

**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.

**Synthesis Review of R-PP of : Central African Republic**

Reviewer : Stephen Cobb and ~~five~~ six other TAP reviewers

Date of review : ~~11<sup>th</sup> February~~ 7<sup>th</sup> March 2011

Formatted: Superscript

**Standards to be Met by R-PP Components**

*Note: This uses FCPF version 4 template standards. Since the new R-PP template version 5 revises these standards, potential upgrade to meet version 5 are also noted.*

**Overview**

This is a very evenly-balanced and thoroughly professional proposal and its authors, both national and international, are to be congratulated on the high standard they have

achieved. It is close to being of adequate standard. If it is held back from achieving the necessary overall standard, that is largely because of the consultation process, and the institutional arrangements. The TAP reviewers were uneasy about the lack of consultation outside the capital city, and about a number of consultation and participation principles in relation to Indigenous Peoples. The TAP feels that a bit of additional effort to redress this now, will avoid storing up greater problems in the future.

The TAP is not entirely convinced by the institutional arrangements that are proposed, feeling that the structures are rather heavyweight, with a dominance of government representation, and with the links between central and provincial bodies not well described. There are concerns about how well local voices will be heard; and also about how successful might be the proposals for managing REDD funds in a way that would be open to scrutiny.

Another institutional worry is that reviewers felt that not enough weight was given to the shortcomings of the legal arrangements, and the steps needed to amend them, to clarify the rights to the future values of forests, forested land, trees and forest carbon. The R-PP does not advance this critical area far enough.

The technical aspects of the proposal are of a consistently high standard, with a logical link between analysis and proposed solutions (the links between the drivers of deforestation and the strategy options have been well thought through). The highly technical components 3 and 4, relating to the reference emission levels and the approach to MRV have been well treated: they face formidable challenges during implementation, due to the paucity of existing baseline data of adequate quality (notably in the 80% of the country covered by dry, semi-deciduous woodlands), and the chronic capacity constraints.

This last point exposes a worry expressed by all the TAP reviewers of CAR's proposal. The international community wishes to assist CAR to make itself REDD-ready in step with other countries. The support given to CAR, through the technical assistance provided by ONFI, is a sign of this. Reviewers felt that there needs to be more strategic thought given to a realistic and properly conducted training needs assessment and capacity-building plan, if CAR is to position itself to do more of this work on its own.

~~The TAP recalls the insistence expressed by the Congo Basin countries on the adoption of a regional approach to REDD-readiness through the FCPF, and is surprised to note that there is almost no mention made of the possibility of collaboration with neighbouring countries, of orchestrating common approaches through COMIFAC, or of basing some aspects of the programme (satellite image acquisition and analysis, for example) with regional institutions, such as OFAC. The TAP has already made the same observation to the other two Congo Basin countries that have so far submitted their R-PPs notes the fact that CAR has drawn attention to its obligations to regional collaboration with its Congo basin neighbours through COMIFAC.~~

~~A point to be dealt with in the final submission is that of the maps, which are of rather poor quality. For example, the main map, which appears in Figures 1 and 4, is an administrative map, not showing the forests, but showing some protected areas, though perhaps surprisingly, not the principal forested protected areas. Figure 5 is so out of focus as to be illegible. Figure 6 is a digital representation of the extent of the forest, at two scales of density: but it doesn't show forested national parks, forest reserves or forest concessions. It would be a real help to improve on all these.~~

## Summary of the attainment of standards

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements: *partially meets the standard.*

Standard 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation: *partially meets the standard*

Standard 2.a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance: *partially meets the standard.*

Standard 2.b: REDD strategy Options: *largely meets the standard.*

Standard 2.c: REDD implementation framework: *partially meets the standard*

Standard 2.d: Assessment of social and environmental impacts: *largely meets the standard*

Standard 3: Reference scenario: *largely meets the standard*

Standard 4: Design a monitoring system:

