

UGANDA

*(R-PP dated May 2011)***GOVERNANCE OF REDD+***To what extent does the R-PP promote good governance within REDD+ systems and processes?***Stakeholder Participation in REDD+ planning and Implementation**

- + *Identifies relevant stakeholders for REDD+*
- + *Specifically considers how to engage local stakeholders*
- Proposes a transparent process for stakeholder participation*
- Proposes a process to ensure accountability for stakeholder input*
- + *Proposes a grievance / dispute resolution mechanism*
- *Considers how to learn and build from other relevant participatory processes*

The R-PP suggests that preliminary efforts to raise awareness about REDD+ and solicit views from stakeholders have been quite extensive, particularly with respect to reaching forest dependent people. To achieve these “expanded” consultations, additional resources and support were provided by the Norwegian Government and several NGOs (p. 36). The R-PP summarizes key outcomes from the consultations and identifies seven categories of stakeholders that were directly consulted: ministries, development partners, NGOs, the private sector, forest dependent people, academia, and research institutions (p. 39).

With respect to future stakeholder engagement, the R-PP describes key objectives and desired outputs from the Consultations and Outreach Plan (REDD-C&P) and Awareness and Communication Strategy (RACS) that will be developed during R-PP implementation (p. 43-47). It further states that the National Technical Committee and REDD+ Steering Committee will ultimately be responsible for incorporating stakeholder feedback into REDD+ strategy options (p. 47). However, the R-PP does not identify any specific strategies or approaches that could be used to achieve stated objectives and outputs. As a result, the R-PP’s commitment to transparency and accountability at this stage remains fairly general.

The R-PP’s discussion of conflict resolution and grievance mechanisms is relatively thorough. It anticipates potential conflicts that may arise under REDD+ (i.e., at field, institutional, and policy levels), describes existing grievance mechanisms relating to natural resource management, and discusses potential additional mechanisms for REDD+ (p. 48-49). Furthermore, it provides a schedule and budget for developing a “Conflicts and Grievances Management Strategy” to identify and mitigate potential conflicts and build capacities for conflict resolution (p. 49). The Strategy will be linked to the SESA.

Recommendations:

- Identify past/existing stakeholder processes in Uganda that provide relevant lessons or that could be leveraged for proposed REDD+ consultations
- Begin identifying specific strategies/approaches for ensuring transparency and accountability in the consultation process

Government coordination in REDD+ planning and implementation

- Considers REDD+ in the context of other sector policies, land use plans, and national development plans*
- + *Proposes mechanisms to coordinate REDD+ across sectors*
- Proposes mechanisms to coordinate REDD+ across levels of government*

The R-PP repeatedly emphasizes the importance of integrating REDD+ strategies across sectors and promoting institutional coordination. It assigns specific responsibilities for coordination to various institutions. The National Policy Committee on the Environment, which is housed in the Prime Minister’s office, is tasked with high-level policy harmonization for REDD+ (p. 22). In addition, the REDD-Plus Steering Committee is tasked with resolving conflicts between institutions (p. 18). Both of these bodies have multi-sector representation. At this stage the R-PP does not identify any specific sector policies that may be a barrier to REDD+, even though agricultural expansion and energy demand are generally identified as important drivers of deforestation (p. 63, 65, 70).

The R-PP identifies district level government as important actors in REDD+ due to Uganda’s decentralized system of forest management (p. 21). According to the R-PP, preliminary consultations with district political and technical leadership have already been carried out, but it is not clear from the R-PP what type of role district actors will play in REDD+ moving forward. Currently, there is one district government representative on the REDD+ Steering Committee. Although the R-PP states that “Districts were represented in the REDD-Plus Working Group” (p. 21), it is not clear from the provided list of participants (p. 162-163) who the

- + – The R-PP or NPD has, in our view, discussed the issue in some detail and/or has provided a process for further investigation of the issue.
- The R-PP or NPD has mentioned the issue but not discussed it in detail and has not provided concrete next steps.
- – The issue has not been identified or discussed in the R-PP or NPD.

UGANDA

(R-PP dated May 2011)

representatives were.

