



# PC Review

## **UGANDA's R-PP**

Canada, Nepal and AFD (lead)

PC9, Oslo, June 2011



# GENERAL COMMENTS

- Major improvements since PC8 (e.g. SESA, evaluation framework, consultations)
- 3 PC reviews : February 2011 (before draft PC8 presentation), May & June 2011.

- Most of the critical information is now provided in the body text.

Overall the document is now very long :

- body text > 150 p.,
  - annexes > 50 p.,
  - appendixes > 200 p. (separate studies on each of the components of the R-PP commissioned to private organizations : NGOs, advisory companies, consultants)
- Careful responses from Uganda to each of the May PC review comments.
  - After considering Uganda's argumentation and some additional information that was provided, the June PC review assesses :

***All the standards, but Std 2c, are met, subject to minor changes***

# ASSESSMENT OF STANDARDS

**C1a: Standard is met\***, (May: idem, February : standard partially met)

**C1b: Standard is met** (May: Standard met, February: standard not met)

**C1c: Standard is met**

**C2a: Standard is met\***, (May: idem, February : standard partially met)

**C2b: Standard is met\***, (May: Standard partially met, February : idem)

**C2c: Standard is partially met** (May: Standard not met, February: idem)

**C2d: Standard is met** (May: Standard met\*, February: Standard not met)

**C3 : Standard is met** (May: Standard partially met, February : standard not met).

**C4a: Standard is met\***, (May: idem, February : standard partially met)

**C4b: standard is met\***, (May : Standard partially met, February : standard not met).

**C5 : Standard is met\***, (May: Standard partially met).

**C6 : Standard is met** (May: Standard met\*)

**\* = subject to the consideration of a still pending comment**

# STRENGTHS

1. Valuable references to the R-PP guidelines, in particular for the terms of reference;
2. Utilizes comprehensive studies carried out for each component
3. SESA component has significantly improved. Comprehensive action plan;
4. Extensive consultations;
5. Good comparison between deforestation and land tenure/management-modes (C2a);
6. Complete set of M&E indicators for RPP implementation (C6)

# AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

## PENDING ISSUES

1. Few preliminary analyses (i.e.: gap analyses) as demonstrated in C2a, C2b, C3, C4b
  - But activities planned to be done during the implementation phase.
2. Component 2c needs further refining. Not well defined:
  - Key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation
  - Potential arrangements to address these key issues
3. Comments for clarification:
  - **C1a: the Steering Committee created in June 2010** will adopt its own rules of procedure. **Why have these rules not already been produced?**
  - **C2a/2b: If built-up area is a major driver, R-PP provides insufficient information regarding future analytical work (C2a) and development of strategic options (C2b) to address this driver**
  - **C5: Similar budgets and equivalent activities for C4a and for C4b. Why?**  
*“Development of monitoring plan: Develop set of indicators and measurement methodologies for monitoring of ecological and social co-benefits”, which is still planned for a budget of 100 000 \$ under this component 4a whereas it is related to component 4b.*