



# **Forest Carbon Partnership Facility**

**Introduction and presentation of ad hoc TAPs for  
PC17 R-PPs.**

**Review Process**

Lima, Peru

July 2-4, 2014



## Reviewed Five Countries

- Africa: Madagascar and Sudan
- Latin America: Belize, Paraguay and Uruguay



## Criteria to guide the selection...

1. The quality of the submitted R-PP, as informed by the TAP review;
2. The commitment of a Delivery Partner ....
3. The availability of sufficient resources...
4. Funding from non-FCPF sources and demonstrated level of commitment to REDD+...and other criteria...





## 5 R-PPs, 28 TAP experts, 4 TAP lead reviewers

- Eduardo Morales: Paraguay
- Harrison Kojwang: Sudan
- Tomas Schlichter: Belize and Uruguay
- Steve Cobb: Madagascar



## Process & TAP management

- Relied on precedent from previous TAPs,
- R-PP review guidelines as per Template Version 6,
- Experts recruitment process as per WB Procurement Policies started in February this year (28 consultants hired for 5 country teams),
- Countries submitted R-PPs by April 7, 2014 and resubmitted revised versions after TAP recommendations by June 9, 2014.
- Final TAP synthesis review (five countries) posted on the FCPF web on June 18,
- **TAP process has taken four months including contracting time,**
- **TAP review process has taken two months.**

# For quick analysis and chart production purposes:


- 1= Partially Met
- 2= Largely Met
- 3= Met



Standards rating by country	Belize	Madagascar	Paraguay	Sudan	Uruguay
1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
1b: Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
1c: Consultation and Participation Process	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
2a: Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met
2b: REDD+ Strategy Options	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met
2c: Implementation Framework	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
2d: Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met
3: Reference Level	Largely Met	Met	Met	Largely Met	Met
4a: Monitoring – Emissions and Removals	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met	Largely Met
4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
5: Budget	Met	Largely Met	Met	Met	Met
6: Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met




# R-PP Assessment Results from 11 Participant Committee Meetings




# R-PP Assessment Results from 11 Participant Committee Meetings

RPP PERFORMANCE BY COMPONENT





# R-PP Assessment Results from 11 Participant Committee Meetings





## Observations from this TAP process

- Countries responded back to TAP suggestions with much improved R-PP
- Government representatives took the TAP comments and use feedback very positively.
- In-country presence of existing funding and international consultants, tend to give countries significant advantage in meeting R-PP standards, but ownership needs to be assessed.
- Approaches to consultation processes have been improving over time.
- High level government support for national REDD+ programs, usually represented by inter-ministerial coordination committees is the norm in latest R-PPs.
- Institutional arrangements are generally well described and are linked to their eventual mitigation strategy options.



THANK YOU!

[www.forestcarbonpartnership.org](http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org)