4a) Emissions and removals: *largely meets the standard*

4b) Multiple benefits, other impacts & governance: *meets the standard*

Standard 5: Completeness of information & resource requirements: *partially meets the Standard.*

Standard 6: Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: *largely meets the standard*

## 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;

*Version 5 standard text not included in version 4 standard:*

*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:

Although a wide range of stakeholders is planned to be involved in the oversight function of the REDD+ programme, it is felt by reviewers that the structures, ~~while not numerically are too~~ dominated by State representation, ~~may be conceived in a way.~~ In particular, it is felt that the ~~private sector (not least the forest industry) is underrepresented, as are the forest dependent and indigenous peoples.~~

~~The format of representation also that~~ poses concerns: in the case of the Indigenous Peoples, there is a real worry that with two seats on a 17-person committee chaired by the Prime Minister, IP representatives will feel intimidated, and not free to express themselves. This socio-cultural dynamic needs more careful and sensitive thought; ~~traditional societies may just not get the intended representation by being given a seat on a committee. It is felt that the private sector~~

(not least the forest industry) is underrepresented

as are those who are involved in the major source of deforestation: smallholder farmers.

Some reviewers have pointed out that the dynamics of NGO representation are more complex and more fluid than is acknowledged in this component, and that a more flexible and democratic means of seeking NGO (and IP group) representation on the committee structure needs to be worked out.

The description of the scope of the CNEDD (the National Environment and Sustainable Development Commission) provides a useful dimension to understanding CAR's approach to cross-cutting environmental issues, but it would be more useful still if the document gave any hint as to whether or not the Commission has ever met, and if so, with what frequency and outcomes. Some TAP reviewers are concerned that the Commission may seem convincing on paper, but has not yet proved to have any real substance.

An additional idea is Reviewers have suggested that the REDD Coordination Unit would be more efficient and freer of distracting influences if it were managed by a private-sector or civil society group, of a kind with a reputation for efficiency.

Mention is made of the Fonds National pour l'Environnement, as a potential future home for the products of REDD+ transactions. Although this is referred to again in Component 2d, it would be reassuring to know more about the FNE and its ~~past experience~~ proposed financial management role, and why it would be a mechanism that would attract the confidence not only of the state, but of civil society and future global private sector REDD investors also.

Figure 2 has been placed in the body of section 1.4, whereas it belongs in section 1.3. It should be moved.

Although a hierarchy of Committees (some of them very unwieldy in size) is described, that would be involved in supervising REDD+ implementation. ~~There is, however,~~ no strong sense of how the structure would actually work, and how the different committees would interact with one another, and with the Secretariat. The lack of any diagrammatic representation of how all these bodies would interact, is unfortunate. The lack of Terms of Reference, or mandate, of each of the Committees is also a handicap.

The particular shortcoming of this section is that it does not describe the process whereby this committee structure was decided, not does it give a sense of how the different sectoral interests have come together to agree that REDD+ concerns them all: that it is not just about forestry, but is about addressing the causes of deforestation and degradation, most of which lie in other sectors of the rural economy, such as agriculture, mining, infrastructure development.

#### Recommendations

1. Give careful thought to the Committee structure and composition, both at national and provincial levels
2. Establish how these bodies are really going to interact with one another, and what they will actually do
3. Present a convincing case that the different sectors concerned with REDD have really been engaged in thinking about it
4. Describe in more detail how the FNE would be used to be a truly transparent mechanism for managing REDD funds

The sub-component partially meets the standard.

#### Standard 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders: Inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, assessed in the following ways:

- i. the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far<sup>3</sup>, the extent of ownership within government and REDD coordinating body, as well as in the broader national stakeholder community; and

the Consultation and Participation Plan included in the R-PP (which looks forward in time); and the inclusion of elements in the R-PP that adequately document the expressed concerns and recommendations of relevant stakeholders and propose a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

*Version 5 standard text on 1c: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation, not included in version 4 standard:*

*R-PP should include mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.*

*(Standard 1c (version 5): This standard is very similar to version 4 standard 1b.)*

***Standard 1b in version 5: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups (This is a new text and standard called 1b that did not exist in previous versions)***

*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.*

<sup>3</sup> 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).

