

**TAP Draft Synthesis Review of R-PP of Suriname
Version 4 (23 February 2013) submitted to FCPF on 23
February 2013**

Reviewers: D. James Baker, Harrison Kojwang and TAP Team

Date of review: 4 March 2013

Introduction and Overview

Forests cover approximately 94% of Suriname's land area, much of which is intact. The majority of the national population of slightly more than one-half million is concentrated in coastal areas and to date there has been relatively little penetration of infrastructure, agricultural settlement, and commercial extractive industry into the forests. Suriname is thus in a strong position to supply ecosystem services on a national and regional level, including clean, reliable water supplies and soil conservation, and to serve a global function of maintaining significant carbon stocks in its standing forests.

This strength places Suriname in the category of High Forest cover, Low Deforestation rate countries, which gives it the option either to convert its forests to other productive land uses, or to continue to conserve its existing forests while forgoing potential extraction-based income-generating opportunities by participating in forest carbon financing mechanisms. The Government of Suriname has stated its wish to realize legitimate national aspirations and move along a development path that would harness its potentially rich mineral resources, respond to international demand for tropical timber and develop transportation links in the Amazon basin with road-building. At the same time, it has committed itself to sustainable forest management and livelihoods and wishes to create and benefit from positive incentives through an international REDD+ framework.

Version 4 Final Draft (23 February 2012) R-PP is a result of continuing efforts by the Government of Suriname to develop a comprehensive national program based on sustainable, but low-impact, use of its forest areas. This has been a continuing process with several earlier drafts. The first draft R-PP was reviewed by the TAP in October 2009. The second revision was reviewed in March 2010. The 19 December 2012 version of the R-PP, which built on the second revision but having been expanded substantially was thus in essence an entirely new document, was reviewed in January 2013.

The R-PP Version 4 (23 February 2013) has been again been substantially enhanced following the January 2013 review and is the subject of this review. **TAP comments on the revised R-PP are presented in blue font.**

The review that is provided below has examined carefully how the new version meets the standards set out by the FCPF and implementing partners as applicable, as well as taking into account as appropriate the comments made by the previous review. The TAP team recognizes the significant work done by the Suriname R-PP team to develop this final draft. In summary, the TAP believes that the Version 4 Final Draft either meets or largely meets all of the standards. In the comments below, the TAP has made a number of recommendations in the summary and in the specific components and sub-components for consideration in the course of implementing the R-PP as Suriname builds adequate capacity.

Strengths of the R-PP

The document is generally well written and comprehensive descriptions of processes under each component have been provided. On the whole, Version 4 (23 February 2013) of the R-PP (to be referred to in following simply as Version 4) is a great improvement over the previous versions. It shows that much work and attention have been paid to the requirements for the R-PP, and the Government of Suriname can be given credit for making a substantial step forward in meeting the previous recommendations from the January 2013 review.

As a result, all of the standards are now either met or largely met. Additional points made in reference to Version 4 are in italics below. The major strengths of the R-PP are as follows:

- The steps outlined under information sharing, stakeholder mapping, consultation and participation are appropriate, even though there is still insufficient clarity on how exhaustive the key stakeholders have been consulted and how their interests , particularly those of indigenous groups and their traditional authorities have been taken on board.
 - *Comments on R-PP Version 4 (23 February 2013): Version 4 shows more clarity on these issues, which must be carefully monitored as the program develops.*
- The direct drivers of deforestation and forest degradation have been clearly described.
- The principles of social and environmental impact assessments seem to have been well understood, even if examples of how they relate to specific circumstances in Suriname need to be added.
- There seems to be an adequate Policy Framework for REDD+ as explained by the current National Development Plan (2012-2016), Forest Management Act (1992), National Forest Policy 2003, Interim Strategic Action Plan for the Forest Sector (2008) - but continuing consideration should be given to the need for their review and development of additional environmental legislation. *These points will have to be kept under consideration as the program develops.*
- Proposals on the setting of reference scenarios and MRV are appropriate, even though they still need some improvement. *In particular, Version 4 continues to have a focus for MRV on the coastal area. As the program proceeds, it will be necessary to also target areas that are affected by new infrastructure, mining, logging, and hydroelectricity where deforestation will also occur.*

Areas and issues of concern

- TAP Reviewers with in-country knowledge noted earlier that there are concerns that the planning process was not inclusive enough and that the views of stake and rights holders may not have been sufficiently taken into consideration in the design of strategy options.
 - *Comments on R-PP Version 4 (23 February 2013): Version 4 has a much more detailed account of how these views are being taken into account.*
- One key point is that the stakeholder analysis has not adequately identified some important rights-holders. For example and within the context of UNDRIP, the resource rights of Indigenous people and the Saramaka judgment has not featured anywhere within

the R-PP, as it would be an important recognition within the proposed REDD+ Programme. In general, the RPP is not clear on how and whether it has effectively addressed or put in place plans to address the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples, giving them the effective control over their territories and resources within a sustainable forest management framework. In line with this, it is also noteworthy that the issue of land rights has not been mentioned in the key issues (Box 1 and 2; p. 23-24) to be discussed during sectoral and local dialogues, even though the RPP acknowledges that this was raised as a prerequisite in the early stages of the dialogue process.

