



FCPF External Technical Advisory Panel

TAP's overview of the 4 R-PPs submitted to PC:

New submissions: Colombia, Nicaragua (informal)

Revised submissions: Liberia, Uganda (formal)

June 20-22, 2011

9th FCPF Participants Committee Meeting

Oslo, Norway

1a. National Readiness Management Arrangements

- The institutions that will be responsible for leading the REDD implementation process do not generally have the political strength of that found in other sectors; this is frequently also linked to one of the major drivers of deforestation: land-use change to make way for agricultural expansion (Nicaragua)
- Uganda, Liberia and Colombia have responded well to earlier comments; though their committee structures may still not have the necessary powers, nor the legal underpinnings
- As we said at the last PC meeting, countries still have difficulty proposing strong mechanisms of leverage to facilitate cross-sectoral coordination, which is critical for REDD-plus. This was true for all four countries under review.

1b. Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups

- **Consultation processes have concentrated on people living in and dependent on forests; more engagement is still needed with a wider range of institutions, as well as with those whose activities are responsible for deforestation (farmers, ranchers, commercial agriculture enterprises). This was true for all 4 countries**
- **R-PP formulation processes have not generally engaged deeply enough with other sectors of the economy (and government)**
- **However, Liberia broadened the membership of its committee structure in response to TAP comments**

1c. Consultation and Participation Process

- Preparation of a consultation plan is an appropriate approach for demonstrating the commitment to the consultation & participation process (Liberia)
- Generally it is rather unclear how the results of the consultations have been fed into the project formulation process
- Countries have been responsive to comments (Uganda, Liberia)
- Countries generally recognise that participation is a process, not an end in itself
- Participation and consultation processes have improved markedly since the early R-PPs from other countries

2a. Assessment of Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance

- **The Quality of this section has considerably improved in all four R-PPs and the drivers of DD and their underlying causes are well described (Colombia in particular)**
- **Historical data on the impact of the drivers (infrastructure, commercial agriculture, subsistence agriculture, mining, power plants, bio-fuels, commercial and/or illegal logging etc.) are limited in most of the countries**
- **Land tenure and carbon ownership issues are often not treated to significant depths in most of the assessments; there is a real need for attention to be focused on this during implementation and to create the framework for the dialogue needed to resolve land and carbon ownership issues**
- **Most countries do not produce strong analyses of the links between governance, law enforcement and the causes of deforestation, such as excisions from the forest estate and perverse policies which can lead to forest loss**

2b. REDD-plus Strategy Options

- **Most countries have written good sections, with a well presented analysis of the options**
- **Liberia has a good table on the costs and benefits of different strategic options (see next slide, which tries to create a rational economic framework for strategy selection; it is an example of an approach, not a factual statement about the figures)**
- **Countries have not grasped sufficiently strongly in the R-PP process the challenge of engaging with those most involved with the causes of the problems of deforestation: hence, for example, miners (Liberia), ranchers (Nicaragua) and small farmers (Uganda). This affects the probability of success of the strategies.**

LIBERIA: SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS (\$) AND EXPECTED BENEFITS (TONNES CO2) AND BREAKEVEN PRICE OF CO2 PER TONNE TO COMPENSATE COSTS OF FOREGONE OPPORTUNITIES

FORESTRY SECTOR	Costs (\$ /yr)	CO2 reductions (t/yr)	Breakeven CO2 price (US\$/t CO2)
1) Raising commercial logging standards over total area of 2.3 Mha;	Cost effective (zero incremental cost)	1.47Mt (at 0.64 t/ha/yr)	Any price
2) Reducing area footprint of commercial logging			
(i) To 1.6 Mha ;	\$36.33M value added and \$17.29M tax revenues	1.85Mt	\$9.35 (taxes only); \$28.99 (taxes +value-added)
(ii) To 1.0 Mha ;	\$67.47M value added and \$32.11M tax revenues	3.43Mt	\$9.38 (taxes only); \$29.05 (taxes +value-added)
3) Regulating and managing chainsaw logging	Cost effective (zero incremental cost)	3.0Mt (33% increase in recovery rates)	Any price
4) Integrating of Conservation and Protected Areas into REDD and acceleration of the timeline for extra 0.894Mha)	\$2.23M protection costs (at \$2.38/ha/yr)	1.77Mt (at reduced deforestation rate by 0.375% and base level 527t/ha)	\$1.26
5) Enhancement of carbon sink in degraded forest areas (category 3.2) over an assumed area of 0.894Mha)	\$2.23M protection costs (at \$2.38/ha/yr)	0.88Mt (enhancement at annual rate of 0.375% from degraded level of 50% of base level 527t/ha)	\$2.53

