

## Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF): Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) – External Bank Review Form

May 10, 2008

**Guidelines for Reviewers:**

- 1) This review form is a record of your review, which may be shared for transparency. Please bear that in mind when filling it out.
- 2) Please summarize your comments-- address whatever you feel is important.
- 3) Please evaluate and mark (score) each of the 5 Summary Assessment review criterion from the FCPF Information Memo, the Participants Committee Selection Criteria, and the numbered R-PIN major topics, as requested in the right-hand column. Select a mark from the scale below:  
NA: Not Addressed. 1: Inadequately addresses criterion. 2: Barely adequately addresses criterion. 3: Average, or adequately addresses criterion. 4: Good job of addressing criterion. 5: Excellent job of addressing criterion.

<b>1) Country submitting the R-PIN:</b>	Mozambique	
<b>2) Date of Review:</b>	February 11 2009	
<b>3) Name and affiliation of R-PIN Reviewer:</b>	TAP Review Synthesis	
<b>I. Summary Assessment of the Quality and Completeness of the R-PIN:</b>		<b>Mark (score):</b>
<i>Note with value of 1 – 5; internal Bank reviewers do not score.</i>		
<b>Criterion (i): Ownership of the proposal by both the government and relevant stakeholders:</b>		
<b>Criterion ii): Consistency between national and sectoral strategies and proposed REDD Strategy:</b>		
<b>Criterion (iii): Completeness of information and data provided:</b>		
<b>Criterion (iv): Clarity of responsibilities for the execution of REDD activities to be financed;</b>		
<b>Criterion v): Feasibility of proposal and likelihood of success.</b>		
<b>Improvements country could make to R-PIN, and any TA needs for it:</b> A better definition of Challenges for REDD in section 8 More reliable data on deforestation rates		
<b>How well do proposed activities fit into existing Bank-supported or other country development plans?</b> The proposed activities seem appropriate for the bank's purposes		

**II. Participants Committee Selection Criteria: Information**

- **Relevance of country in REDD context: Priority to countries with: (i) substantial forest area and forest carbon stocks; and (ii) relevance of forests in economy, including livelihoods of forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples:**

In Southern Africa, Mozambique is one of the few countries besides Zambia and Angola with substantial forest cover and would do well to participate in the REDD Process. It also the largest portion along the East Africa Coast, of East Africa's Coastal Forests, which are quite unique in their high levels of endemic species and the largest populations of the highly endangered African Blackwood (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*). In addition and despite rural populations dependent on cultivation agriculture there are substantial woodland formations in rural districts that can be co-managed and provide incentives for community participation

- **Geographic and biome balance: across the world's main forest biomes.**

The dominant forest cover type by area is the Miombo Woodlands dominated by the Caesalpinoid tree species of *Brachystegia* and *Julbernardia*. In riverine forests in the immediate hinterland, and upland plains such as the Cheringoma plateau, one finds mosaics with both miombo and coastal forest elements, producing commercial timber species such as the popular *Milletia stuhlmanii* (panga panga).

- **Variety of approaches:** Proposed innovative approaches to tackling deforestation and degradation; methods; testing new mechanisms and distribution of REDD revenues; and/or regionally important leadership.

**III. Detailed Review of R-PIN Response to Template Questions:**

*Please review the R-PIN quality and completeness in terms of addressing the major questions in the FCPF R-PIN template.*

**1. Government focal point, and ownership and consultation in producing the R-PIN:**

These are the two government institutions, Directorate of Lands and Forests and that Environmental Affairs but the one who will be responsible is not clear and should be clarified.

The evidence suggests sufficient consultations within the government, academic institutions, donors and international conservation bodies such as WWF and IUCN.

**2. Identification of institutions responsible for: forest monitoring, law enforcement, conservation, and coordination across forest, agriculture and rural development:**

These fall under

- The Directorate of Lands and Forests,
- Directorate of Tourism and Protected Areas, Ministry of Tourism
- National and Provincial Provincial Services for Forests and Wildlife

It has been stated that enforcement powers can be delegated to community level structures, but the delegation mechanisms or conditions ought to be clarified.

Coordination reportedly takes place at both national and district levels. It should be made clear how district administrations coordinate the implementation of forestry work and how the policies of related institutions such as Tourism and Protected Areas (under a different ministry) and Wildlife Issues (under agriculture) are also coordinated.

**3. Current country situation:**

**Where do forest deforestation and degradation occur, main causes, estimates of greenhouse gas emissions, data available? Key issues in forest law enforcement and forest sector governance?**

**Where deforestation occurs**

Deforestation occurs all over the country with the highest rates recorded in Maputo Province. The range is illustration by an annual rate of .22% in Niassa to 1.67 in Maputo in the South and an overall average of .58 %. The latest estimates of forest cover changes show decrease from 52 to 49 million ha between 1990 and 2002 and the current estimate suggest 40 million ha of forest cover, suggesting a loss of 9 million ha between 2002 and 2008. These deforestation figures are confusing and would need to be clarified properly for them to be useful in a REDD context. A useful map has been provided

**Main Causes of Deforestation**

- Shifting cultivation – which leads to degradation
- Wood fuel harvesting and charcoal burning

Main underlying causes include

- Poverty as a driving force for unsustainable practices in the face of limited alternatives
- Over-reliance on wood fuels including charcoal burning
- Population growth and the need for more conversion of land
- Inadequate harmonization between policies especially in the field
- Poor land use planning and unplanned settlements
- Low incentives for rural communities to maintain forest cover
- Low capacity to enforce land use policies laws

**Estimates of GHG Emissions**

The text suggests that the issue of emissions has been addressed in Mozambique starting from the 1994 report which estimated total emissions of 9 265 gigatons of CO<sub>2</sub> of forests and land use changes contributed 8% or 780 Gg of CO<sub>2</sub>. However, deriving from current rates of deforestation of about 200 000 ha per year estimated emissions yield a figure of 16.7 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. Again the figures are confusing and need to be checked. Bushfires and land preparation fires no doubt contribute significantly to total emissions. Still the 1994 figures need to be reviewed in the face of recent data on forest cover, which should also include fires.