- *Comments on R-PP Version 4 (23 February 2013): This issue has been discussed in much more detail in Version 4 in section 2c, on Land rights aspects, FPIC, and the Saramaka Judgement. Three pages of very useful new material address the activities that the Government of Suriname has undertaken, including consultations, negotiations, and elements of an indicative process for respecting the rights of communities to Free and Prior Informed Consent. As the program moves forward, it will be important to keep the fundamental issue of land and resource rights as a high priority in the future REDD-readiness program.*
- There are concerns that during the information sharing and discussion sessions with stakeholders, SESA issues were not emphasized enough, despite many remarks made in local dialogues on the impacts of exploitative concessions and other forms of conflicting land titles in indigenous peoples' territories.
 - *Comments on R-PP Version 4 (23 February 2013): This issue has now been addressed in Version 4, but the TAP notes that it would be very useful in this context to have national environmental legislation in place.*
- Another area of concern is that the responsibility for the environment is spread over various ministries including the Ministry of Labor, Technological Development and Environment (ATM) including NIMOS, Spatial Planning, Land and Forest Management (ROGB), Natural Resources, Public Works, and Health. There are new plans to move NIMOS to the office of the President. According to the website of NIMOS, this institute has signed MOUs with only 5 out of the 17 ministries. The various mentioned bodies related to environment/climate change within the Cabinet of the President are all newly established, do not (yet) have a legal basis, and their way of working is not adequately understood among the general public. All of these points require clarity.
 - *Comments on R-PP Version 4 (23 February 2013): The plans in Version 4 seem appropriate, but the details will have to be worked out as the program develops.*
- While it is understandable that the R-PP considers the formation of new structures to guide and implement the proposed REDD+ Programme, it should do so while recognizing that it is equally important to strengthen and streamline existing structures. It must also provide them with the required policy support and legal mandates to enable them to deal with the opportunities and challenges that a proposed REDD+ Programme will entail.
 - *Comments on R-PP Version 4 (23 February 2013): Version 4 shows that the responsible parties are aware of these issues, but in terms of grievance and conflict resolution mechanism, there must be continuing and careful attention paid to the need for ensuring that the process is both impartial and non-partisan.*

Earlier key recommendations (these have all been addressed in Version 4 (23 February 2013) - see specific comments under each component.

- In general, the plans to achieve the objectives under each component need to be clearly stated in light of the specific recommendations below. *Addressed in Version 4.*

- As already done for the REDD+ Steering Committee (RSC), the compositions and terms of reference of IMAC and NIMOS should be stated and their hierarchical relationships further clarified. In Figure 2, for example, there is a confusing relationship between IMAC and NIMOS. The role of the “Major Groups Collective” and the hierarchical and reporting relationships between IMAC and NIMOS, as well as the composition of IMAC, need clarification. *Addressed in Version 4.*
- Consider how to address missing issues in the strategic options and challenges to be dealt with, in particular the lack of land and resource rights of indigenous and tribal peoples, with special emphasis on how the country plans to implement the Inter-American Court’s judgment on land rights and FPIC legislation, among others, and the absence of environmental legislation. *These issues are addressed further in Version 4. As the program moves forward, it will be very important to link legal recognition of land and resource rights of indigenous and tribal people to the REDD-readiness program.*
- Analyze and present the likely impacts of issues on land rights on the proposed REDD+ Strategy Options and also give a clearer account on past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. *Addressed in Version 4, but it will be important to monitor the impact of concessions in indigenous and tribal lands to ensure that they have a positive impact.*
- There is a need for the strategy options to be revised so that they directly address the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. In addition each strategy could be analysed to estimate potential gains in reduced emissions associated with it. *Addressed in Version 4.*
- Ensure that modalities are created for the effective participation of indigenous and tribal peoples and also of the private sector, particularly the mining and forestry sectors. *These issues have been addressed in Version 4, but the TAP notes the important issue of self-selection and emphasizes that all means possible should be used to guarantee effective participation.*
- The TAP further draws attention to components 4b and 6, noting that 4b on multiple benefits is still incomplete, and that component 6 needs more clarification. *Addressed in Version 4.*
- The capacity requirements under each component need to be clearly stated and appropriately budgeted. *Addressed in Version 4, but the TAP notes that it will be important to have funding for empowering rightsholders and stakeholders as well as government actors so that the former can effectively participate in future strategy, policy, and implementation process.*

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

The TAP review process applies a classification scheme as follows:

- **Standard Met** (no further work needed to describe the actions proposed under this

standard)

- **Standard Largely Met** (proposed work is acceptable, but can be enhanced with additional information)
- **Standard Partially Met** (some additional information is required before the proposed strategy fulfills the terms of the standard)
- **Standard Not Met** (information is incomplete and does not fulfill the terms of the standard)

