

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

**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.

Review of R-PP of (fill in country name): Uganda

Reviewer (fill in): Abdul-Razak Saeed, Stephen Cobb and ~~Team~~^{five other} reviewers

Date of review (fill in): ~~31st January~~^{9th March} 2011

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto, Superscript

Formatted: Font color: Auto

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

The editorial team for this R-PP is to be congratulated for producing an accessible, well-balanced and generally convincing proposal, that is mainly a pleasure to read. For an informal proposal, it is well on the way to becoming an acceptable R-PP. TAP reviewers had a number of suggestions about how to rearrange the document to make it much more powerful. The second draft of 4th March has already acted on many of these (which were also discussed during the teleconference), which is a very positive sign.

The authors of every R-PP have to make a judgement about what to include in the main text and what to relegate to Annexes. This R-PP is accompanied by some excellent, data-rich Annexes, for example ones on Land-use and the Reference Scenario and MRV approaches to be adopted. It has to be assumed, however, that only a small number of readers will have the time to exploit the Annexes, and the reviewers feel that the balance between the main text and the Annexes is not quite right: the main text does not, in some of the most important areas, quite do justice to the richness of data, analysis and proposed solutions, that are to be found in the Annexes. The reviewers feel that the Uganda R-PP would be greatly strengthened if this balance were altered. In the March 2011 revision, the authors had come a long way towards reacting to this, in a generally very satisfactory way. By their own admission they have not completed the work on transferring information from Annexes to Components 3 and 4.

Confusingly, some are called Annexes and some Appendices, though the reason for this distinction is not obvious. References to Annexes in the text do not consistently match the numbering of the Annexes provided, making it on occasions hard to cross refer. One single PDF contains six of the Annexes, while there are 5 separate PDFs for Appendix 6 alone. There is no list of Annexes or Appendices in the main R-PP. This is all a pity, because the information is probably all there, but it is not yet organized in a way that encourages the reader to gain access to it. This work is partially complete.

As part of the dialogue between the R-PP team and the TAP (and the PC), Uganda has very helpfully produced a new version of the text in Track Changes, as well as an excellent table, which takes each TAP comment and recommendation in turn and specifies the remedial action taken in the main document. This meticulous approach is to be commended.

Our principal recommendation, therefore, is 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

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

have said, this is well under way.

Summary of attainment of standards (including the changes in status between the January and March submissions):

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements: *R-PP partially meets the standard (In March 2011, it now meets the standard)*

Standard 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation: *R-PP partially meets the standard (in March 2011, it now largely meets the standard)*

Standard 2.a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance: *R-PP does not yet meet the standard (In March 2011, it now largely meets the standard)*

Standard 2.b: REDD strategy Options: *R-PP partially meets the standard (In March 2011, it now meets the standard)*

Standard 2.c: REDD implementation framework: *R-PP does not yet meet the standard In March 2011, (No change)*

Standard 2.d: Assessment of social and environmental impacts: *R-PP largely meets the standard (In March 2011, it now meets the standard)*

Standard 3: Reference scenario: *R-PP does not currently meet the standard (In March 2011, no change)*

Standard 4: Design a monitoring system: *R-PP does not yet meet the standard (In March 2011, no change)*

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements: *R-PP partially meets the standard (In March 2011, it now meets the standard)*

Standard 6: Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework : *R-PP does not yet meet the standard (In March 2011, it now meets the standard)*

In summary, the Uganda R-PP has made enormous progress in the last few weeks: it now (March 9th) meets five of the standards, and largely meets two 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) or politics (such as the institutional arrangements) are required. This is a very satisfactory state to be in.

Formatted: Superscript

Component 1. Organize and Consult

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

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:

General observations

The section is clearly written and makes a good read..

A good number of studies have been carried out and these are a useful support in informing the R-PP and the National REDD+ strategy formulation.

The Component draws links between the R-PP and other policies and programmes (Forest Policy, National Forest Plan, National Development, Conservation Policies, Climate Change, Local Government) which is useful in giving a cross-sectoral overview.

The institutional set up looks well thought through and reflects the high priority accorded to REDD+ through the direct leadership of the National Policy Committee on the Environment, chaired by the Prime Minister. ~~However under this National Policy Committee, the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development, which is one important sector in REDD plus in Uganda is missing representation.~~ It will be important for this Committee not only to have been constituted, but to meet regularly.

