



FCPF Technical Advisory Panel

Uganda Formal RPP TAP Comments & Recommendations



**June 20-22, 2011
FCPF Participants Committee
Oslo, Norway**

**Stephen Cobb, Harrison Kojwang and
other TAP team members**

Strengths of the Uganda RPP (1)

- **This is an accessible, well-balanced and generally convincing proposal, giving thorough attention to all components. It was already well advanced at the 8th PC meeting in Vietnam**
- **TAP reviewers made numerous comments and recommendations about three successive drafts of the document.**
- **The final version describes not only a reasonable 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. The consultation process could no doubt be strengthened and enlarged in scope. 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.**

Strengths of the Uganda RPP (2)

- **The initial version hid both data and analyses in 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)**
- **Throughout the interactions, the Uganda team has been at pains to show how they have responded, in detail, to each of the TAP's comments. This has been very helpful**
- **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. This has now been resolved.**
- **Uganda has responded well to the TAP's numerous previous recommendations (concerning all components), which have, in the main, either been followed or, in some cases, errors of understanding on the part of TAP reviewers have been carefully pointed out**

Areas that could still be improved

- **More thought is still 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**
- **Component 1c would benefit from a properly thought Consultation Plan**
- **There are signs that forest governance is more of a problem than the TAP had originally been aware of, and it would be reassuring for the authors to return to sections 1a and 2a to say more about this**
- **Components 3 and 4 have been greatly improved, with better and more convincing methodology, though before Uganda moves to implementation much attention will need to be given to detailed work planning and assignment of responsibilities**

Major Recommendations

- **The R-PP should still 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).**
- **This explains the fact that the implementation framework remains the one area where the TAP felt that Uganda still did not meet the standard required.**
- **A consultation plan would be a reassuring addition**
- **It is probable that Uganda will want to take the opportunity to strengthen its sections on forest governance and transparency in all arrangements, particularly financial. Although the TAP had earlier passed the R-PP on these counts, it might be helpful for Uganda to improve on these at this stage**
- **In summary, the Uganda R-PP has improved enormously through the iterations since the informal presentation and the TAP reviewers feel that it is very close to being of adequate standard throughout**

Overall Summary

Overall Summary of the attainment of Standards			
	January	March revision	May revision
Component 1a	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Largely meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
1b	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Largely meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
Component 2a	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Largely meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
2b	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
2c	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Does not yet meet</i>	<i>Partially meets the standard</i>
2d	<i>Largely met</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
Component 3	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Does not yet meet</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
Component 4 (4a in May)	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Partially meets</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
4b	<i>Not separately assessed</i>		<i>Meets the Standard</i>
Component 5	<i>Partially met</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>
Component 6	<i>Did not meet</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>	<i>Meets the standard</i>