Summary of component by component rating by the TAP compared to earlier rating:

Standard	R-PP of December 19, 2012	R-PP of February 23, 2013
1a. National Readiness Management Arrangements	<i>Standard Largely Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
1b. Information Sharing and Stakeholder Dialogue	<i>Standard Largely Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
1c. Consultation and Participation Process	<i>Standard Largely Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
2a. Land Use, Forest Law, Policy and Governance	<i>Standard Partially Met</i>	<i>Standard Largely Met</i>
2b. REDD+ Strategy Options	<i>Standard Partially Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
2c. Implementation Framework	<i>Standard Partially Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
2d. Social & Environmental Impacts during Preparation and Implementation	<i>Standard Partially Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
3. Reference Level	<i>Standard Largely Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
4a. Monitoring - Emissions and Removals	<i>Standard Largely Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
4b. Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts and Governance	<i>Standard Not Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
5. Schedule and Budget	<i>Standard Partially Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>
6. Program Monitoring & Evaluation Framework	<i>Standard Partially Met</i>	<i>Standard Met</i>

Component 1. Organize and Consult

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity

building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process, and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review made a number of points and recommendations about component 1a and concluded that the standard was largely met. Those points and recommendations are listed below. Version 4 has largely addressed those recommendations, specifically for the details of the role of NIMOS, and for the role of indigenous and tribal people. There is new material on the assessment of environmental and social risks and a mechanism for preparation of an ESMF. With this new material, the standard has been met, but we note that it will be useful as the program moves forward to monitor the progress of each of the elements of the readiness management arrangements.

Previous review: The success of the new administrative arrangement will depend critically on NIMOS, which plays a central role, and on ROGB, which is tasked with enforcing forest laws and governance issues and developing land use planning. NIMOS' mandate comes from the President, and it will be an effective clearing house, provided that it reflects the interests of all of the government. Reasonable and potentially effective arrangements for management and dispute settlement have been proposed.

The proposal for administration here is based in historical administrative arrangements such as the 'Spatial Structuring and the Environment' office (ROM) acting at the level of the 'National Security' unit at the Cabinet of the President of the Republic. It is also proposed that the REDD+ Steering Committee will mitigate potential disagreements among working group members and across sectors. The work plan is presented in a clear and straightforward manner in tables that are easy to read and interpret.

The R-PP proposes a management arrangement through the establishment of the Inter-Ministerial Advisory Committee (IMAC) that would be made up mainly of Government Functionaries. This body will further be complemented by the REDD+ Steering Committee (RSC) and the REDD+ Assistant Collective that would be made up of government entities, the private sector, indigenous organizations, academia, land users and civil society. The main concern is the actual implementation of the programme, given what seems to be an elaborate administrative process.

It has been stated that NIMOS will be advised by a REDD+ Steering Committee (RSC), which will emerge from the REDD+ Project Group which prepared the R-PP. But it is not clear what roles IMAC, NIMOS and RSC will play in a National REDD+ Programme, but one could assume that IMAC and NIMOS are high level policy making bodies and the RSC will be the key Technical Advisory Body for REDD+. It is also not clear how 'powerful' NIMOS itself will/can be in relation to the various drivers of deforestation as mentioned in section 2; see remarks there.

The proposed arrangements appear to be somewhat top-heavy with government representation and decision-taking. There is a risk that Indigenous and tribal peoples are likely to continue to be marginalized in such multi-stakeholder groups. There is strong focus in the proposed budget on capacity strengthening which in itself is good and understandable, but it should also include empowerment of vulnerable stakeholders as well. The description of the integration and coordination of environmental and social issues during the readiness phase still seems limited and does therefore not provide sufficient grounds for making an assessment of existing arrangements. The only reference

given is to the FCPF guidelines and NIMOS' guidelines, the latter of which do not yet have a legal basis because of the absence of approved contemporary environment legislation. These NIMOS guidelines would also need to be assessed in more detail to determine their compliance with actual UN and World Bank standards. The proposed Environment Framework Law (which has met with resistance by various stakeholders and rights holders including indigenous and maroon peoples) is yet to be approved by the Council of Ministers before it can be presented to the National Assembly (Parliament) for further discussion and eventual approval.

In general, the gender related aspects in participation and decision-taking in relation to natural resources and forests in general need to be strengthened, particularly in the interior among indigenous people.

Previous recommendations (*these have now been addressed*):

- As already done for the REDD+ Steering Committee (RSC) the compositions and terms of reference of IMAC and NIMOS should be stated and their hierarchical relationships further clarified. In Figure 2, for example, there is a confusing relationship between IMAC and NIMOS. The role of “Major Groups Collective” and the hierarchical and reporting relationships between IMAC and NIMOS, as well as the composition of IMAC need clarification.
- The need for environmental regulations, which are still pending, should be emphasized in this sub-component since it is a major governance issue.
- Consider how to clarify, in particular, the relationship of the REDD-plus working group to the existing working structure and processes for national forestry and land use policy dialogue since REDD + strategies need to be integrated into ongoing policy and stakeholder discussions on economic development, land use and forestry and national climate change mitigation action plans.
- Show how marginalization of indigenous and tribal peoples from decision-taking process could be avoided in the proposed institutional management arrangements.
- Provide additional information, as available, for the proposed budget for component 1a, to show how rights-holders and stakeholders could be strengthened to be able to effectively participate in, and take ownership of REDD+ processes, and how dependence on, and undue external influence of external expertise will be prevented.
- Explain how the integration of environmental and social issues, including assessments of environmental and social risks and potential impacts of REDD-plus, and the preparation of an ESMF will be coordinated during the preparation and implementation of REDD-plus readiness activities (e.g., a SESA sub-committee).

