

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Plan External Review Template**

(interim, April 24, 2009, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 2)

GUYANA R-PLAN:

SYNTHESIS REVIEW BY FCPF TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL (TAP)

June 8, 2009

Review of R-Plan of: GUYANA

Lead TAP Reviewer: Juergen Blaser, synthesizing reviews by 8 TAP members

Date of review : May 15 - June 4, 2009. The current TAP-review is a revised version of the review submitted to the Government of Guyana on May 22, 2009. It reflects the changes made by the Government of Guyana in its R-Plan and received on June 1, 2009.

- A Summary comments of the TAP
- B Cross-cutting criteria
- C Standards to be met

A Summary Comments of the Technical Advisory Panel Regarding the REDD Readiness Plan (R-PLAN) submitted by the Government of Guyana

Overview:

Most of Guyana's forests are still intact and widely unexploited. These forests are sparsely populated and are home mainly to Amerindian communities, who make their entire livelihoods out of its resources. The forests are characterized by a predominance of relatively slow-growing, valuable timber species and smaller trees than in most other tropical regions; this is due to the inherently low fertility of soils derived from the ancient Guiana shield rocks. Guyana has introduced and implemented a well-designed forest management and control system in its timber production forests. While deforestation is relatively low (0.3%), it is severe in certain locations. Various scales of mining and agricultural activities are the principal causes of forest loss and degradation. Other drivers causing forest loss and degradation include international demand for both forest and agricultural products. Infrastructure developments both within Guyana and in neighboring Brazil are other drivers, as is possible 'leakage' which may be caused by pro-REDD policies in Brazil.

In principle, Guyana is a promising candidate for embarking on the development and future implementation of a national REDD-strategy. It represents the situation of so-called high-forested, low deforestation countries for which the future pathway on land management can be either continuous management and conservation of most of its forest estate or increased conversion of forests to other land-uses than forests. The President of Guyana fully stands behind an overall strategy aiming at increasing the value of forests in the country. He decided to embark on REDD, designating the Guyana Forestry Commission (GFA) as the logical point agency for REDD in Guyana. Being the lead forestry agency, this is appropriate, but as no one agency will be able to cover all aspects of forest-based land use, it is important that cross sectoral expertise is fully integrated into the process of REDD Readiness and implementation, in order to operate

effectively and to develop the broad ownership needed for the introduction and sustainable implementation of a REDD program.

As the country is sparsely populated and the economic activities heavily concentrated in only few sectors, the Government of Guyana potentially has great capacity to design and implement a sustainable development pathway based on the use and conservation of forest resources, more than many other developing countries. Thus, developing an overall REDD-Strategy, based on a comprehensive land-use plan, and integrating both, the economic forces that drive deforestation (mainly mining), and the livelihood concerns of the Amerindian population living in the forest areas, constitute an important step towards such a forestry-based sustainable development pathway. The national vision for REDD needs to be based on a clear understanding of the current and future drivers of deforestation and degradation and the likely trade-offs and incentives that will be needed to commit forests for emission reductions and for enhancement of carbon sinks.

Strengths of the R-Plan:

The R-Plan clearly and succinctly outlines the Government of Guyana role in the development of a REDD strategy and demonstrates the full ownership of the REDD-process by Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC) and its REDD Secretariat (RS). The document submitted is fairly complete and contains a number of useful and comprehensive documents and maps made available as appendixes to the R-Plan draft.

The full implementation of the proposed R-Plan will greatly advance the concept of sustainable forest management in Guyana. While the Plan is fairly comprehensive, it can be improved along the lines as outlined in the TAP report. The R-Plan makes reference (but should go more into details) to important key governance issues, such as the forest/mining link and participation of rural and indigenous people in decision-making and implementation of REDD. However, it is understood that the solution package to solve such key issues should be part of the work program in the Readiness phase and that progress should be made according to deliverables that are clearly stated in the R-Plan. Taking this approach into account, the Guyana R-Plan has an interesting demonstration element for other countries in the region. Another innovative element would be added if the R-Plan is revised in line to get a clearer vision of how consultations would occur and what capacity is needed to accomplish them.

The GFC has undertaken initial consultations regarding REDD with other government agencies, academics, environmental NGOs, and Indigenous Peoples, and has submitted an R-PLAN that reflects a significant amount of work and thought. The R-Plan presents plans for many specific activities designed to increase the understanding of deforestation and degradation in the country and put in place a system for Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV); consult with stakeholders about REDD; and improve understanding of REDD and other environmental issues among a wide range of stakeholders, among other activities.