2c. REDD-plus Implementation Framework

- **Liberia has a good implementation framework, very well written. This talks about managing REDD revenue, securing carbon rights, a proper carbon registry. It includes elements on pro-poor resource distribution systems, strengthening law-enforcement, access to information and justice, FPIC.**
- **Generally speaking, countries have not found this section easy, being unclear about what to include**
- **Institutional mandates with new laws and regulations should be a part of these frameworks**

2d. Social and Environmental Impacts During Readiness Preparation and REDD-plus Implementation

- **Countries have mostly designed SESA approaches with close attention to World Bank safeguards**
- **The thinking about possible impacts of REDD+ has generally not been geared to the strategic or the long-term, using a SEA approach**
- **Countries are hampered in this by the general weakness of land-use planning, which would have created the framework against which future impacts could be assessed**
- **Workplans are generally absent, or not well developed**

3. Develop a Reference Level

➤ **New Version 5 template gives more guidance for this component**

- **Most countries are now making use of the approaches adopted by UNFCCC CoP in the preparation of reference scenarios**
- **There is some uncertainty about data quality (Tiers) that countries will be in a position to pursue.**
- **The use of default values (e.g. below ground biomass) , without empirical data, could well lead to serious underestimates of carbon stocks (Colombia & Nicaragua).**
- **Approaches to developing reference scenarios are still varied among countries and the technical capacity needs in some RPPs have insufficient detail (Colombia)**

4. Design a Monitoring System

4a. Carbon monitoring

- The technical aspects of sampling designs and estimation of carbon in chosen pools seem to be well understood
- There is a general lack of concrete stepwise plans to build national capacities to monitor carbon.
- Countries could propose collaborative structures, set targets and timelines and definition of roles with regard to MRV

4b. Additional benefits

- The monitoring of non-carbon variables is generally not very well developed and most RPPs have no clear methodologies for monitoring the impacts of policy and governance changes, biodiversity and socio-economic benefits

5. Schedule and Budget

- **Component 5 remains an underdeveloped part of R-PPs**
- **Budgets have tended to be underestimated (Uganda, for example), and quite loosely constructed**
- **Most countries have funding gaps and have not explained how they expect to meet them (through an accompanying fund-raising plan, for example)**

6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

- This a mandatory requirement which until recently was not taken seriously.
- In general countries could better define evaluation criteria and follow-up procedures for the different steps of R-PP implementation – this will require more detailed objectives, activities and expected results in each component
- Uganda went some way to doing this justice, with a reasonable M & E framework with indicators (see next slide)

Uganda – Example of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Component	Activity/ Undertaking	Output	Key Indicator(s)	MoV	2012	2013	2014
				REDD-Plus			
Component 2c	Develop REDD Implementation Framework	Approved Implementation Framework by end of 2014	✓ Description of Implementation Framework	✓ Records of Steering Committee decision on Implementation Framework		x	x
		National Capacity for implementing REDD –Plus Strategy (Institutional, Policy, facilities, personnel, systems and procedures)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Institutional structures and processes established for REDD-Plus implementation ✓ Tools, systems and procedures for implementation ✓ Capacity within REDD- Plus National Focal Point and Implementing Institutions to implement REDD –Plus Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Documents and Reports of approved Tools, Systems and procedures ✓ Record of decisions approving institutional processes and structures, ✓ Staff and institutional capacities built and Facilities provided for REDD-Plus implementation 	x	x	x

Concluding observations from the 4 R-PPs

- While the countries have proposed what may appear to be appropriate national management arrangements (Standard 1a) a number still have difficulties in proposing the necessary implementation frameworks (Standard 2c) to facilitate their functioning.
- IP rights and those of forest dependent people are being better observed now in all the RPPs reviewed. However the issue of how to implement REDD in forests under Indigenous management or control still remain unclear in many cases
- Countries have had to go through a number of iterative steps to address the technically challenging aspects of components 3 and 4 on reference scenarios and MRV (Liberia, Nicaragua, Uganda). They are much improved, however
- The articulation of strategy options have improved but mechanisms to engage with and influence the agricultural sectors of their respective countries are still weak in all of them.
- The building of country capacities to implement the proposed strategy options and to facilitate the functioning of the proposed institutional arrangements need to be given special focus in these and the other RPPs before them, as they move into the next stages of preparation to readiness