**Key Issues in forest law enforcement**

- Concession policies which govern simple and long term concessions do not offer much control on harvesting practices and the management of concessions are weak leading to over-harvesting and low revenues.
- The policy allowing retention of 20% of timber royalties for distribution to local communities is not effective
- Afforestation strategy – has invited renewed investor interests in CDM and even bio-fuel projects
- Policy for Participatory law enforcement for lands and forests exists but the success of its application has not been explained in the document

**4) Data available on indigenous peoples and forest dwellers?**

Mozambique does not have those who can be called forest dwellers but because 70% of the population live in the rural areas and practice subsistence agriculture, which is linked to shifting cultivation which mainly entails converting wooded areas. In addition, the majority of the land is in communal areas so any REDD activities will as a matter of necessity need the participation of rural farmers, be they be livestock farmers or cultivators, and will have to meet their needs for woody biomass.

It also appears that rights of local communities to land, are protected by various laws and policies but communities still have low capacities to fully exercise their rights.

The graph entitled 'Access to Land' in section 4 is not clear and not properly referenced

**5. Current strategy in place to address deforestation and degradation. What stakeholder process was used to arrive at it?**

There is a very clear list of policies, strategies and initiatives and some such as Strategy for Prevention of Fire and Deforestation, National Forest Policy and Strategy, National Afforestation Strategy, PROAGRI II 2005-2009, Action Plan for the reduction of absolute poverty (PARPA) seem to have strong links with addressing deforestation.

This is a very impressive list, and a decent attempt to address the underlying causes of deforestation is in section 6. What is needed are analyses to assess how and whether the main underlying causes of deforestation are being adequately addressed (e.g. energy, disharmonies between policies) and develop proxy indicators to monitor them.

The main challenge is however on coordination, since the programmes and activities are implemented by different ministries and it is not clear how or whether reducing deforestation and degradation is considered or recognized as a common objective.

It is also not clear whether the key strategies have been arrived at using comprehensive stakeholder processes, particularly the ones on forestry.

**6. What would be needed to reduce deforestation and forest degradation?**

These have been quite clearly spelt out and it is pleasing to note some underlying causes such as energy, poor and use zoning, concession management, capacity for law enforcement etc have been listed (see section 6 and 6 a of the R-PIN)

**Have you considered the potential relationship between REDD strategies and your country's broader development agenda?**

Reference has been made of other supportive policies in section 5 of the R-PIN. A national REDD working group has been proposed to focus attention to REDD objectives which should also help develop interest and working groups at the sub-national levels.

**Has any technical assistance been received, or is planned on REDD?**

Not much beyond land cover mapping by Italy and a proposed capacity building project by IEED and CIFOR in the pipeline

**7. What stakeholder consultation process you would use for developing and implementing REDD under FCPF support?**

There is already a tradition of public / stakeholder consultations in Mozambique as adequately described in the R-PIN. The formation of a National REDD Working Group (provided that its participation base is broad and combines both technical, implementation and policy making components) should be adequate.

**8. Implementing REDD strategies: challenges to introducing effective REDD strategies, and how might they be overcome? Would performance-based payments through REDD be a major incentive for implementing a more coherent strategy to tackle deforestation?**

A clear table in which challenges and proposed solutions are presented is available. However some of the solutions may not be relevant to meet the challenges, hence the challenges identified need to be defined properly before the appropriate solutions can be proposed.

For example, the solution to the challenge of an Outdated National Forest Strategy is an update of a strategy, which should have information of biomass distribution. This would appear to be a data challenge, not necessarily of an outdated strategy. This section needs better definition of the challenges. The challenge of Technical Capacity also needs clearer and more precise definitions. It is noteworthy that, a system for sharing benefits under REDD need to be worked out since the one on timber royalties does not function well.

**9. REDD strategy monitoring and implementation: How are forest cover and land use change monitored today, and its constraints?**

There is no specialized unit in government to monitor forest resources and the Forest Inventory Unit formed in the 90's but has tended to concentrate on timber-centered assessments. This is understandable but a REDD Programme would require a well trained and resourced unit whether in the public or private sector

The new Directorate of Lands and Forests with its Inventory Unit would need assistance to start a nationwide monitoring system together or in conjunction with the Surveyor's (Cartographic) and Remote Sensing Office.

**10. Additional benefits of potential REDD strategy, and how to monitor them: biodiversity and rural livelihood?**

These are well stated, of which control of fires features quite strongly since it is associated with land degradation, atmospheric emissions and even respiratory illnesses. Others include enhancement of rural livelihoods and increased tourism.

**11. What assistance are you likely to request from FCPF Readiness Mechanism?**

This section has been addressed quite well and 5 areas have been identified and defined. These are National Consultative Process, Assessment of historical emissions, Formulating a National Strategy, an Emissions and Deforestation Monitoring Scheme )

**12. Donors and international partners already cooperating with you on REDD.**

There is no particular donor at the moment but there is already interest among bilateral donors which would be encouraged into action by the FCPF Process

**13. Country's Potential Next Steps and Schedule:**

These are creating public awareness, clarifying the challenges, opportunities and associated fund raising.

**14. Attachments and their usefulness:**

There were no attachments

CONFIDENTIAL