Issues in the R-Plan:

The R-PLAN has made a good attempt to describe the current drivers of deforestation and degradation but needs to be clearer on the current and projected situation regarding deforestation and forest degradation. In addition it has not articulated a strategy for using policy instruments to maintain forest cover and improve quality. In fact, it deals more with the symptoms of deforestation and forest degradation rather than with the real drivers, i.e., policy and market failures. It is understood that such a diagnosis will require additional work and that considerable effort must be undertaken to increase awareness and understanding of the issues among the key stakeholders before a comprehensive REDD strategy can be developed. It also needs to identify other drivers, mostly outside the forest sector, such as international global markets, which it may not address on its own but through multilateral instruments and mechanisms. The current draft acknowledges these issues, and indicates that the body of new work that the R-Plan proposes to fund and accomplish would allow Guyana to address these issues.

What needs to be improved in the current R-Plan draft are the presentation of the proposed measures and how they will work and whether the activities as currently presented in the R-Plan will generate a comprehensive REDD strategy. It

may be useful if more information can be provided by reflecting and analyzing the situation from this angle, and also establishing the linkage between the proposed activities at the national level and the requirements for REDD at the international level.

The TAP identified a number of issues that can be grouped into 4 principal clusters:

(1) Forestry-Centric Approach of the Proposal.

While the full ownership of the GFC is one of the great assets of the proposal, the single ownership by the GFC is of concern. This can create a number of serious shortcomings, as e.g.

- The major drivers of deforestation lie outside of the forestry sector. Historically, the GFC has had moderate success in effectively regulating forest industry activities, though their capacity and effectiveness has been growing significantly over the last several years. However, the jump to effectively regulate forest land use across sectors is a big one and a commitment of different sectors of the economy will be required, in particular key sectors such as mining and agriculture. This should be clearly reflected in the TORs and composition of the REDD Secretariat.
- Responses to forest loss and management suggested in the R-Plan focus on improved forest management within the forestry sector. There are, however, only limited potentials in this regard as Guyana's forests are characterized by low forest productivity and the limited number of commercially attractive species capable of generating positive resource rentals from forest exploitation.

(2) Full integration of local stakeholders in the development of the REDD-strategy.

To effectively prepare a comprehensive REDD strategy, there needs to be a clear understanding by the REDD secretariat about what a comprehensive consultation process with local stakeholders is about. The purpose of full consultations are to involve the various sectors of society in discussing, identifying, and understanding in an interactive way, their level of knowledge about climate change and sustainable development linked to REDD. The consultation plan thus needs to be extensive and comprehensive, more for the purpose of pursuing sustainable development, which is what the broader and longer term REDD agenda requires. With regard to indigenous people, it is unclear how participants in the process are chosen and what their roles in accepting pro-REDD policies and implementing its programs; otherwise the process of how information is transferred is well described.

(3) Realistic Future Reference Level Projections

The Plan makes the argument that historical deforestation rates understate future emission levels and that much of the now forested landscape will come under pressure for forest loss and degradation from increased timber demand and conversion to agriculture. This is questionable due to the inherently low fertility of the Guiana shield soils, which is reflected both in forest productivity and agricultural land capability. Such biophysical constraints limit the attractiveness of the area for development and current patterns of under development will almost certainly persist with a few notable and spatially limited exceptions.

To be internationally credible, future emission reference levels should focus on historical emission patterns and the likely impact of activities not singly dependent on land fertility and agricultural suitability e.g., the progressively upgrading road link to Brazil will be important here and the impact zone of this key development should be explicitly considered.

(4) Incorporate Assessment of the Economics of the Major Land Uses causing Deforestation and Degradation

A main view of the TAP is that sufficient attention needs to be given to the drivers of deforestation in the further process of the R-Plan implementation. In particular, there is a need to assess the economics of the land uses currently causing forest loss and degradation. Without this information, it is impossible to hold meaningful consultations with stakeholders or develop feasible pilot activities, and to reform policy and put them into practice. The TORs for the development of the REDD strategy will need to make provision for such assessment if readiness is really to be achieved.