Standard met

Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:

The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus, and commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The campaign's major objective is to establish an early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process that sets the stage for the later consultation process during the implementation of the R-PP work plan. This effort needs to reach out, to the extent feasible at this stage, to networks and representatives of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers and forest dependent communities, both at national and local level. The R-PP contains evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that a reasonable amount of time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD-plus including the SESA.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review noted that in terms of reaching out to stakeholders, following the earlier recommendations, Suriname officials have carried out a series of dialogues as documented in detail in the Annexes. Guidelines and procedural rights have been identified and the R-PP has a fairly well developed Consultation and Outreach Plan. In the consultations, a number of key issues - the need for respect for rights, and the need to respond to comments, for example - were raised in several different meetings.

It is particularly important to note that the R-PP seeks to utilize the services of Chiefs or Captains of indigenous or Maroon communities. This indicates a willingness to engage communities whose lives and livelihoods will be impacted by the R-PP. However, the most important issues remain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and benefit sharing, and a few other issues noted below that need clarification.

Table 5 provides a good indication on how the mapping of stakeholders for REDD+ is going to be managed. The figure of the 'granman' will be instrumental in assuring the achievement of the purposes under this standard, and Tribal groups are being approached through official Government channels. The Ministry of Regional Development is legally responsible for maintaining the relationship between the central Government and dignitaries and inhabitants of the interior.

As indigenous and Maroon organizations have expressed repeated concerns that these consultation processes have not sufficiently taken into account their traditional methods of meeting or their traditional structures for consultations, the R-PP process as it develops from early dialogues should be careful to be sensitive to the cultural norms and protocols that are important during consultations with them.

In general, information sharing should be a permanent and ongoing activity, but the budget allocation covers only 2014 and 2015. This budget should be revised and amplified to the full five years, at a decreasing rate maybe, but unquestionably to the full 5 years term.

Version 4 has addressed these points and recommendations with new material about how the stakeholder process will take place. With that new information, the essential parts of the recommendations have been dealt with. The standard has been met, but it will be important to monitor stakeholder's views to ensure that there is a continuing and positive dialogue.

Previous recommendations (these have been addressed):

- Revise the stakeholder analysis to be more culturally appropriate and clearly indicate rights-holders with established rights and the impact of the proposed REDD+ strategy on them.
- Consider more dialogue with all rights-holders and stakeholders based on full and understandable information, in order to achieve a consensual, bottom-up design of an institutional framework for REDD+ readiness activities.
- Clarify the impact of the Saramaka judgment and other relevant international obligations of Suriname in relation to all REDD+ components (*note: this has been addressed in component 2c*).

Standard met

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

The previous review noted that the objective of the Consultation and Participation Plan is to engage the people of Suriname in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the future REDD+ readiness strategy and to ensure continuous feedback. All relevant stakeholders will be part of the design and implementation of the REDD+ readiness strategy. This is a key element to ensure the successful design and future implementation of the REDD+ readiness strategy.

Very appropriately the proposal considers that stakeholders who feel that they have been negatively impacted by the promotion of REDD+ and future REDD+ projects have to be given the opportunity to restore their identity within the process. Grievances shall be submitted to the project group, tested on eligibility and decision can be made by a non-partial organization.

The process of consultation and participation appears to be comprehensive and has been supported by a stakeholder mapping exercise and it has been stated that the results of consultations would be used in the design of strategy options, which is a useful way of building upon the process. However, it is not clear how that has been done under component 2. The plan describes the analysis of stakeholders and lists a number of actors to be involved in the consultation and participation process but does not sufficiently

³ Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Program Steering Committee).

describe how meaningful consultation with relevant stakeholders would be carried out and how transparency (especially in decision-taking) will be ensured at all levels and in all stages.

It remains unclear if agreement from the actors mentioned in the proposed consultation and participation plan (ranging from government ministries to mining and forestry sectors, indigenous peoples organizations and groups such as the University of Amsterdam) has been granted.

Version 4 provides some more detail to expand on the points noted above. The needs of rights-holders and stakeholders are emphasized, and the budget has more detail and clarification of activities and sub-activities. The recommendations have been addressed, and the standard has been met.

