



## **TAP's Summary Report - Nicaragua**

# FCPF External Technical Advisory Panel

**June 20-22, 2011**  
**9<sup>th</sup> FCPF Participants Committee Meeting**  
**Oslo, Norway**

# General aspects

- Nicaragua submitted its third RPP version at the end of May 2011. This last version presents a lot of improvements, specially related to the institutional framework, description of deforestation drivers, consultation plan, strategy options, reference scenarios and budget.
- The TAP team made several recommendations on the first and second drafts. Many of them were considered in the present version, resulting in a more consistent and coherent document
- The document improved also in its structure avoiding some redundancies that were present in previous versions.

# Areas needing further work

- Consultation (1b and c) processes have concentrated on people living in and dependent on forests; **more engagement is still needed with a wider range of institutions, as well as with those whose activities are responsible for deforestation (farmers, ranchers, commercial agriculture enterprises).**
- In the previous reviews, the TAP asked Nicaragua to be more specific about measures to be undertaken to decrease deforestation and forest degradation (2b). **Although more details about this issue are provided in the third RPP version, there is still a need to develop further in this aspect relating the measures with the deforestation drivers, (eg. cattle ranching)**

## Areas needing further work

- In the latest version more details are given about the implementation framework, including actors and programs that will have an important role in the process (2c). **However, there is still lack of information about the roles of each institution, and discussion on carbon and property rights should be included in the next version.**
- Nicaragua proposes to develop SESA (2d) in a next stage. **The TAP feels that the SESA component should be completed at the present stage.**

# Areas needing further work

- Nicaragua proposes to complete the development of an MRV (4) during the implementation of Readiness activities. **Therefore there is a lack of a concrete work plan, including the definition of institutional roles.**
- This RPP includes a preliminary plan related to the development of an MRV to account for other benefits (4b). **The next version should provide more details about variables and processes to be monitored**
- **There are still some duplications of information.**



## Areas needing further work

- **There are important improvements and Nicaragua proposal is a rich source of valuable information, but in order to become a satisfactory RPP still needs to put some additional work to meet the expectations outlined in the standards, in particular component 2**

# Overall summary

May 2011

June 2011

Component 1a	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 1b	Standard largely met	Standard partially met
Component 1c	Standard partially met	Standard met
Component 2a	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 2b	Standard not met	Standard partially met
Component 2c	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 2d	Standard not met	Standard not met
Component 3	Standard met	Standard met
Component 4a	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 4b	Standard partially met	Standard partially met
Component 5	Standard partially met	Standard met
Component 6	Standard met	Standard met