



FCPF Technical Advisory Panel

**Central African Republic
RPP – Formal Submission
TAP Comments &
Recommendations**

**October 18-19, 2011
FCPF Participants Committee
Berlin, Germany**

Stephen Cobb and 4 TAP team members

Overall Summary : Strengths of the RPP

- **An evenly-balanced and thoroughly professional proposal, which is close to being of adequate standard.**
- **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 (2a and 2b).**
- **Components 3 and 4 have been particularly well treated. They will face formidable challenges during implementation, including the capacity constraints experienced by many countries.**
CAR does have a strong background in forest measurement, though, which will stand it in good stead in these domains.
- **The TAP notes the fact that CAR has drawn attention to its obligations to regional collaboration with its Congo basin neighbours through COMIFAC.**

Areas that are less strong

- The TAP is not entirely convinced by the institutional arrangements that are proposed, including the links between central and provincial bodies . There are concerns about how well local voices will be heard; and also whether the proposals for managing REDD funds would create a system sufficiently open to scrutiny.
- The TAP reviewers were uneasy about the degree of consultation outside the capital city, and about the consultation and participation processes in relation to Indigenous Peoples. Plans are in hand to strengthen this during implementation.
- Not enough weight has been 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, trees and forest carbon. The R-PP clearly describes the dilemma facing law-makers.
- Strategic thought is being given to a realistic and properly conducted training needs assessment and capacity-building plan

Conclusions

- The dialogue between the TAP and the CAR team has generated a number of suggestions for improvements. Some of these were acted upon in revised submissions in March and again between September and October.
- Comments have recently been made by civil society organizations, meeting in Bangui last week to review the R-PP, as they did in March. These joint statements and analyses (in one case extremely detailed) recently published by a number of NGOs (WRI, Global Witness and BIC).
- TAP reviewers feel that these additional comments provide a number of important insights which will prove helpful in improving the readiness process as it proceeds
- It remains the case that the TAP has judged the CAR proposal to have met two of the 12 standards, while the other 10 are largely met

Overall summary

	March 2011	September 2011	October 2011
Component 1a	Partially met	Largely met	Largely met
Component 1b	Partially met	Largely met	Largely met
Component 1c	Partially met	Largely met	Largely met
Component 2a	Largely met	Largely met	Met
Component 2b	Partially met	Partially met	Largely met
Component 2c	Largely met	Largely met	Largely met
Component 2d	Largely met	Largely met	Largely met
Component 3	Largely met	Largely met	Largely met
Component 4a	Largely met	Largely met	Largely met
Component 4b	Met	Met	Met
Component 5	Partially met	Partially met	Largely met
Component 6	Largely met	Largely met	Largely met