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

A detailed and scrupulously recorded process of workshops and information sessions is described, both in the text and in Annexes. The consultation already carried out appears on the face of it to have reached the right groups, and it is good that the consultation is continuing. However, those close to the process report that many civil society and church groups, that have been closely involved in REDD-relevant activities, feel excluded from the consultation process, particularly outside the capital, Bangui. This was apparently pointed out after the pre-validation workshop, and not remedied at the validation workshop. It should be dealt with in the revision phase, not least to compensate for the rapid phase of preparation of the first draft of the R-PP.

The rapid pace of R-PP preparation apparently had its side-effects: the final document was submitted to a validation workshop, but there had not been time to circulate it in advance, so consultees felt that they were being asked to validate a document they had not had due time to consider. It would be as well to remedy this in the coming period of revision, in order to keep the widest possible support behind the process.

Most of the workshop sessions so far have been in the capital, Bangui; only one was outside the capital (at Mbaiki). Place-specific workshops at local level and for indigenous people are also important and are planned. Experience shows that it is not easy to convey the concepts of REDD, and that continuing education by all means is necessary. The outreach planned is comprehensive, using radio, television, and school programs. The question here will be how well is the information and feedback from stakeholders used in the continuing governance of the program. Experience from other countries suggests that it is easier to hold the workshops than to actually incorporate the suggestions and make changes - and stakeholders have felt left out of the process.

The proposal recognizes the shortcomings of the consultation process outside the capital and proposes to rectify this during R-PP implementation. It should be noted however, that other countries have already found themselves in precisely this situation and been asked by the PC to extend the consultation process. TAP reviewers of this proposal generally felt that this is a real issue that needs to be addressed sooner, rather than later. There is a broad concern that the process so far has not respected FPIC principles, and that Indigenous People's interests have not been given proper attention.

The results of the consultations conducted so far are not clearly summarized in the R-PP - one would expect a clear depiction of the critical issues coming out of the consultations, and in cases where consultations are yet to be completed, expected issues and questions should be presented. On the other hand, the R-PP gives a good account of the real challenges of communication and information flow that the REDD process represents, and acknowledges that it will be a lengthy process overcoming these challenges.

**Recommendations**

1. The consultation process needs to be extended more widely throughout the country, in order to generate confidence in the process.
2. Due process needs to be applied, to ensure that the concerns expressed during consultations, find their way into programme design

The sub-component partially meets the standard.

## 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, direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD, and major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues. It documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD. The assessment sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

*(Version 5 standard: no significant changes from version 4)*

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

The forests of CAR are currently undergoing a very low rate of deforestation, but are under considerable new pressures and there is a significant percentage (more than 10%) of forest concessions to logging companies. There appears to be a good understanding of the underlying causes: unsustainable agriculture, logging, infrastructure development (e.g., urbanization), etc. and inadequate policies and institutions to deal with the pressures. The assessment will have to show what the priorities are for dealing with this large number of issues.

The fact that Environmental Management does not feature strongly in the current Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, but instead stresses the need to exploit forests for development has been pointed out as a matter worthy of careful consideration in the national dialogue on REDD+

An important observation has been made that while mining is an increasing economic activity in the forests in CAR, its administration could be more transparent. At present there is little information and data on existing and planned operations that may affect forest and hence REDD+ areas.

Reviewers note that CAR lacks both an appropriate range of sectoral policies and strategies and the related capacity to deal with its forest sector obligations, to say nothing of its future challenges during REDD implementation.

It is also felt that the R-PP does not go into enough detail in analyzing the erosion, under the current forest laws, of the traditional powers over village-based forest use and the frailty of traditional forest-dwellers' and Indigenous Peoples' rights, when confronted with those of more powerful economic interests. This weak tenure system is of great concern in the forthcoming development of REDD+ as a land-use mechanism.