We commend the inclusion of the Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development in the Steering Committee. It is hoped that, as a result, gender dimensions will also be duly considered in the R-PP process.

The R-PP is also commended for setting up a REDD+ national focal point that heads the national R-PP secretariat.

Recommendations

The organizational chart (Figure 2) for the coordination and implementation of a national REDD+ Programme provided should be edited to show clearly the relationships (e.g. reporting lines) between the National Policy Committee, National Steering Committee, Technical Committee, Task Forces etc. In addition, the diagram should also be more precise in mentioning the identity of each responsible institution. This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)

The current proposal has risks since other sectors may view REDD+ as emanating from its parent ministry, and not really concerning them. Although the Environment Policy Committee is supposed to overcome this sort of sectoral protectionism (common to most countries), the R-PP should try to give more reassurance that the interdisciplinary nature of REDD+ has really been discussed and taken on board at suitably high levels of Government. An explanation has been provided, which does not really answer the recommendation

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

The list (Annex 1) places the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development under Non-Governmental Organizations; this needs to be moved to the section headed government organizations. **This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)**

Section 1.5.3.1 describes institutional mandates during R-PP implementation, and emphasizes that the National REDD-Plus Focal Point will be a part of the Ministry of Water and Environment. Reviewers wonder whether the interdisciplinary nature of the tasks facing the Focal Point could not be strengthened in one way or another. **This recommendation has been largely dealt with (version of 04.03.11)**

R-PP 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 far³, 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)

³ 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).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

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 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.

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

General Observations

The revised version has demonstrated not only a good process of dialogue with two of the country's principal indigenous groups, the Benet of Mt Elgon and the Batwa pygmies of the western Rift Valley forests, but also a coherent synthesis of their views in relation to a future REDD+ regime and a well-considered set of proposals as to what should be done next. This is an excellent improvement (some of which was previously hidden in Annexes).

Although a reasonably good process of consultation was planned ~~Good representations of various stakeholders were consulted and carried out, and the results, by category of consultee, are presented in Table 8. By far the majority of consultees were forest-dependent people, though this figure is in part an artifact of the type of meeting that was held.~~, ~~though the~~The impression is given that, outside Kampala, there was rather uneven treatment of stakeholders at District level. On page 29, for example, the participation of different stakeholders consulted during R-PP preparation seems to have failed to reach the key local governments representatives, the District forest services and local opinion leaders who are crucial in decision making at community level. It is not clear how, if at all, their views have been taken into consideration during regional consultations

Consultation generally went beyond awareness creation into defining roles and responsibilities of stakeholders and that of clarifying a number of key issues such as the drivers of deforestation and degradation. However, regarding the dynamic nature of REDD-plus and its novelty to some participants at the workshops, the one-day workshop format is probably not adequate to allow the stakeholders to grasp the concept of the mechanism and develop concrete and credible thoughts and opinions around it.

The R-PP clearly recognizes the advantage that a continued stakeholder engagement will represent for addressing emerging issues and trends under REDD-plus.

~~Under the contents of the consultation workshops in the R-PP Annexes, it is apparent that discussions on forest policy, current forest management arrangements were absent.~~

In Table 1, the component budget (and all the other component budgets in the main text) there is no provision for activities to be carried out in 2011. In view of the timetable for approval by the PC, subsequent due diligence by the FCPF FMT and the World Bank, and contracting processes, this is probably realistic.

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Recommendations

The mention of "special groups" by the R-PP should explicitly define to which class of stakeholders this refers; the current term is too vague, especially since "forest dependent people" are mentioned separately. **This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)**

Some independent institutional set up should be devised to run a conflict resolution and grievance system throughout the REDD+ implementation. **This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)**

Given that REDD+ is a government led process in Uganda, it is positive that the R-PP recognizes that it is essential to inform the political and executive leadership about the requirements and process for Uganda's REDD readiness, including updates on progress. However, the exact mechanism (how and by whom) through which this would be done should be specified. **This recommendation has been dealt with, though rather cursorily (version of 04.03.11)**

A diagrammatic representation of the consultation and participation plan would be helpful in the R-PP to give an overview of the inter-relationship between the various steps of the process. **This recommendation has been dealt with, though the excellent diagram that has been provided has some layout problems that need to be dealt with (version of 04.03.11)**