Recommendations for Further Elaboration of the R-Plan:

When the TAP went through each of the specific cross-cutting criteria and standards that it was asked to comment on, in many cases the TAP found that the R-PLAN did not meet or only partially met the standards that the FCPF had instructed the TAP to base its conclusions on. Meeting the requirements of many of those criteria and standards will require additional activities that would be funded using World Bank readiness funds. The Government of Guyana cannot reasonably be expected to meet those requirements prior to receiving funds and undertaking those activities. Thus the TAP understands that the R-Plan should not be foreseen as a completed plan, but rather a document that lays out the planning steps leading to REDD readiness. Guyana may need some guidance on larger strategic and framework questions and in the preparation of scenarios and emissions planning. Thus, the TAP recommends undertaking further planning through 2 or 3 phases with a more targeted emphasis on quality of the outputs to fully prepare a R-Plan and start readiness.

The TAP made a list of recommendations in respect to the cross-cutting areas and in respect to the standards to be met. The TAP is of the view that the many specific comments and recommendations it had provided on the different aspects will serve as useful inputs for the Government of Guyana in the further process and in going forward in the preparation of the national REDD-strategy. In any case for REDD to meet its promise of generating additional improvements in net reductions in GHG-emissions related to forests, the Government of Guyana will need to clearly identify the magnitude, location, and direct and underlying causes of changes in forest cover and quality-- and then design a REDD strategy that is specifically focused on addressing those direct and underlying causes. This cross-sectoral task will have to involve at least the Government agencies dealing with mining and agriculture and national development policy frameworks, which have direct or indirect bearings on land use. In addition to such a more integrative approach at governmental level, free, prior and informed consultation with and respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples is an important issue that needs to be fully integrated in the R-Plan in order to make the process credible. The R-Plan might also need to address outstanding conflicts of land tenure and territorial rights, among other aspects.

B. Cross-cutting criteria

(reflecting a general view of what an R-Plan should provide):

Criteria Number: *(from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 2)*

1

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-Plan by the government and relevant stakeholders.

Inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by major stakeholders could be assessed in three ways:

- a. The consultation and participation process for R-Plan development thus far³, the extent of ownership within government and REDD coordinating body, as well as in the broader national stakeholder community, and the Consultation and Participation Plan included in the R-Plan (which looks forward in time);
- b. The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national working group on REDD, in terms of including major stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department; and
- c. Inclusion of elements in the R-Plan that adequately address the expressed concerns and recommendations of major stakeholders, and/or expressions of their support for the R-Plan.

Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:

- (a) Consultation and Participation.** The R-Plan clearly and succinctly outlines the Government of Guyana (GoG) projected role in the development of a REDD strategy and demonstrates the full ownership of the REDD- process by Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC) and its REDD Secretariat (RS). This is based on a full commitment by the highest level of Government (leadership by the Office of the President).

A preliminary wider consultation process with stakeholders outside the GFC has been conducted (section 2b and consultation summary report). Given that Readiness *per se* has not started yet, this is encouraging. To effectively prepare readiness, there needs to be, however, a clearer understanding by GoG that this kind of information sharing is only the beginning of a process that has much larger aims. The purpose of full consultations are to involve the various sectors of society in discussing, identifying, and understanding in an interactive way, their level of knowledge about climate change and sustainable development linked to REDD. The consultation plan thus needs to be extensive and comprehensive, more for the purpose of making sustainable development happen, which is what the broader and longer term REDD agenda requires. With regard to indigenous people, it is unclear how participants in the process are chosen; otherwise the process of how information is transferred is well described. While the revised R-Plan on Pg 21 sought to indicate criteria for selection of NGOs to the RCOC, it is still unclear how participants will be chosen. The indigenous peoples are not a monolithic group and some still speak their native language. Hence, being cognizant of this in the consultation process, and ensuring we have material and resource persons that understand this, is also vital. Furthermore, from the criteria listed, it is unclear whether to be selected one has to fulfill one or all of the criteria.

- (b) Cross-cutting nature of REDD.** On one hand, cross-cutting issues are well covered by the R-Plan as illustrated by the RS and of its relations with the most important governmental agencies. On the other hand, many sectors of society do not seem to have been included in the process, such as business and science (e.g. the University of Guyana that is a major research entity; the Guyana Forest Producers Association), regional and local government, regional and local representatives of agencies involved in environment, and wider groups of indigenous leaders and NGOs (e.g. Amerindian Peoples Association (APA) and the Guyana Organization of Indigenous Peoples, GOIP). These groups are not mentioned in the Consultation report. While the R-Plan states that Component 2 a and b was shared with some indigenous organizations during a 5-day Regional Meeting, this process needs to be outlined and the document in its entirety shared with these organizations for their feedback.

