



FCPF Technical Advisory Panel

Uganda Draft RPP TAP Comments & Recommendations

March 24-25, 2011

FCPF Participants Committee
Da Lat, Vietnam

Stephen Cobb and
6 other TAP team members

Strengths of the Uganda RPP

- This is an **accessible, well-balanced and generally convincing proposal**, giving thorough attention to all components. It is on the way to meeting all the required standards
- TAP reviewers made numerous recommendations about the first draft of the document. The second draft of 4th March has **already acted on many of these**.
- The revised version describes not only a **good process of dialogue with two of the country's principal indigenous groups**, but also a coherent synthesis of their views about a future REDD-plus regime. There are good proposals on what should be done next (section 1b)
- This R-PP is accompanied by some excellent, data-rich Annexes, for example ones on Land-use, the Reference Scenario and the MRV approaches to be adopted.
- The initial version hid both data and analyses in these Annexes, but, after TAP comments, **the all-important section 2a, including the causes of D and D, is now a well-presented analysis**
- There is a thoughtful and **thorough M and E framework** (section 6)
- After interacting with the TAP, Uganda produced a new version in Track Changes, and an excellent table, matching edits to each TAP comment. **This approach is to be commended**.

Areas that need further work

- The TAP originally felt that the balance between the main text and the Annexes was not right: the main text did not do justice to the richness of data, analysis and proposed solutions, that were to be found in the Annexes. In the March 2011 revision, the authors had come a long way towards reacting to this, in a generally very satisfactory way.
- The naming, numbering and referencing of Annexes needs to be improved, and confusions removed in relation to Appendices
- The section on **benefit-sharing needs improving**, drawing on Uganda's rich experience in this domain
- It would be helpful to hold a **strategic planning event**, to get collective buy-in and sharpness to the work-plan proposals in component 2b
- More thought is needed about how to approach the **legal aspects of carbon ownership**, which in turn needs a clear expression of **how transparency problems will be dealt with**. **Better proposals for conflict resolution are still needed**
- **Components 3 and 4, in particular, need further work to respond to TAP and PC comments**. In particular, this involves extracting good information from the Annexes and working it into the main text. This work is acknowledged by Uganda, and is in hand

Major Recommendations

- Our principal recommendation, therefore, has been to **rearrange the balance between the Annexes and the main text** and to manage the component parts of the document as a whole, so that it is easier to navigate around it. As we have said, this is well under way, and when complete should deal with components 2c, 3 and 4
- The R-PP should try to give more reassurance that the **interdisciplinary nature of REDD-plus has really been discussed and taken on board at suitably high levels of Government (sections 1a and 2c)**. An explanation has been provided, which does not really answer the recommendation
- The **implementation framework** (section 2c) still needs to be more carefully thought out, to raise it to the level of the good thinking that has gone into component 1a
- In summary, the Uganda R-PP has made **enormous progress** in the last few weeks: it now meets four of the standards, and largely meets three others. There is work still to do on three of them, but these are all technical and editorial, and should therefore be straightforward. No fundamental changes to the process (such as consultations) are required. This is a very satisfactory state to be in.

Overall Summary

Overall Summary

January

March revision

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|
| Component | 1a | <i>Partially met</i> | <i>Largely meets the standard</i> |
| | 1b | <i>Partially met</i> | <i>Largely meets the standard</i> |
| Component | 2a | <i>Did not meet</i> | <i>Largely meets the standard</i> |
| | 2b | <i>Partially met</i> | <i>Meets the standard</i> |
| | 2c | <i>Did not meet</i> | <i>Does not yet meet</i> |
| | 2d | <i>Largely met</i> | <i>Meets the standard</i> |
| Component | 3 | <i>Did not meet</i> | <i>Does not yet meet</i> |
| Component | 4 | <i>Did not meet</i> | <i>Partially meets</i> |
| Component | 5 | <i>Partially met</i> | <i>Meets the standard</i> |
| Component | 6 | <i>Did not meet</i> | <i>Meets the standard</i> |