There should be a clear process that shows how the feedback or issues arising from the consultations will be considered or taken on-board. Also, this section should clearly indicate how transparency and accountability will be ensured during awareness-building and consultations. **Although this recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11), it would be helpful to have greater detail on how to ensure transparency and accountability of the processes proposed.**

The relationship between REDD+ and CDM should be clarified since many people confuse them and don't know the difference. **The reponse to this is in preparation and will be included in the final version of the R-PP.**

Formatted: Font: Bold

R-PP partially-nearly 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:

General Observations

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Land-use, forest governance and the drivers of deforestation are given rather superficial, descriptive treatment in this 10-page section, whereas they are rather thoroughly covered in Appendix 2 and Annex 2A, totaling some 83 pages of well-researched analysis. This balance undersells the quality of the work that has gone into the preparation of this R-PP. This observation has been very well dealt with (version of 04.03.11)

The drivers of deforestation have been described, and for each driver a set of underlying causes have been described. This is later used in Component 2b to design strategy options.

Recognizes that the basic requirements (good governance) for a successful REDD+ is poor in the Ugandan forest sector, for a range of reasons including weak law enforcement.

The R-PP recognizes the need for Uganda to clarify the issue of 'carbon rights' as a factor which may be either an incentive or a hindrance to the participation of key stakeholders outside government in REDD+ Programmes.

There is an assessment of the various categories of land tenure in relation to the impact on deforestation and degradation which is a good way to focus on specific governance challenges with respect to the ownership regime in question.

Although the assessment of land use, forest policy and governance sets the stage for addressing Uganda's REDD strategy, the discussion is weak on past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

The R-PP duly recognizes the need for access to information by the public.

Finally, it is unsettling that there are no activities recorded under the section 2a given the myriad of governance problems, legal and policy work, etc that need to be examined for a successful REDD-plus implementation. It is not entirely clear that this is overcome in the subsequent Strategy Options section.

Recommendations

On Table 10, the year of promulgation of the laws should be provided and any significant amendments should also be mentioned. What are the provisions in these documents that allow the implementation of REDD+ if they are there? What needs to be improved or revised in them both to reflect and enable REDD+ to be successfully implemented? This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11). There is now a table of all the laws, with an accompanying text describing the shortcomings in the legal and policy environment.

The description of governance issues that will affect the success of any REDD+ programme is 'woolly'. To enable the design of remedial actions they should be more explicitly stated and not just stated as information requirements (GIS maps, tender allocations etc). This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11), in the form of a well-structured analysis of governance issues.

The R-PP needs to show the exact changes between land use types since currently it only indicates

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

the percentage change and annual change but not in absolute terms of hectares from the 1990-2005 period (Table 8, pg 37). In other words, another column is needed. [This recommendation has been dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\)](#)

While the information is already there, there should be an explicit recognition of direct and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation. [This recommendation has been very well dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\); there is now a thorough and well presented analysis of the causes of D and D, presented with considerable honesty, which will be helpful in developing appropriate policies to address those causes.](#)

Recognition of wetlands as carbon repositories should be highlighted, given that Uganda has significant amounts of land cover under wetlands, relative to other East African Countries. [This recommendation has been dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\). There is a well-researched paragraph on the role of wetlands in carbon sequestration, and the implications in Uganda.](#)

Given the earlier comment in the R-PP on increasing demand for fuel wood and also charcoal burning as major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, it is prudent that "key policies and laws relevant to REDD-Plus" as tabled on p. 41 include those of energy in Uganda. Unsustainable cutting of trees for firewood (p. 45) - unless biomass energy is substituted with alternative energy sources, deforestation and forest degradation is going to continue unabated in Uganda. The root cause of the problem of deforestation is not just unsustainable harvesting of trees for firewood, but the link with the impact of other extra sectoral policies. This underlines the need for cross-sectoral policy coordination, at the level of the Environment Policy Committee and above. This should be stressed. [This recommendation has been dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\), in the thorough treatment of D+D which now exists. The issue of cross-sectoral policy coordination is perhaps still left hanging.](#)

The R-PP mentions a meeting of experts convened in Kampala in June 2010 to look at concerns of forest governance. The R-PP should draw more explicitly on their conclusions, as well as including the list of these experts and their organizations, either in the main contents or in an Annex. [This recommendation has been dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\)](#)