Previous recommendations (these have now been addressed):

- Review the RPP in light of the importance of achieving a bottom-up and empowerment approach that will ensure ownership and effective participation of rights-holders and stakeholders over the entire REDD readiness process.
- Revise the budget with respect to capacity-building of rights-holders and stakeholders to strengthen them to effectively participate in decision-taking processes and allow their voices to be heard.
- Clarify how the proposed consultation and participation plan relates to the FCPF/UN-REDD requirements related to SESA, and provide details to meet this requirement.
- It is advisable that during future consultations and participation, Suriname shows how it will comply with the judgment of the Inter-American Court for Human Rights throughout all REDD+ readiness actions including the preparation and implementation of the RPP (this recommendation should be kept in mind as the program develops).

Standard met

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review noted that in this section, the R-PP sets out a number of drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. One particular impressive inclusion is a matrix (Table 11) that illustrates vividly what are the main direct and indirect drivers, the gaps and

challenges that exist and the institutional framework that currently obtains. Generally the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and the factors that influence their evolution have been well described.

But there is a lack of information about overall forest resources and the management practices to which forest resources are subjected and not much information about available data on carbon stocks. In fact estimates of carbon appear only in sections 3 and 4, which is fine but the core description of forest resources should be in 2a. While the drivers and their underlying causes have been described, the sub-component still needs a description of the forest resources, current management practices and any data on carbon stocks. In addition, systemic drivers of deforestation, such as market and policy failures are largely missing and should be included. *Version 4 begins to deal with these issues in a useful way, but as the program moves forward, it would be helpful to start with additional information in hand.*

It is somewhat worrisome that timber production after being stagnated for decades, all of a sudden has rapidly increased by a factor of four. The R-PP is silent on this matter but should recognize that Suriname will need a clear direction on how to deal with this change.

Version 4 has a somewhat expanded version of the previous component 2a. More information, and a more detailed budget are provided. This new material shows how Suriname will deal with the issues that have been raised. The standard has been largely met, because there is enough information for the program to move forward now. But some of the recommendations (as noted) should be dealt with in the early stages of the program.

Previous recommendations (these have now been addressed except as noted):

- Review the assessment in line with the guidelines of documenting past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and setting the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.
- Clarify how the various mentioned policies and plans related to logging, mining, energy, infrastructure etc. will impact on the proposed REDD+ strategy and how this would be dealt with (*this will have to be dealt with as the program moves forward*).
- Clarify how the country plans to reconcile conflicting development strategies (*this will have to be dealt with as the program moves forward*).
- Include indigenous peoples and Maroons and their authorities as crucial rights-holders and actors and show their role in the policy process.
- Elaborate as appropriate on the impact of the Saramaka judgment and corresponding government obligations and actions in this regard, on the REDD+ strategy (*note: this has been addressed in component 2c*).
- Elaborate on existing law enforcement mechanisms and their effectiveness; consider how they relate to the proposed REDD+ strategy (*this will be a continuing issue to be dealt with as the program moves forward*).

Standard largely met - program can move forward, but it would be useful to have some more information in place as noted above at the outset of implementation.

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD-plus strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and a summary of the emerging REDD-plus strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD-plus strategy options. This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy; consideration of environmental and social issues; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD-plus strategy; and a plan of how to assess the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits. The assessments included in the R-PP eventually should result in an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD-plus strategy over time.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review noted that in this component, there has been a careful attempt in Table 13 to lay out strategy options and potential benefits for the drivers identified in section 2a. Then these strategy options are assessed in Table 14 for synergies, sustainability, and governance aspects. Although this analysis does not yet meet the specific recommendations laid out above, it is a good start in this direction. Still needed is a work plan to conduct cost-benefit analysis of REDD strategy options, and a pathway for resolving policy conflicts.

Version 4 provides a work plan for both subcomponents 2b and 2c, meeting the recommendation above.

The strategy options mainly revolve around policy and legal reforms in the mining, forestry and infrastructure sectors and have been arranged or organized according to the main drivers. But the proposed strategy options do not appear to be directly addressing the underlying causes which have been amply articulated in the sub-component. For example, there is no illustrative example provided under each driver that could demonstrate which achievements (in terms of emission reductions) that each option could generate.

Version 4 now provides links to underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, as well as development of spatial/land-use planning policies and legislation as part of the strategy options.

It would be very useful to have a short description of practices and trends in the forest sector to make it easier to appreciate and suggest policy and technical reforms to improve SFM and promote reduced emissions under REDD+. For example, it is not clear whether the current logging practices are clear cuts or are selective (it was mentioned that there are “CELOS” rules but did not explain those rules). It is also not clear how one of the underlying causes, namely low timber taxes that are associated with increased harvesting, will be addressed, while it seems like a major issue also applicable to mining. Under the development of zoning regulations around infra-structure projects, it is not clear what will be addressed.

The R-PP mentions but does not provide the cost and benefits of the emerging REDD

strategy or the costs and benefits of alternative economic activities, but states that each strategy option will be subjected to economic analysis, which may include cost-benefit analyses. Additionally, as pointed out above, the focus on the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are mainly focused on those that occur directly within the forest sector or on forest lands, but have largely left out any drivers that may come from outside the sector, such as agricultural, mining and trade policies. Thus, it will be important to see how the R-PP is situated within the wider development context of Suriname.