Several concerns were expressed about the analysis of the causes of deforestation and degradation, including the view that the analyses are too superficial, thus making it hard to devise appropriate remedies (if you do not know the precise cause, it is hard to prescribe the correct cure). Another view is that too much attention is focused on rural farmers as agents of deforestation, not enough on the forestry concessions themselves.

### Recommendations

1. More attention should be given to analysis of the land tenure system and property rights in forested environments

2. Additional depth should be given to the analysis of the causes of deforestation and degradation

The sub-component partially meets the standard.

**Standard 2.b: REDD strategy Options:**

Alignment of the proposed REDD strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies: the R-PP includes a summary of the emerging REDD strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD strategy options. This summary states:

- i. how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD strategy;
- ii. early estimates of cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental benefits;
- iii. socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD strategy;
- iv. major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD strategy; and
- v. 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 strategy over time.

*Version 5 standard text not included in version 4 standard:*

*For point ii (cost benefits), and point iv (risk of domestic leakage), R-PPs should present only a plan, not the actual work.*

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

The overall strategic design is appropriate in the context of REDD+, though it would be wise to anchor it more clearly in the existing national framework of sectoral strategies already in place, such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy. [The policy framework has its shortcomings, which will eventually need to be attended to.](#) The scoring system attached to the strategy options gives the process of choosing a sense of legitimacy, which is probably a good thing.

The whole question of land title remains an unsettling one, though it is of the utmost importance in preparing a REDD+ regime that attracts widespread support from the rural, forest-dependent population. The national rangelands law (the Code foncier agropastoral) has been before parliament for a very long time, and this slow passage of legislation in relation to rural land tenure gives cause for worry about how a REDD+ law would fare. This is discussed again in the next component. Reviewers feel that this whole area is under-researched in the R-PP.

The four policy options listed are sensible parts of the REDD+ plan, as far as they go, but will require further development through the pilot projects. Given that the rate of deforestation and forest degradation is so low (0.13%/year is quoted), it appears that the immediate focus for CAR could be on conservation, which is rewarded on the basis of no changes in forest stock. This puts priority on improving zoning and establishing new protected areas, and on strengthening institutions and governance.

The second priority would then be on promoting sustainable forest management and improving agro-technologies. By focusing on conservation at the outset, it will be easier to start the



development of a REL and an MRV system. Reviewers note that the country already has a substantial proportion of its land surface allocated to conservation purposes, with a long record of supporting them, in particular with international support from the European Union, Germany, WWF and others. Nonetheless, this support has not yet proven adequate, nor is it financially sustainable. The conservation model adopted in the past has often been a repressive one, which may not be in keeping with the needs to involve communities in management and the sharing of benefits, as REDD+ models would indicate.

The authors of the R-PP should note, in relation to pilot projects, that while such activities may be a sensible part of the REDD-readiness preparations, they may be ineligible for FCPF funding, and would therefore have to be supported by other elements of a multi-donor funding package. This will need careful planning.

Reviewers would have liked to see a clearer presentation of how rural communities might be actively engaged in Sustainable Forest Management under a future REDD regime.

#### Recommendations

1. The strategic options should include strategies on how to engage with the Agricultural and Mining Sectors both at the National Policy and Sub-national levels
2. The RPP should also consider the potential for CDM type projects in the degraded forest areas and in the wooded savannas as a mechanism to involve farmers to increase carbon stocks and benefit from such operations.
3. The strategy needs to give much more thought to the frailty of existing laws in protecting rights of forest dwellers and indigenous peoples to the future values of forests and their carbon resources

The sub-component partially meets the standard.

#### Standard 2.c: REDD implementation framework:

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD in the country setting that identifies key issues, explores potential arrangements to address them, and offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package.