The R-PP should mention the incidence of benefit sharing regimes that are already existent in the forest and natural resources sector and analyse the current situation with respect to REDD+. Uganda has longer experience than most African countries in benefit-sharing (around Bwindi-Mgahinga National Park, for example, where benefit-sharing of gorilla-tourism revenues has a 20-year pedigree), yet the reviewers did not find this experience being exploited in the text. This could usefully be remedied. [This recommendation has been partially dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\), though the section that does this is rather light, not really doing justice to all the work and experience that has been built up in this domain over the years in Uganda.](#)

The R-PP should envisage the possibility of future conflicts and the measures to address such conflicts when they arise. It should mention existing conflict resolution structures and systems that are used in the Ugandan forest sector, with an assessment of their success, if possible. [This](#)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)

The statement, "Local communities can designate a forest area as a community wildlife area (CWA) under local governments", needs further elaboration. Whether this is under the Local Government Act or the Wildlife Act more details, with success stories that community forests have been given such agreements, would greatly enhance the text. This recommendation has been partially dealt with (version of 04.03.11), the text giving a rather pessimistic view of experience so far in Uganda.

The mention of concentration of people in internally displaced camps is a misleading point. This point should be rephrased, since the camps are no longer there. The last camp in northern Uganda was demolished in 2009. This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)

All the points above would improve the R-PP, elevating it towards meeting the Standard. But perhaps the overarching editorial task that would enable it to do so, is the general observation already made, about needing to alter the balance of facts and evidence that currently exists between the main text and the Annexes and Appendices. When this is done, there is no doubt that the material has already been gathered, though not yet adequately presented, to enable this Component to meet the Standard. This recommendation has been extremely well dealt with (version of 04.03.11), transforming the authority and readability of the text.

R-PP ~~does not yet largely 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:

General Observations

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

The objectives of the sub-component are well articulated at the outset.

This is a commendable attempt to describe programmes / actions that could counteract the identified drivers. The linkage between 2a and 2b is generally well described, as is that between 2b and 1a. However these initial interventions (Table 12) mentioned are too broad and rather too random and need to be further broken down into "how" they would be carried out, and how they would respond to the strategic options.

The lists subsequently identified in this section are much more detailed than the drivers mentioned in Component 2a. The added issues in the "drivers" column do not make a logical flow as drivers of deforestation, such as "dependent People", "undefined modalities for stakeholder engagement", etc. The language and logic of this needs to be much more carefully controlled; this could be an editorial matter, but it would be far better if this Table (12) were actually submitted to the scrutiny of a formal project planning session (a logical or results framework exercise). Boxes in the Table appear to have been filled rather at random (with and without ticks, which add nothing to the meaning), and do not create a logical, strategic flow.

Socio-economic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD strategy has not been discussed.

Recommendations

In section 2.8 Objective 1, it should be stated that the R-PP will deal with both direct and underlying drivers of D&D. [This recommendation has been dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\)](#)

In Table 12 on REDD+ Strategy Options, some of the issues under agricultural encroachment have been left out. These have to do with e.g. the commercialization and pricing policies of the government which require some counter-active options. [This recommendation has been dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\)](#)

The principal recommendation, however, is to create a small event that will enable a mixed group of people to take the contents of Table 12 and turn it from the present rather random list to a carefully phrased strategic planning framework, that could become the basis of an operational plan. [This recommendation has been only partially dealt with \(version of 04.03.11\). A great deal of careful editorial thought has gone into elevating the quality of the Table in question, but the process of taking this forward, as a collective strategic planning exercise has been hidden behind the general work programme of the task force. It is enough that we have flagged its importance at this juncture, though, and it should not be a sticking point.](#)

R-PP 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.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

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:

General Observations

The sub-component is still in a very early stage of development and as such still needs more work. The R-PP needs to develop and elaborate on the institutional arrangements for REDD-Plus from policy, through consultations to technical aspects of carbon accounting and benefits sharing. There are numerous studies being proposed but there is a need to learn from existing forest and REDD+ related initiatives.

The legal aspects of the implementation need also to be addressed, covering issues of ownership, tenure and future rights to carbon revenues.