Previous recommendations *(these have now been addressed with the material in 2b and 2c):*

- The strategy options should show clear linkages to the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation which have been clearly described.
- Attempt to describe systemic (policy type) drivers that may be operating from outside the forest sector and propose how their negative effects on the forest sector could be mitigated.
- Provide a work plan to conduct cost-benefit analysis of REDD strategy options.
- Provide more detail on the various livelihood alternatives which have been mentioned in the strategy options.
- Show how the views of stakeholders have been incorporated in the elaboration of the strategy options.

Standard met

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review noted that while the attempt to analyze the institutional, economic, legal, and governance arrangements for implementing REDD-REDD+ strategy options are commendable, the framework should be developed in line with the 2011-2015 Development Plan.

It has been stated that the NIMOS mission is to develop a national legal framework for environmental policy and environmental management. The framework of the component is largely based on the role that NIMOS is expected to and is already playing, particularly in the aspects of policy and legislative reform. The Environmental Monitoring and Enforcement Department of NIMOS is the technical section for monitoring and reporting on land use change and GHG inventory development.

Although the structure is valid and the governance aspects listed in the chapter are all valid, the main challenges remain in capacities to enforce and monitor implementation of policies

and supporting procedures. Furthermore, the TAP has noted that there is no Environmental Act that could provide much needed legal mandate to deal issues in the forest sector. The expected role of the key land and natural resource users in REDD+ Implementation has not been articulated. No guidelines on REDD+ Projects, be they be Pilots or National Projects have been stated. The legal mandates of key institutions is not clear. Table 16 could be improved if it had more components dealing with guidelines, conflict resolution, FPIC, a Carbon Registry.

Version 4 has substantial new material addressing the points above and the recommendations. The mandates have been addressed, and there is a substantial new analysis of land rights aspects, FPIC, and the Saramaka Judgement. The scope of REDD+ implementation is discussed at length. A new national tracking system or registry has been proposed. The new material substantially addresses the points above and the recommendations, and therefore the standard has been met.

Previous recommendations (these have now been addressed):

- Include the existing and expected legal mandates of the institutions responsible for REDD+,
- Present workplan how the following issues will be dealt with during R-PP implementation: guidelines for REDD+ Projects, a body for conflict resolution, provision for a carbon registry, and a proposed benefit-sharing mechanisms relevant to REDD+ stakeholders.
- The TAP further suggests that R-PP could consider housing an arrangement for conflict resolution in a politically neutral body.
- Show how the effective participation of rights-holders and stakeholders, in particular indigenous and tribal peoples, will be encouraged.

Standard met

Standard 2.d: Social and Environmental Impacts during Readiness Preparation and REDD-plus Implementation:

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence in the form of an assessment of environmental and social risks and impacts as part of the SESA process. It also provides a description of safeguard issues that are relevant to the country's readiness preparation efforts. For FCPF countries, a simple work plan is presented for conducting the SESA process, cross referencing other components of the R-PP as appropriate, and for preparing the ESMF.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review noted that the R-PP outlines procedure and a phased implementation of the SESA, and the main issues and protocols have been identified. The way in which this component is approached suggests that Suriname will use the funding to gain in-depth information on the quality of the environment and the socio-economic status when implementing REDD+ activities. The proposal calls for NIMOS executing the process and being monitored by third parties.

Encouragingly, the proposal establishes the linkage between the community outreach programme and the SESA. However, what remains unclear is how the various regulations would be enforced with the Environmental Act still being in draft with little indication when this Act will be passed. This is cause for serious concern.

The description of the prevailing standards of public consultation and participation for EIA and SESA is good as far as it goes but would be improved with a more comprehensive plan including the required capacity.

The text describes the existing EIA procedure as required by NIMOS; however, the actual NIMOS guidelines and policies are not made available. Compliance with World Bank and UN-REDD safeguard and operational policies and guidelines need to be assured.

Version 4 addresses these points, and has added material specifically on the design of SESA and new budget information. The material added is adequate to meet the recommendations, and therefore the standard is met.

Previous recommendations (*these have now been addressed*):

- Indicate how the stipulations in the environmental and social management plan will be enforced in the absence of the Environmental Act.
- Give consideration to including non-carbon values as well as the non-economic values of forests in the national circumstances given the strong presence of indigenous peoples and Maroons in the forests.
- The workplan should include provisions for continuous monitoring of the ESMF and SESA frameworks. Further information should be provided on the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples and their effective participation in designing the ESMF and SESA, as well as on gender considerations.
- The budget requested for this subcomponent in Table 17 should consider a more permanent set of activities for the whole period. It would be useful to develop a plan for a cost/benefit analysis (*this point should be kept in mind as the program progresses*).