*Version 5 standard text not included in version 4 standard::*

- i) *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.*
- ii) *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:

If there is to be a concerted national effort to get the country ready for REDD+, the reviewers note, as do the authors of the R-PP, that a new REDD+ Law will be needed, since the present legal arrangements in the country do not, by any means, permit the necessary mechanisms to operate in favour of the potential future beneficiaries of REDD+. Reviewers note that while there is a wide-ranging review in the R-PP of the legal instruments already in place, there is no proper treatment in the R-PP of the status in law of the rights to forests, trees and forest carbon. This is crucial to gaining acceptance of REDD+ as a future mechanism.

It is pointed out by reviewers that in 2010, CAR ratified the 1989 Convention No. 169 of the International Labour Organisation on the rights of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. The implications of this need to be properly addressed in the R-PP. It also needs to be wary of statements about land-use, usufruct and land-rights that are in contravention of Convention 169.

Reviewers also note the lack of focus on decentralization in the R-PP. Although the country has some way to go in the process of decentralization of decision-making and other powers, it is felt that REDD+ must place its focus on action at a local level, which in turn requires a fair degree of decentralized authority. How this would be made to work has not been made clear in the R-PP.

Reviewers are concerned that the proposal to manage REDD revenues through the Fonds National pour l'Environnement is not accompanied by any description of what this would mean, with reference in particular to the establishment of transparent procedures that would reassure all parties about proper financial management. At the very least, at this stage, its scope and powers could be spelt out, even if more detail were only to come later.

CAR recognizes that they will have to undertake a number of legislative and regulatory reforms to address weaknesses in land use planning and governance in general, in addition to the shortcomings just mentioned. These reforms will take time, and it will be important to start some of the processes immediately - notably the assessments and the REL so that there is a knowledge base for governance discussions. One of the key elements for financing of REDD+ is that funds flow to the communities responsible for maintaining forests. This is particularly important for a country like CAR where the rate of deforestation and forest degradation is so low. With conservation a high priority, the communities must be involved at all levels, and safeguards for them put in place at the outset. This underscores the need to think carefully about the role of the FNE.

There is no work plan yet, but the elements of such a plan have been identified.

#### Recommendations

1. The R-PP needs to give more weight to the national and international legal framework, and obligations, and the implications of these for future REDD implementation (including the protection of forest dwellers' rights)
2. The transparency of the FNE as a repository for REDD funds needs to be properly explained
3. The framework described does not give adequate weight to provincial concerns (despite the description of the provincial committees) and how these would work their way up to the national level

This sub-component partially meets the standard

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 Bank'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.

*Version 5 standard text not included in version 4 standard:*

*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:**

CAR plans to conduct a SESA, and implement the ESMF in accordance with World Bank safeguard policies. The issues are listed and activities proposed. But the details of how this will happen are limited to the chart of principal activities, sub-activities, and budgets. A work flow plan is also needed to show how this comes together and how the safeguards will be addressed. Attention also needs to be given to the establishment of a baseline against which changes in social and environmental conditions can subsequently be monitored (though the environmental conditions will in part be covered by the REL work tackled elsewhere).

The table that lays out the potential impacts of the different strategic options needs more careful thought, considering the impacts from a wider range of potentially interested parties. The table would also be improved by the addition of an additional column to summarise potential mitigation measures.

It would be helpful to include an account of whether social and environmental impact policies have been successfully applied in the CAR in relation to other sectors, for example the currently fast-expanding mining interests.

**Recommendations**

1. A work plan needs to be established
2. A bit more thought is needed in the consideration of impacts on different stakeholder-groups, and on how to mitigate impacts
3. The process of impact analysis needs to be described in the context of existing impact studies, for example in the mining sector, which is currently in phase of rapid expansion

**This sub-component largely meets the standard**

### Component 3. Develop a Reference Scenario

#### Standard 3 Reference scenario:

Present work plan for how the reference scenario for deforestation, and for forest degradation (if desired), will be developed, including early ideas on feasibility of which methods to use (e.g., scenario of forest cover change and emissions based on historical trends in emissions and/or based on projections into the future of historical trend data), major data requirements and capacity needs, and linkages to the monitoring system design.

(The FCPF recognizes 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.)