Recommendation:

- Discuss the relationship between key sector policies in agriculture and energy, and proposed REDD+ strategies
- Discuss the role for district actors in R-PP and REDD+ strategy implementation, and how they will be engaged

Transparent and accountable REDD+ revenue management & benefit sharing

Proposes a transparent system to track and coordinate international financing of activities related to REDD+

Considers measures to promote fiscal transparency and accountability for REDD+ revenue management

Proposes a participatory process to develop systems for REDD+ revenue distribution, including benefit-sharing mechanisms

Reviews lessons from past and/or existing systems for managing and distributing forest revenues

The R-PP's consideration of issues relating to REDD+ revenue management is preliminary at this stage; however, several studies and next steps are proposed to investigate options for fund management and financial incentives delivery (p. 99). The R-PP states that the Ministry of Water and Environment will have the mandate to receive, manage, and account for REDD+ investments from international sources (p. 97). The R-PP also describes, in very general terms, a commitment to transparency and accountability for REDD+ investments. For example, it states that transparency and accountability will be promoted through the application of "REDD-Plus Guidelines and Standards" (which are not further described in the R-PP), oversight from the REDD-Plus Steering Committee, and "systems for regular reporting, communication and participatory planning" (p. 97-98). Specific tools, such as the use of independent audits, are not mentioned.

The R-PP's consideration of how REDD+ revenues and other benefits will be shared is also very limited at this stage. The R-PP mentions at several points that existing benefit sharing mechanisms in forest management have been inadequate (p. 70, 80), but does not elaborate reasons for this. It further states that a benefit sharing mechanism for REDD+ must be developed to provide a "sufficient incentive to all stakeholders" (p. 76), and it proposes a study to review existing benefit sharing arrangements and potential options for REDD+ (p. 85).

Recommendations:

- Discuss current practices of the Ministry of Water and Environment regarding financial transparency and accountability
- Provide additional detail on potential benefits and beneficiaries anticipated under REDD+, and describe how potential benefit sharing options will be developed and considered in consultation with relevant stakeholders

Transparent monitoring and oversight of REDD+

Proposes to establish information management systems for REDD+ that guarantee public access to information

Proposes mechanisms for independent oversight of the implementation of REDD+ activities

Proposes mechanisms to monitor efforts to address governance challenges

The R-PP proposes to create a comprehensive monitoring system and information database on deforestation, forest governance and new funding mechanisms (p. 20). In particular, it proposes to develop a system that tracks "key governance issues pertinent to implementation," although it does not elaborate on which aspects of governance might be relevant in this context (p. 132). As the National REDD+ National Focal Point, the Forest Sector Support Department (FSSD) will be responsible for monitoring R-PP implementation. However, the R-PP does not identify a monitoring or oversight mechanism that will be independent from the agencies responsible for R-PP implementation.

The R-PP notes the need for transparency and public disclosure of information (p. 73), and states that a REDD+ monitoring system should enable and encourage other research organizations to use the information (p. 126). However, it does not describe in practical terms how public access to information will be promoted through specific measures or mechanisms.

Recommendations:

- Consider developing monitoring and oversight mechanisms that are independent from REDD+ implementation
- Elaborate on the specific governance issues that will be relevant for REDD+ implementation

GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES FOR ADDRESSING DEFORESTATION DRIVERS

To what extent does the R-PP consider key forest governance challenges for achieving REDD+?

Land and forest tenure

- (+) – The R-PP or NPD has, in our view, discussed the issue in some detail and/or has provided a process for further investigation of the issue.
- (-) – The R-PP or NPD has mentioned the issue but not discussed it in detail and has not provided concrete next steps.
- (-) – The issue has not been identified or discussed in the R-PP or NPD.

UGANDA

(R-PP dated May 2011)

+ *Discusses the situation regarding land and forest tenure, including for indigenous peoples*

- *Considers the capacity of judicial and non-judicial systems to resolve conflicts and uphold the rights of citizens*

+ *Links identified governance challenges to proposed REDD+ strategy options and implementation framework*

The R-PP provides useful detail on the various categories of land tenure in Uganda, and their implications for deforestation and degradation. However, the R-PP does not provide a clear picture of how secure land tenure is in practice, especially for forest dependent communities. For example, it mentions that significant areas of land are under customary tenure; however, this land is “generally not officially surveyed or registered” (p. 54). Similarly, the R-PP states that community forests can be owned by Communal Land Associations (CLA), but few community groups have managed to complete the CLA application process and none have been endorsed by the minister (p. 58). Finally, the R-PP frequently references the existence of conflicts over forest resources (e.g., p. 14, 42, 58, 70), but does not describe the capacity or effectiveness of existing dispute resolution and recourse mechanisms, such as the land tribunals and judicial system (p. 48).

The R-PP does not elaborate on the origins or implications of these challenges. Further, it is not yet clear whether the proposed REDD+ strategy options relating to tenure (i.e. to clarify property rights to land and trees and to assess forest and carbon rights of forest dependent people) will seek to address them (p. 87-88). The R-PP does make brief reference to the current process to develop a new Land Policy (p42 and Appendix 2, p. 17), which may have bearing on these issues, but more detail is needed to understand the potential implications.