Standard met - additional information required as noted above

Component 3. Develop a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level

Standard 3: a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level

Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (monitoring system design). (FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review noted that in general terms the sub-component is well analyzed in terms of capacity building, hardware requirements and international cooperation. The section has carefully laid out what the REDD+ Plan would seek to accomplish. It also seeks to build on other initiatives taking place in and around Suriname which is both pragmatic and cost effective. An accurate description of the issues involved in using production forest definitions versus nature reserve definitions is now included. There is a brief discussion of methodology which will build on the referenced University of Wageningen work. More work will be required to build a complete methodology, but there is much existing literature on this to be drawn from. Following the Guyana reference level model is good because it is an end-to-end system. This section, contrary to previous sections, does identify the issues of land rights as a first major gap. No further consideration is given to this statement, however.

The responsible institutions for data and analyses have been identified in the relevant sections (see Table 21) - this is a good first step. The specific roles of the institutions in developing national reference scenarios are outlined in the table. Technical capacity needs are substantial, and these have mostly been identified in Table 22 and the following text. The main point here is to build the necessary capacity.

Version 4 of the R-PP now provides much of the detail that was requested in the previous review. Methodology, data sources and necessary capacity building have been more clearly delineated. The role of institutions has been expanded. The first steps of a work plan with activities, sub-activities, and timing are now part of the R-PP. It was previously recommended that the timing of the program needs to be further clarified. The workplan and budget foresee various complex activities to take place only in 2014, again raising a question as to whether Suriname will be able to undertake all this within one year with its limited domestic capacities. The amount of time foreseen for the assessment of national circumstances is very limited. The same is true for the quantification of carbon stock change data which is very crucial in the RL path proposed here. These aspects should follow later in the sequence of activities since they depend on pre-established capacity, data and governance mechanisms. *These points have been addressed in Version 4.*

It was noted earlier that In terms of funding, the subcomponent was inadequate in its budget requirements; most of the activities will require a permanent funding allocation. Now in Version 4, a detailed budget has been provided, which is adequate for moving forward.

Previous recommendations (*these have now been addressed*):

- Develop at least the first steps of a work plan showing how a stepwise approach will lead to the flow of work to be done, identifying specific areas for investment and improvement, and giving specific deliverables with a time line. Such a chart would help answer many of the questions that have been raised. A good example for reference level development can be found in the 2011 Ethiopia R-PP, page 123. A sampling plan indicating the proportion of temporary and permanent sample plots covering all the forest cover types would be useful at this stage.
- Revise Table 21 specifying roles of institutions under ‘capacities and capacity requirements’ to include a more comprehensive contribution to field work for forest dependent communities. This table should also include actors such as mining and timber companies, indigenous and maroon organizations and NGOs.
- While sufficient information on available maps, data, ongoing projects and a broad methodology have been provided for this component, Suriname should agree on its forest definitions, and show specific methods that it will use to combine activity data and emission factors to generate historical emissions and also reference emission levels.
- Clarify the timing and sequencing of the work to be done - not all of it can be accomplished in 2014. For example, the establishment of the RL based on gathered data will have to happen after the studies which it depends on.

Standard met

Component 4. Design Systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards

Standard 4a: National Forest Monitoring System:

The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD-plus strategy in the forest sector.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The previous review noted that there is now recognition of the general objectives and guiding principles for a national monitoring system as indicated by the main elements and

principles as outlined in Table 24 which gives a comprehensive list of what is required for MRV. There is also a good list of which institutions, including forest-dependent communities, would be involved. There is a clear analysis of the drivers of deforestation and land degradation, including the forestry and mining sectors, energy production, infrastructure, as well as illegal markets for forest and mineral products, the latter particularly in border areas, and which monitoring is appropriate for these drivers. In addition, the proposed MRV structure, where SSB has the leading role, seems appropriate. SSB and NIMOS both need to be adequately empowered.

The proposed MRV efforts will concentrate on the coastal parts of the country which are the most highly populated and most prone to historically higher levels of deforestation and forest degradation than elsewhere, but there is a possibility that deforestation and degradation threats are increasing elsewhere; a possibility that should not be ignored.

- *Version 4 of the R-PP now provides much more detail, both for capacity building and for the elements of a work plan. With this new information, the recommendations provided earlier have now been addressed. As the program moves forward, it will be important to continually audit how progress is being made, so that resources are applied in the most efficient way. The TAP notes that Version 4 continues to have a focus for MRV on the coastal area. As the program proceeds, it will be necessary to also target areas that are affected by new infrastructure, mining, logging, and hydroelectricity where deforestation will also occur.*

Previous recommendations (*these have now been addressed*):

- The main elements and principles need to be put into at least the first steps of a comprehensive work plan specific to Suriname showing activities, institutions involved, intermediate results, outcomes, deliverables, and all within a specific time line, so that the efforts to be carried out can be done efficiently and at lowest cost. A good example for MRV development can be found in the 2011 Ethiopia R-PP, page 148. Also show how rural and indigenous communities as well as the NGO community in Suriname, and non-carbon aspects of forests, would be incorporated into the monitoring regime.
- Include a table identifying the type of capacity building to be incorporated (training, infrastructure improvements, personnel, etc.); proposed recipients; expected outputs; and an indication of how these outputs will fulfill the terms of the proposed approach.
- Propose the incorporation of an audit at the beginning and the end of the project to determine the local capacity for the conduct of MRV.
- With regard to Table 26 Budget for Subcomponent it would be useful to have guidelines to show how budgets will be updated as requirements for the monitoring system change over time.