#### *Version 5 standard text not included in version 4 standard:*

- i) The work plan also needs to include, besides deforestation and forest degradation, conservation, sustainable management of forest and enhancement of carbon stocks.*
- ii) Assess current capacity as well as future capacity needs.*
- iii) Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design).*
- iv) A stepwise approach.*

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

The goal is to provide a national reference level, and there should be an effort directed towards that national aim. As mentioned above, an early focus on conservation would make sense, and that helps focus the locations of sub-national efforts where more intense work would take place.

Clearly, CAR is starting from a very low level of information: past emissions are not known and future projections of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are difficult. The emphasis on strengthening human and logistical services in ICASEES, the agency in charge of statistics, is probably correct. The combination of the bottom up and top down approaches to estimate national levels is also sensible.

Given future uncertainties, it is clear that any baseline developed from past activities will, as the text notes, underestimate future emissions. Given the lack of economic models to draw from, it makes sense to try to develop and adapt the IIASA CongoBIOM model for this purpose. Outside experts as well as technical training will be required to make this and the geographical modeling suggested actually work. There will be need for software, data, and training for the LACCEG.

Given the low level of capacity, it is important to focus the limited resources where deforestation and forest degradation are expected to be high. This will, in turn, help focus the MRV on the areas where the most intense monitoring should take place. This puts an immediate focus on two of the areas mentioned: Area (i) CIP Sud, and Area (ii) CIP Est, since these are both subject to illegal logging and other pressures. Area (iii) has low carbon stocks, and Area (iv) is the rest of the country, but eventually have to be included so that a national reference level can be established.

The R-PP authors have rejected the use of "expert testimony" as a basis for establishing reference levels. From a data quality standpoint this may have been correct, but from the standpoint of giving a real role to Indigenous Peoples in the process, this was perhaps unnecessarily dismissive. More thought could usefully be given to this.

The simple scenarios that have been proposed for the development of the national reference level are reasonable. Reviewers agree that there should be consultations on the type of models to be

used, and the CAR should monitor international work on the issue of reduced emissions in some areas with total emissions rising. The modeling required to build reference scenarios recognizes the importance of using drivers of deforestation and sector targets that affect forestry, as factors or inputs into scenario building. This is sensible.

There still needs to be a detailed work plan with deliverables, a time line, and responsible parties. The R-PP for Cambodia (available on the FCPF website) has an excellent work plan and outcome chain for both REL and MRV. This example could be followed for CAR.

As far as adaptation to changing rules, it will be most efficient to put in place the simplest systems with elements that would be required in any case - data collection systems for satellite and field studies, models for estimating carbon, and data delivery and decision support systems, all of which will be needed in any case. The reference level information will be a key data input to the decision support system that will be part of the MRV system.

Several reviewers underscore the need for extensive training and capacity-building in this broad domain; mentioned in the R-PP, but perhaps with not enough emphasis.

#### Recommendation

1. Component 3 should also clearly show how activity data will be combined with emission factors to derive reference emission levels. A definition of terms would be helpful.
2. There needs to be a detailed workplan
3. Serious thought needs to be given to training needs

*The component largely meets the standard*

#### Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

##### Standard 4: Design a monitoring system:

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation. The system design should include early ideas on including capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor other benefits and impacts, for example rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD implementation in the country, and to assess the impacts of the REDD 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 implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD monitoring system with this full set of capabilities.

(The FCPF recognizes 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.)

*Version 5 standard text not included in version 4 standard:*

Provide proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis.

Monitoring other benefits and impacts is broken into a separate subcomponent 4b in version 5, but the substance is consistent.

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

##### 4 a) Emissions and removals

In this section, as in Component 3, the R-PP has identified most of the issues that need to be addressed, and has listed actions to be taken. In terms of emission factors, CAR plans to focus first on tier 2 approach 2, then to move to the tier 3 approach 3 as soon as possible. What is critical here is to agree on a level that is in fact workable and get a system up in place at that level. It can be upgraded later. But the available information and the human resources are very thin, and much capacity building will have to take place in all of the relevant agencies, but especially in CDF, LACCEG, and the OFB.