There is a need of full involvement of agencies directly involved in land use, mining, planning, agriculture and environment remains a major gap. Land use reform is one of the most important challenges for REDD. Currently, decisions on land use are made based mainly on sectoral interests and the various Departments make decisions independently of each other (though most of the entities would have representation on their Boards from the other Agencies and the GGMC, GFC and the GLSC all sit on the EPA Board). There is no environmental strategy or current policy that would be an essential driver for REDD to be instigated throughout Government. This aspect needs to be highlighted in the R-Plan and tackled with some urgency in the readiness process. The reviewers get the impression that the R-Plan was exclusively prepared by the Forestry Commission and that there is the risk of a distinct lack of 'ownership' by a larger segment of Guyana's society. Indicating that they were consulted and data accessed from such entities as a means of building ownership is superficial at best. The reviewers cannot assess if there is a full 'vision' of REDD process by country's political elite and if the outcomes of a full REDD process are understood beyond the GFC. E.g. it is of particular importance that the existing inter-ministerial Land Use Committee and the Natural Resources and Environment Advisory Committee (when dealing with REDD) also comprise, where practical, external advisory civil society, business, academics and Indigenous representation.

(c) *Concerns and Recommendations of major stakeholders.* The GFC/RS sought to create an adequate setting by meeting most of the indigenous and forest-dependent communities within their home grounds. However, it remains unclear from the document whether the communities have fully understood and are supportive of the REDD initiative. This needs to be clearly confirmed in the further process. Additionally, based on the feedback from the consultations it appears that a main concern surrounds "benefit sharing" and "further quota restrictions on logging". It will, therefore, be important that a plan of action be identified by the GFC/RS that will include a delineation of roles and responsibilities, benefit sharing mechanisms and reporting structures. The revised R-Plan includes a Table on Pg 12 that indicate efforts to, and challenges encountered, to address REDD. While a useful synopsis there need to be some prioritization as not all these challenges can be addressed simultaneously. The revised Plan still lacks a framework or any discussion on benefit sharing and reporting structures. There is no process described in any part of the Plan that would allow for a full understanding and expression of interest, planning or support on the part of the stakeholders in such important issues.

Of particular concern to Amerindian communities and their representatives are those elements of the legal framework (both at the national and international) that provide recognition and protection to the rights of Indigenous peoples in regard to their traditional lands, territories and resources even where these are yet to be legally titled. The concern is that in its present form, the R-Plan is superficial when it refers to these rights. It is acknowledged that the R-Plan recognizes that "the implementation of REDD, and participation in the REDD programme will not be mandatory but rather will be optional [for Indigenous communities]. [These] Communities will therefore choose whether they would like to get involved following careful decision making after having been fully informed by the GoG [and] ...This will be done after appropriate consultations with communities."

However, one TAP member with legal expertise in IP issues in Guyana observes that there still remains concern within the IP community that "careful decision making after being fully informed by the GoG" and "after appropriate consultations" should respect free, prior and informed consent processes within the parameters of the legal framework (both at national and international law) that provide recognition and protection to the rights of indigenous peoples in regard to their traditional lands, territories and resources even where these are untitled. This TAP member observes that while the R-Plan recognizes that Amerindian communally titled lands are comparable to privately owned lands and by extension such communities have the right to consent to any activities on their lands, it fails to recognize similar consent requirements for untitled communities and their rights to their traditional lands. This may be partly explained by the fact that the Amerindian Act 2006 does not provide protection to untitled Amerindian communities and their traditional lands in the same manner as it does for titled community lands. The latest estimates emanating from the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs indicate that some ten communities remain without title to their traditional lands, forty out of ninety-six titled communities are still to be demarcated and added to this is the unspecified number of titled communities that have claims over traditional lands for extension to their currently titled lands. Therefore, the R-Plan needs at least to recognize these outstanding unresolved Indigenous land tenure issues.