Standard met, but note that it will be useful to have an audit at the beginning and end of the project to verify progress in capacity building

Standard 4b: Designing an Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards :

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities), for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

(The FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The earlier review noted that there was a good recognition of the need to go beyond the impacts associated with carbon. The component provides a useful summary of existing systems and current capacities which is followed by some general principles for system design. In addition, specific mention is made of monitoring of sectoral environmental-related policies such as water supply and socio-economic impacts.

The revised component now goes into detail about key selected thematic SFM elements to be monitored, including forest biological diversity and ecosystem services, socio-economic functions, productive functions, and governance. Roles of stakeholders, a schedule of activities, and a budget have been thought through and more detail is provided. The recommendations in the previous review have now been met.

Previous recommendations (these have now been addressed):

- Use national examples, for example, biodiversity conservation, to illustrate appreciation of the issues of multiple benefits and safeguards
- Clarify what capacity needs will need to be addressed under the component. This could include, an initial work plan, existing and required GIS capacity and other personnel and an appropriate institutional framework
- Clarify the process for trainers and training for forest dependent communities
- Noting that all activities are concentrated in 2014; these should be spread over a larger period.
- Table 28 should be revised to consider the follow up of assessing the monitoring systems and structures required for monitoring and reviewing and adjusting the monitoring process.

Standard met

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD readiness, and identifies capacity building and financial resources needed to accomplish these activities. A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF and/or UN-REDD, as well as from other international sources (e.g., bilateral assistance), are summarized by year and by potential donor. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP, and is sufficient to meet the costs associated with REDD-plus readiness activities identified in the R-PP. Any gaps in funding, or sources of funding, are clearly noted.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Overall, the budget is thorough and comprehensive, and most of the cost estimates appear to be reasonable. Some travel estimates may be too limited, unless it is well coordinated and costs minimized.

The revised budget now has a clearer delineation of the sequence of the proposed activities, and description as to how these activities tie together to meet each standard. As the program moves forward, it will be useful to further describe the consultancies required here and in several other sections of the budget. Also, it will be important to monitor how the coordination of travel to ensure that it will be managed to produce the outputs under such limited budgets.

The recommendations on the previous R-PP on likely sources of funding, possible co-funding, spreading activities over more than one or two years, and likeliness of other funding have all been addressed adequately in Version 4.

The TAP also notes that it will be important to have a strategy and corresponding budget for strengthening the rights holders and stakeholders to empower them to effectively participate in future strategy, policy and implementation processes. The described budgets currently focus on strengthening the governmental actors, but as the program develops, consideration should also be given to helping indigenous and tribal peoples and other actors to effectively participate.

Previous recommendations (*these have now been addressed*):

- If possible, identify - against activities - all possible, or likely, sources of funding and what would require new funding. In addition, it would be useful to consider what activities can be mainstreamed within existing programs, i.e., establish synergies and complementary between existing initiatives, and to show how gaps in funding would affect the delivery of the overall programme
- Explore the possibility of co-financing under components 1c, 2a, 2d, 3, 4b, and 6.
- Many activities are planned to accomplish in 2014, but the country may not have enough capacity to implement those activities in one year, although it would be ideal if possible. Suriname may want to spread out some activities over a couple of years.
- Provide an explanation of the likeliness of other sources of funding. Given the fact

that there has been funding for various mapping programs in Suriname, such as from the KfW Development Bank of Germany (see p. 73), and that Norway has provided Brazil with funds to help other developing countries with MRV activities, these and other potential sources of funds might be listed here.

Standard met

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6: The R-PP adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The earlier version had an outline of what will be considered for a national M&E Program Framework. The new information in Tables 37 and 38 provide activities, outputs, key indicators, means of verification, and dates, as well as a budget and timeline. This is a very good basis on which to move forward, but the details will have to be monitored and adjusted as the program moves forward. All of the earlier recommendations have been met.

Previous recommendations (*these have now been addressed*):

- Identification of the baseline information and key data sources that will be used for specific program performance indicators for each Component.
- The indicators should be designed to provide information that can lead to necessary changes in compliance.
- There is a need to clearly state how all rights-holders and stakeholders will effectively participate in all steps of the program monitoring and evaluation, and in the measurements of results and benefits.
- It is advisable that specific dates for monitoring and evaluation reports be mentioned, maybe once a year or twice a year. This encourages actors to do their duties. But it also gives feedback to those that are behind schedule.
- Stakeholders meeting regarding the M&E program should continue through the years and be on a regular basis for instance once a year. The proposal already recognizes that many of these issues are yet to be addressed.

Standard met