Recommendations:

- Elaborate on the Land Policy drafting process, including changes to existing tenure arrangements and potential implications for implementation of REDD+ strategies
- Provide detail on the capacity and effectiveness of existing dispute resolution and recourse mechanisms
- Consider additional REDD+ strategy options to address issues such as low levels of registration of customary lands and community forests.

Forest Management

+ *Discusses the ability of forest agencies to plan and implement forest management activities*

+ *Considers the role of non-government stakeholders, including communities, in forest management*

+ *Links identified governance challenges to proposed REDD+ strategy options and implementation framework*

The R-PP provides a relatively thorough discussion of the current forest management situation in Uganda. Table 20 (p. 77) outlines the mandates and roles of various national and local institutions, including communities, in forest management. The R-PP also describes several key implementation challenges, such as poor record-keeping for timber permits, lack of national standards for timber harvesting and processing, and inadequate access to information (p. 77). As a result, only 12 of 506 forest reserves have management plans, most of which are still not implemented (p. 69). Similarly, efforts to implement community forest management systems have also been slow due to time consuming negotiation processes, inadequate benefit sharing provisions, and high operational costs (p. 80).

The proposed REDD+ strategy options to address these challenges include interventions such as improving forest management planning/zoning, strengthening timber tracking systems, assessing options for increased private sector engagement in forest management, and assessing options to improve existing community forest management programs (p. 87-89). Moving forward with R-PP implementation, these options will need to be elaborated into more specific strategies to address the barriers to implementation that have stymied past efforts to strengthen forest management systems.

Recommendation:

- Propose additional studies or activities to address capacity constraints for both government and community actors involved in forest management

Forest Law Enforcement

+ *Discusses the ability of law enforcement bodies to effectively enforce forest laws*

+ *Discusses efforts to combat corruption*

+ *Links identified governance challenges to proposed REDD+ strategy options and implementation framework*

The R-PP identifies illegal encroachment and timber harvesting as key challenges in the forest sector, and states that weak law

(+) – The R-PP or NPD has, in our view, discussed the issue in some detail and/or has provided a process for further investigation of the issue.

(+) – The R-PP or NPD has mentioned the issue but not discussed it in detail and has not provided concrete next steps.

(-) – The issue has not been identified or discussed in the R-PP or NPD.

UGANDA

(R-PP dated May 2011)

enforcement – characterized by lack of capacity and coordination – was a major barrier to the implementation of the 2002 National Forest Plan (p. 82). The R-PP also describes ongoing efforts to improve law enforcement, including the recent creation of a Green Police unit (p. 66, 70), although few additional details are provided. Corruption is briefly cited as contributing to these challenges, but the R-PP does not elaborate on the nature of corruption in the forest sector (p. 69).

The R-PP proposes additional studies to identify solutions to current law enforcement challenges and to develop methods to curb corruption (p. 76). It also identifies several institutions that should collaborate on these efforts – the Forest Sector Support Department, the Regional Environment Support Units, and the newly formed Green Police. However, at this stage the proposed REDD+ strategy options relating to law enforcement are very general and vague, i.e. “strengthen law enforcement capacities and measures” (p. 87, 90).

Recommendations:

- Provide additional discussion of corruption challenges in the forest sector
- Elaborate on REDD+ strategy options to strengthen law enforcement

Other Forest Governance Issues Relevant for REDD+

+ *Discusses other forest governance issues that are relevant for REDD+*

+ *Links identified governance challenges to proposed REDD+ strategy and implementation framework*

The R-PP discusses efforts to address forest governance issues such as increasing community and citizen participation in environmental decision-making and natural resource management (p. 79). General weaknesses in policy implementation, law enforcement and “mismanagement of institutional mandates” are noted (p. 74), as well as the fact that decentralization policies in the 1990s occurred without sufficient capacity-building for local authorities (p. 79). The R-PP includes a terms of reference for “Strengthening National Capacity and Readiness for REDD-Plus” that outlines a range of governance issues to be addressed, including a capacity needs assessment (p. 164).

Recommendation:

- Provide additional detail in the capacity building terms of reference for how identified local capacity constraints will be targeted and addressed

(+) – The R-PP or NPD has, in our view, discussed the issue in some detail and/or has provided a process for further investigation of the issue.

(+) – The R-PP or NPD has mentioned the issue but not discussed it in detail and has not provided concrete next steps.

(-) – The issue has not been identified or discussed in the R-PP or NPD.