	<p>The R-Plan further states that “with regards to untitled Indigenous communities, consultations will be done with these groups and following titling, these communities will also be given an opportunity to participate in the readiness programme.” This is does not yet clarify how issues such as delimitation of the lands in question will be done in particular what will be the procedure and criteria for determining such delimitation and what timeframe is estimated for titling to be completed.</p> <p>Despite the protection provided in national and international law it is essential that all public consultation on the R-Plan should also comply with standards set out in the World Bank's own Operational Procedure 4.10 which affirm <i>inter alia</i> that “The Bank provides project financing only where free, prior, and informed consultation results in broad community support to the project by the affected Indigenous Peoples” (OP 4.10, paragraph 1)</p> <p>The Plan places collaboration with the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs and the National Tshaos Council (the latter not fully operational) as key to keeping stakeholders well informed. Nonetheless, Indigenous peoples and forest dependent communities have often complained in the past of the difficulty they constantly experience in having access to information and processes needed to make informed decisions. Communities need adequate time and resources including independent technical advice to become fully involved in REDD mechanisms.</p> <p><u>In respect to ownership, transparency and dissemination, the further development of the R-Plan and its implementation could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a strategy for moving stakeholder involvement from a “consultation” mode to a more inclusive, interactive “consultation/participation” approach. Such an approach could include, <i>inter alia</i>, a consultation mechanisms within the inter-ministerial Land Use Committee in respect to REDD; 2. Identify the representatives of key stakeholders and local authorities, including existing alliances, social structures, and possibly prevailing conflicts among local groups and/or external groups and NGOs that will be actively involved in the R-Plan implementation; 3. Ensure that the staffing of the REDD Secretariat be drawn from across government agencies and stakeholder groups that affect forest and forest land use and that it include staff with skills in multi-sectoral planning and participatory planning processes; 4. Provide, e.g. in the form of a summary table, additional socio-economic data in relation to forests, forest land use and conversion i.e., financial output over the last ten years, the contribution of the various aspects forest land use and conversion to GDP over the last ten years, number of persons/households that are dependent on these resources, project population growth, levels of poverty in the regions of major forest resources. This information would help to understand the role of forests (and the GFC) in the wider development agenda of the country; 5. Explain how the plan will address or at the very least recognize outstanding unresolved Indigenous land tenure issues and how it will address REDD on traditionally used land not recognized by land titles; 6. Develop the criteria being used to determine membership of “relevant NGOs” and community groups in the proposed Consultation and Outreach Committee (RCOC); While the revised R-Plan sought to explain the criteria the standards seem stringent and may exclude rather than be inclusive. Furthermore, criterion (d) seems unrealistic. It is also unclear how many or if all of these criteria have to be met for inclusion. 7. Identity in the summary of the consultation plan, its objectives, responsibilities, and inputs to be provided for each group of stakeholders.
<p>2</p>	<p>Alignment of the proposed REDD strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.</p> <p>Does the R-plan identify the major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and design its REDD strategy and R-Plan to address those drivers with feasible programs and policies likely to alter land use incentives and behavior (and to avoid displacing deforestation and degradation from one area to another)?</p>

Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:

Four direct causes of deforestation are identified, mining (major cause), large-scale selected logging (forest degradation), agricultural activity and infrastructure development such as roads. Most of them are rubber stamped by a state license. The revised R-Plan states on p. 14 (under REDD and Forest activities) that "with the implementation of REDD activities, it is expected that mining, forestry and agricultural activities will be allowed to continue in accordance with existing laws and guidelines which govern their practices. There will be continued and increased stringent monitoring and enforcement of compliance of the operators by the respective regulatory bodies. Projects that are currently going through the permitting (as in the case of existing forest concessions and mining leases) process will continue. However, they must adhere to national requirements under current laws and environmental management procedures". It is appreciated that Guyana has fairly robust laws and guidelines and combined with the present monitoring and enforcement capabilities of the regulatory bodies this ensure some degree of compliance. However there is a need to recognize that challenges do exist and there is a need for a clear outline of how these challenges will be dealt with in order to improve and maintain compliance to a sufficient standard to enable REDDS readiness.

Harmonized natural resource legislation and national land-use policy has been identified in Guyana as necessary for improved land and natural resource use, but until today no noticeable progress has been made in this area. It is neither not sufficient to simply state that GGMC must upgrade its monitoring and enforcement systems given that mining is identified as the major cause of deforestation and forest degradation. Rather it would be recommendable to develop the basis for a comprehensive land-use plan, where the current and future mining areas are clearly identified and other areas will be brought under a full REDD scheme.