As mentioned earlier, given the state of its forest, CAR should focus on conservation areas at the outset. This puts less priority on the questions of definition of forest and forest degradation, but a decision there will have to be taken at some point.

In terms of next steps, CAR has a creditable history both in setting standards for sustainable forestry and in the formulation and implementation of forest management plans. The list of actions incorporates the requirements for the establishment of an MRV system. But now this list needs to be turned into a work plan with deliverables, a time line, with the responsible parties clearly identified. Moreover, they will need an outcome chain, both for MRV and for REL, that shows how the flow of actions will lead to the information required for adequate management and reporting within a REDD+ context. The outcome chain now being used by Cambodia for both REL and MRV is a good example of a work flow framework that could be adapted here.

As noted in the REL discussion, it will not be necessary for the national MRV to be started at equal levels of intensity in all regions of the country. The sampling scheme and focus of data can be put

in those areas where the deforestation rate is the highest now, and where the forest is expected to be at most risk. In other areas, the sampling can be simpler and a lower level of monitoring can meet the initial needs. The recognition is welcomed, that key parameters of measurement should have suitable measures of statistical precision attached to them.

Training is a key aspect of the proposal. There should be a separate plan focused on training to show exactly what is needed and what resources can be brought to bear. The sooner this can start, the better. Given the low capacity level, maximum reliance on existing projects and programmes (both national, such as PARPAF, PARN and APV-FLEGT, and also regional) will be necessary. The participation of institutions outside government and communities are not apparent in the sub-component.

#### Recommendations

1. It would be helpful to examine the Cambodia proposal, and to derive inspiration from it. The DRC proposal is also helpful
2. Serious thought needs to be given to training and capacity building

The sub-component largely meets the standard

#### 4b) Other benefits

Section 4b. on multiple benefits, other impacts, and governance is good as an introduction to the issues, but it needs to have specifics of a monitoring system for environmental, socio-economic, and governance monitoring, with specific indicators and sub-activities identified.

The proposal to use the Criteria and Indicators Framework is worthwhile, particularly if it builds upon what has been used in CAR and the Congo Basin Countries. This is because the C and I process monitors forestry, biodiversity, other environmental and socio-economic and governance indicators

#### Recommendations

None

The sub-component meets the standard.

### 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, as well as from other international sources (e.g., UN-REDD or 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 readiness activities identified in the R-PP, or gaps in funding are clearly noted.

*Version 5 standard text not included in version 4 standard:*

*Any gaps in funding, and sources of funding, are clearly noted.*

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

The R-PP has provided a list of activities needed to achieve REDD readiness, and has identified the large capacity building necessary. The budgets proposed are probably reasonable, but the activities have not yet been put into an acceptable work plan that shows how the funding would be spent.

As was mentioned previously, the large proportion of the budget (43%) allocated to the pilot projects (that would be advertised in a tendering process) needs careful thought, since these projects are almost certainly not eligible for FCPF funding. Whilst a good idea in themselves, they underline the need for CAR to find counterpart funding to complement the \$3.5 million (approximately) that might be available from FCPF.

**Recommendations**

1. A work plan is needed
2. A plan for distributing the support amongst other donors should also be provided, with particular reference to FCPF eligibility criteria

The component partially meets the Standard.

**Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**

**Standard 6:** 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:**

This is a good start on indicators, means of verification, and responsibilities. However, a real effort needs to be made to develop more precise and more ambitious indicators. Some of the institutional responsibilities need to be more carefully assigned, to avoid generation of conflicts of interest (or lack of objectivity).



It now needs to be put into a framework that shows how the indicators would be used, for example, to help achieve transparency, or to reveal shortfalls in performance timing or quality.

#### Recommendations

1. Some more thought needs to be given to the use of indicators, and the operational aspects of turning the ideas of the R-PP into an operational entity

This component largely meets the Standard