Recommendations

It would be helpful to have definitions and descriptions of institutional mandates in a national REDD+ context including a suggested mechanism for inter-sector coordination. While the outline of this is presented in Component 1a, this Component is seeking clarification on the operational aspects of this. This recommendation has been partially dealt with (version of 04.03.11), though not enough detail is given. A great deal of additional thought has been given to institutional matters in component 1a, and this still needs to be matched with thinking about making the institutional framework operational.

The legal framework which has already been mentioned in the previous sub-component, needs to be described here, including clarity on carbon rights as a major issue. This recommendation has been given some thought (version of 04.03.11), but not in sufficient detail to be reassuring.

There is a need for a national Carbon Registry and a Registry of all REDD+ projects for purposes of transparency in accounting and as an information sharing platform; this needs a description here, too. This recommendation is said to have been dealt with (version of 04.03.11) in Section 2.14, though the TAP reviewers feel that it still needs further work.

Finally, it would be helpful to describe a system and body for conflict resolution This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)

R-PP does not yet meet 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

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

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:

General Observations

This sub-component shows that a thorough think-through has been carried out by the Uganda team on their country situational settings and how the World Bank SESA principles apply in the Ugandan context. It also shows a familiarity with the World Bank's Safeguard Policies.

Due diligence is expressed to be exercised in formulating the ESMF as the preliminary draft would be based on an assessment of impacts from selected pilot sites. The R-PP mentions the proposal to use a participatory approach that involves vulnerable groups and studies.

Appendix 3, 2d provides background information on SESA. The budget there in Table 5 refers to the years 2011, 2012, 2013; the same budget in the main document in Table 16 refers to the same budget, but for 2012, 2013 and 2014.

The Action Plan for the development of an ESMF, introduced to the text in the March version, is clear and well presented.

Recommendations

Uganda would be well advised to also refer to its own policies and laws that are consistent with the requirements for the assessments already described under this sub-component. ***This recommendation has been dealt with (version of 04.03.11)***

R-PP 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.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

- 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:

General Observations/objectives

This component is still relatively under-developed in the main text but there is evidence of a broad understanding of the key issues or elements of this component.

The R-PP identified the capacity needs and existing complementary strengths of specific institutions.

The R-PP mentions the means of building capacity of government agencies as well as research institutions by fostering close collaboration with NGOs, but it fails to mention how and what aspects of such collaboration would strengthen capacity of government agencies and research institutions.

Section 3. "The Future" working group will invite individuals from relevant government agencies and NGOs. The actual composition of this group will be determined by the planning agency for REDD+ (NFA) and the current REDD+ Working Group. This statement is inconsistent with the role of FSSD.

Recommendations

There are many shortcomings in this Component, which include the following, all of which need to be addressed:

- *Clearly state the steps needed to generate reference emissions level and reference levels*
- *Clear definitions on what is meant by activity and emission factors*
- *Data requirements and the adequacy (or lack) of data should be explained*
- *The implications of Uganda's choice of forest definitions on the estimation of reference scenarios should be stated*
- *How and whether the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation will be factored into the development of reference scenarios should be explained*

- An assessment of available and required skills to perform the exercise is necessary
- Show / describe existing data that could be used in the process
- R-PP sub-component should directly involve academic and/or research institutions in the analysis.

All of these would be dealt with by following the general advice given in the overview, which is to alter the balance of fact and detail that currently exists between the Main text and the Annexes.

Substantial additional information has been brought into the text of the March 2011 version of the R-PP from the Annexes, which partly responds to some of the comments above. However, in their point by point response to the Recommendations, the Uganda team states that they are still working on this, so we may expect that all the bullet points above will have been attended to in the next version. Meanwhile, it is to be noted that the responses in the point by point table for Component 3 are to comments made by the PC, not by the TAP (all good comments; but not the TAP's own).

R-PP does not currently meet 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.

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Bold

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

General observations

The component recognizes the capacity requirements that would enable the accurate data collection and archiving for reference but it seems too general and does not give a summarized clear sense of how the MRV system is or will be operating – it needs a clear statement on what will and should be done In the point by point table of responses of 04.03.11, it is stated that a response to this comment is being prepared for the next version of the R-PP.

The sub-component recognizes the need to use ground truthing with remote sensing processes.

The SWOT analysis provided in the annex is useful, because it will help in the development of a work plan.