The reviewers recommend tackling the forest/mining issue with priority, through developing a functional working relationship between the GGMC, GFC/RS and other related parties. Until today it seems not to be clear who has the right of determination of tenure to a particular area where there are multiple potential uses. In addition, a proper distinction needs to be made between large scale and small-scale mining operations and emphasis needs to be given to the enforcement of environmental management plans for medium and large-scale mining operations. While the revised R-Plan added some comments on this issue on Pg 12, it does yet not address the concerns of the TAP nor does it address the issues raised here.

A fundamental aspect of the readiness preparation should be to develop a clear picture of the economics of the various scales of mining and agricultural activities that are the principal causes of forest loss and degradation in Guyana. This will allow the feasibility of alternatives to be assessed in relation to range of forest carbon pricing scenarios. In this regard, it is felt that the utilization of the McKinsey Report (2008) would be of some value.

The draft R-Plan has laid out fairly well the aspects relating to forest degradation, including the expansion of the timber species utilization base and concentration of multiple uses of the forest aimed at more intensive silvicultural management in restricted areas and thus raising forest management efficiency.

An issue that need to be addressed in the R-Plan is that REDD processes could eventually result in severe restrictions on Amerindian People being able to utilize the forests for their traditional activities and livelihoods, including shifting cultivation. This concept is an anathema to REDD and needs to be addressed in the R-Plan. The sustainable utilization of forests needs to be encouraged to help sustain poor and forest communities and should be part of the solution package.

In respect to drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, the R-Plan development could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:

1. Undertake detailed assessments of the economics of mining, agricultural, unsustainable logging and other land use practices that are leading forest loss and degradation.
2. Develop a priority list of tangible policy reforms and measures required to address the main direct drivers of deforestation
3. Develop a time line and an output scheme for those measures that will be undertaken over the coming 3 yrs.

3	<p>Coherence between the proposed activities in the R-Plan (including early ideas on a potential REDD Strategy) and existing national and sectoral strategies:</p> <p>Does the R-Plan make clear reference to country sector strategies and governance arrangements (e.g., FLEGT), and identify major potential synergies or inconsistencies with REDD plans and process? Does the R-Plan discuss and propose to analyze the role and interests of forest-dependent and indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers, including land tenure and natural resource rights? Is there evidence that other government actors (e.g., finance ministry, agriculture ministry, land ministry) are committed to supporting implementation through enacting, implementing and/or funding supportive policies and actions within their own sectors?</p> <p><i>Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:</i></p> <p>From the R-PLAN it can be concluded that there is certain coherence between the R-Plan and the general government policy. The way in which RS is positioned and why it was designed in such a way is well explained. The R-Plan makes satisfactory reference to the various Forest Regulations and Laws governing the forest sector and to other arrangements. However, the R-Plan does yet not provide an analysis of the potential synergies or inconsistencies between national and sectoral strategy and the process of getting ready for a REDD-Strategy. The R-Plan identifies the integral role that Indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities will play "in ensuring that their benefits are secured" and that they will be involved in "discussions to ensure equity in the distribution of REDD benefits, secure land rights and REDD as a positive contributor of poverty alleviation". Nevertheless, what is lacking is a description of the procedure and framework in which these initiatives and discussions will take place, including possible contradiction with existing national and sectoral programmes.</p> <p>REDD implementation will need to be closely coordinated with other sectors and agencies dealing with land administration and land use, e.g. GGMC, Guyana's Land & Survey Commission, EPA (Environmental Protection Agency), MoA. A number of regulations supporting these sectors may require adjustment to make them "ready for REDD". The reviewers see here one of the difficulties; until today, environmental issues have had a low ranking in respect to land-use decision-making in Guyana (in spite of the existence of the EPA). What would be needed is to raise the level of understanding and transparency. The major constraint seems to be perceptions of environmental management as costs rather than benefits and hence obstacles to economic development. This is compounded by an inadequacy of resources and an insufficient supportive institutional environment to enforce the accompanying regulations to the laws. To implement the policies and measures needed to reduce forest loss and degradation successfully, all the Ministries responsible for any aspect of land use must come together to clarify land use allocation, land titles and simplify the way in which decisions are taken (institutional and operational procedures across all sectors of Government.</p> <p>The R-Plan, while identifying as one of its strategies to encourage compliance, does not adequately address how such compliance can be achieved. The role of the GFC/RS in this respect is not clear; its role, goals and mission needs to be recognized by all REDD interested parties and all relevant national or sectoral strategies.</p> <p>The fact that the R-Plan was mainly prepared by staff and consultants of the GFC/RS may be interpreted as a missed opportunity to already secure in an early stage of preparing readiness a wider buy-in of all interested parties, including government agencies, communities, civil society and private sector. As noted in the comments on Criteria 1, It is important that the staff of the REDD Secretariat have cross sectoral expertise and an understanding of the perspectives of key sectoral stakeholders in areas such as mining and agriculture.</p> <p>GFC sought to provide a roadmap for going forward. However, items identified as drivers of deforestation in the Table on pg 46/47 are really symptoms of policy-failures. Policy and market failure as drivers should be highlighted and discussed.</p> <p><u>In respect to coherence between R-PLAN and national strategies, the R-Plan could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide an analysis of the potential synergies or inconsistencies between existing sectors/land-use strategies and the REDD strategy and the trade offs in key sectors that will need to be addressed to achieve sustainable reductions in forest loss and degradation; 2. Indicate as one of its potential strategies, the conduct of feasibility studies on livelihood alternatives that could be integrated in the R-PLAN; 3. Describe the procedures how local stakeholders will be involved in the proposed REDD benefit sharing and REDD
----------	---

