



Forest Carbon Partnership Facility

Nicaragua's RPP PC Review

PC Reviewers: Canada, Germany, Mexico, Switzerland

Santa Marta, Colombia

June 27-29, 2012

General Comments

- 2 PC reviews: June 2011 (PC 9, informal) and June 2012
- Current version has significantly improved from informal presentation at PC9. Last version addresses the concerns previously raised by the PC.
- Continue ensuring the participation of Civil Society during the implementation of the R-PP , especially IPs and local communities
- Clarify potential (additional) funding sources for the proposed activities.
- Progress towards meeting the standard:
 - 10 standards are met(1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3, 4a, 4b).
 - 2 standards are still partially met(5 and 6)

Strengths

- Well summarizes the institutional arrangements and mechanisms
- A lot of energy has been invested in early dialogue and awareness raising, including with Indigenous Peoples leaders, and early feedback seems to have been well integrated into the RPP formulation.
- The RPP notes the importance of giving emphasis to the need to consult with Indigenous Peoples and recognizes their right to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent.
- The analysis of livestock expansion as a driver of deforestation has been included.
- This RPP now presents information about land ownership and carbon rights and benefits, and the way they will be monitored.

Selected recommendations

- Additional outreach still needs to be done especially with the municipalities and private sector, and continued with stakeholders at the local level. (1b)
- Explain how the monitoring system for carbon, benefits and cobenefits proposed in this section relates to the monitoring system presented in component 4 (including budget items referring to the set-up of a monitoring system and respective workshops in table 29 (p. 120)) (2c)
- We highly recommend that the budget adequately reflects all the capacity building plans and outreach requirements. (3)
- In order to guarantee financial sustainability, it should be important to mention if a contribution of the national budget is expected, or mention if all the activities proposed will depend only on external funding. (5)
- The matrix presented should be revised because components 1c and 4b are not delineated in the Monitoring and Evaluation plan (p.175 and 182), and component 2b is incomplete and don't seem to fit with what is presented in the revised text. (6)



THANK YOU!

www.forestcarbonpartnership.org