the total budget)

- **Missing MRV of governance aspects**

- ✓ **The SESA and the provisions under the FLEGT VPA should guide the selection of the final strategic options.** E.g : expansion of logging in the south-east

# AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT PENDING ISSUES

## 2. Need for further elaboration:

- ✓ Sufficient consideration paid to **tenure issues** , and in particular in relation to the ILO 169 (C. 2c)
- ✓ **Assessment of successes and failures of past and current policies and projects (C. 2a)**: needs to be planed as an activity and budgeted
- ✓ Governance of the REDD window within the FNE: decree already adopted?
- ✓ **Grievance mechanism (C. 1c)**

## 3. **Incoherences to be revised** : *calendar* (activities planed for the last semester of 2011 > not realistic) & *budgets* (C. 5, C. 2b and C. 2d)