

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

May 28, 2008

Guidelines for Reviewers:

- 1) This review form is a record of your review, which may be disclosed 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 criteria from the FCPF Information Memorandum, the Participants Committee Selection Criteria, and the numbered R-PIN major topics, as requested in the right-hand column. Select a mark from the following scale: NA; Not Addressed. 1: Inadequately addresses criterion. 2: Barely addresses criterion. 3: Average, or adequately addresses criterion. 4: Good job of addressing criterion. 5: Excellent job of addressing criterion.

1) Country submitting the R-PIN: [SURINAME] 2) Date of Review: February 2009 3) Name and affiliation of R-PIN Reviewer: TAP Review Synthesis	
I. Summary Assessment of the Quality and Completeness of the R-PIN: <i>Note with value of 1 – 5</i>	Mark (score):
Criterion (i): Ownership of the proposal by both the government and relevant stakeholders:	
Criterion (ii): Consistency between national and sectoral strategies and proposed REDD Strategy:	
Criterion (iii): Completeness of information and data provided:	
Criterion (iv): Clarity of responsibilities for the execution of REDD activities to be financed:	
Criterion (v): Feasibility of proposal and likelihood of success:	
SUMMARY SCORE: <i>add scores above and enter sum into box on right</i>	SUM:
Improvements the country could make to R-PIN, and any TA needs for it:	
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:	

Geographic and biome balance: across the world’s main forest biomes.

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 Responses to Template Questions:

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

<p>1. Government focal point, and ownership and consultation in producing the R-PIN: Even the proposal is treated at the highest level in the government, with the participation of NGOs, it’s seems unclear who is the focal point, Ministry of Labor (ATM) or the Foundation for Forest Management and Production Control (SBB). Lack of participation of Indigenous and Maroon peoples representative given the cases put before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in regards the forest people’s land tenure rights.</p>
<p>2. Identification of institutions responsible for: forest monitoring, law enforcement, conservation, and coordination across forest, agriculture and rural development: No information on the <i>status quo</i> of the new authority is provided, in special the potential impact of such institution on a REDD strategy. In general appears some coordination but It’s not clear from the R-PIN how the coordination is done in practice.</p>
<p>3. Current country situation: Where do deforestation and forest degradation occur, main causes, estimates of greenhouse gas emissions, data available? Key issues in forest law enforcement and forest sector governance? There is a clear explanation on the main causes by sectors. Mining seems the main cause of deforestation. Special context of the situation of the forest in Suriname which will require specific REDD strategy, based on conservation. Methodological challenges need to be overcome.</p>
<p>4. Data available on indigenous peoples and forest dwellers? Doesn’t include information on Amerindians (Indigenous Peoples). Suriname has plenty IPs groups with different languages. We need to know more about their distribution in the country. Indigenous Organizations such as VIDS and OIS can provide the information on IPs. More information on the dialogue with IPs is required to see how they can impact REDD strategy or how REDD can impact IPs.</p>
<p>5. Current strategy in place to address deforestation and forest degradation. What stakeholder process was used to arrive at it? No significant consequences of the implementation of the strategy have been identified. It would be better to have additional information. There is generic mention of stakeholder consultation. How REDD will have to be balanced against economic development plans.</p>
<p>6. What would be needed to reduce deforestation and forest degradation? Has country considered the potential relationship between REDD strategies and country’s broader development agenda? The deforestation rate in Suriname is very low. Country will only succeed in contributing to the global REDD effort by securing sufficient resources that will make development move away from activities that convert forests rather than finance their direct use. R-PIN need to have additional and clear information on how the list of activities will help in addressing the main causes of deforestation. How REDD strategy could generate the amount of resources for financing the MOP activities. Has any technical assistance been received, or is planned on REDD? It seems they are able to gather information from France and Brazil satellites on forest cover but not clear on how this initiatives will be or not integrated into REDD strategy.</p>

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

it is not clear what concrete results were obtained from the earlier efforts of consultation as to orient and improve on the new one focusing on REDD. More information on the lessons learned from the 2003 process should be presented. More information on how this interdepartmental committee will be established and work is welcome. National Forestry Policy experience can be improved. Certainly VIDS and OIS are representatives and would be great to work together with them and local leaders as well.

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?

As mentioned before, this section, together with the preceding ones on the same general topic, need further work. There is little in the way of convincing potential investors that resources directed at Suriname's forests would result in net positive benefits for global carbon emission reductions. There is no evidence to support the range of 2 to 6 dollars per hectare, further explanation should be given. Further consideration on opportunity cost is needed.

9. REDD strategy monitoring and implementation: How forest cover and land use change are monitored today, and any constraints in this approach?

All essentially derived and extrapolated from forest plots. Economic modeling approach brings methodological challenges that need to be further clarified. Depending of the mode "calibration" and assumptions the results could complete different, not only in terms of scale but also signal.

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

The proposal mentions a very important point, which is the opportunity to extend these efforts to the entire Guayana Shield, a biogeographically distinct region harbouring unique features that should be represented in conservation priority-setting schemes. The region has been very poorly surveyed for its biodiversity, and remains one of the most pristine of tropical forests on Earth.

11. What assistance is country likely to request from FCPF Readiness Mechanism ?

A very short and general description is presented. Annex 4 (General Readiness Plan Activities) could be used as a basis to better describe the assistance needed.

- Assessment of historical emissions
- Deforestation modeling and projections
- Development of National REDD strategy
- Establishment of monitoring system
- Implement a transparent stakeholder consultation

12. Donors and international partners already cooperating with country on REDD.

WWF, CI, Tropenpos and RedLac. Further information on potential synergies could be provided.

13. Country's Potential Next Steps and Schedule:

The list is quite short and should be made consistent with Annex 4 (General Readiness Plan Activities).

- Awareness campaign
- Establishment of project committees
- Development of reference scenarios
- Development of forest inventory and monitoring plan

All these are not detailed in the RPIN.

14. Attachments and their usefulness:

Annex 4 raises our understanding.

CONFIDENTIAL