The Table Budget for designing a monitoring system on p.19 in Appendix 4 (sum US\$ 600.000) is different from the same Table 18 in main text, p.74/75. Done

Nothing has been said in Appendix 4 on monitoring changes in rural livelihoods, assessing the impacts of the REDD strategy or policy changes in general on the forest cover. In the point by point table of responses of 04.03.11, it is stated that a response to this comment is being prepared for the next version of the R-PP. It would probably be consistent if this were put in the main text, not consigned to an Annexe.

Recommendations

As with Component 3, there are many shortcomings in this Component, which include the following, all of which need to be addressed:

- The R-PP should specify how the data collected would be made available to the general public and how transparency will be built into the system? In the point by point table of responses of 04.03.11, it is stated that a response to this comment is being prepared for the next version of the R-PP.
- R-PP mentions on p.17 in Appendix 4, the introduction of cost recovery mechanisms to run the M&E system. The R-PP should elaborate how this would be done. In the point by point table of responses of 04.03.11, it is stated that a response to this comment is being prepared for the next version of the R-PP.
- Describe a stepwise process for building an MRV system In the point by point table of responses of 04.03.11, it is stated that a response to this comment is being prepared for the next version of the R-PP.
- Describe current capacity as the basis for a capacity building programme. This has been done
- Identify and propose institutions that could be earmarked for monitoring and verifications purposes. In the point by point table of responses of 04.03.11, it is stated that a response to this comment is being prepared for the next version of the R-PP.

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

- State whether and which drivers will also be monitored besides the key carbon variables
- Refer to Tanzania's R-PP on the involvement of communities in carbon measurements / monitoring No response has been offered: this should not be overlooked in the next version of the R-PP
- Suggest a tentative national sampling system – refer to current experiences. No response has been offered: this should not be overlooked in the next version of the R-PP
- Biodiversity has been mentioned but other ecosystems services such as water and soil conservation should be included, particularly along Uganda's water courses, mountain catchments and wetlands. No response has been offered: this should not be overlooked in the next version of the R-PP
- The social impacts monitoring including livelihoods is greatly absent in this sub-component and needs to be included in the monitoring framework together with monitoring the drivers of deforestation and degradation identified earlier in the R-PP. No response has been offered: this should not be overlooked in the next version of the R-PP

All of these would be dealt with by following the general advice given in the overview, which is to alter the balance of fact and detail that currently exists between the Main text and the Annexes, notably Appendix 4.

R-PP does not yet meet 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:

General Observations

The boxes for the potential donor funders are empty under the total figure column, that is, there are gaps in funding sources.

Recommendations

Revise the figure for designing a monitoring plan in component 4, table 18, as on p.75, it is US\$

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

1.230.000, whereas the figure for the same item in the overview table is US\$ 1.260.000.

~~The overview budget should contain a column for activities in 2011 with estimated costs.~~

It could describe the timing of major budgetary allocations linked to achievement of objectives

The R-PP should also state the full value of the figures (e.g. Estimated Cost (US\$)'00).

This part of the R-PP has responded to all the comments made. It should be noted that Uganda has transposed (with some logic, it has to be said) Components 5 and 6.

Formatted: Font: Bold

R-PP ~~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:

General Observations

The component has been described well, including stating the objectives that an M&E strategy will seek to achieve

A very complete M and E framework has been added, with what seem on the face of it to be appropriate indicators. This has transformed this Component in the March 2011 version.

There is no budget accompanying this component.

Recommendations

R-PP should include a budget for designing and maintaining the M&E framework.

It needs to include the indicators that would be used to monitor the program progress and performance.

It would be useful to have a short discussion of the M&E applications in current and past national level programmes in Uganda

R-PP should include the development of a framework for the collection of vital information to be monitored

The Framework should be used to not only measure output, but also impact.

Financial Management Indicators should be part of such a monitoring framework

Section 5.3 Reporting and accountability mechanisms should apply to all concerned actors, not only the lead ministry. Because failure to report and account to stakeholders in many cases have led to mistrust and suspicion that have ended up affecting the implementation of the programmes.

All seven of these points have been appropriately dealt with, and therefore need no further

TAP Synthesis review of revised Uganda R-PP submission, 9th March 2011
Program Document FMT 2009-1 R-PP Review Template, Rev. 5 (January 2011)

attention, in our view.

~~R-PP does not yet meet~~ s ~~the~~ standard

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS, Superscript

Formatted: Font: Trebuchet MS

Formatted: Font: Bold