	<p>activities addressing poverty alleviation;</p> <p>4. Provide factual evidence that other Agencies are committed to supporting the development of a strategy for REDD, the establishment and functioning of the REDD Secretariat and the involvement of non-state stakeholders in the management of the national REDD strategy.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Multiple benefits:</p> <p>Does the R-Plan propose to identify ways of seeking multiple benefits as part of national REDD strategies, including but not limited to biodiversity, poverty reduction and benefit sharing, and monitoring those impacts.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:</i></p> <p>The R-Plan makes some attempt at indicating benefits that may accrue to Guyana, particularly in the outcomes portion of Sections 3 & 6 of the document. In general terms, however, the plan makes little reference to poverty reduction, biodiversity monitoring and other services functions of forests. Underlying this is the lack of any real assessment of the economics of current land use patterns and the likely range of trade offs and benefits that REDD interventions will generate or need to address. Another aspect that needs some consideration is the potential role that forest inhabitants can play in contributing of their knowledge to conserve the environment, multiple use and traditional practices on sustainability. This also in respect to the role they will likely have in REDD, as they are key players in preserving the forests, since this is where they live and make their livelihood. Primarily because the benefits are not properly identified, the Plan lacks a (social) monitoring schedule of how impacts will be monitored over time from the R-Plan.</p> <p><u>In respect to multiple benefits, the R-Plan could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider, to the extent possible, the role of local communities/forest dwellers to generate multiple benefits and contribute as such to REDD 2. Investigate the institutional structures that will be needed to facilitate performance based payment for environmental services to remote communities not accessible to international markets 3. Develop and insert a monitoring plan that will not only focus on forest-related and biodiversity changes that may occur, but also socio-economic ones.
<p>5</p>	<p>Completeness of information and data provided:</p> <p>Does the R-Plan review key information and studies available, and perform a gap analysis of what information or data or studies are needed to assess the potential for REDD? Are ToR or actual plans provided for all components, as well as the implementation budget and schedule?</p> <hr/> <p><i>Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:</i></p> <p>The R-Plan closely follows the template provided. From a technical viewpoint, it is easy to follow the sequence of proposed activities under each component, though it is suggested that the country should do more than just list a number of activities under each section. What is missing as a key activity to develop a country-wide vision on what is the meaning of REDD in Guyana. The REDD strategy should outline where ideally Guyana would like to get to over time, not what can be achieved straight away through a number of technical outputs. What is needed is a clear vision on what the national REDD strategy is striving to achieve in the context of sustainable development. While certain components of the R-PLAN are well elaborated (such as component 8 on carbon stock assessment), other parts only give an indicative overview on planned activities (e.g. component 3). The overall list of activities is impressive, and the TAP was tempted to recommend to the country to focus on a smaller number of activities and picking a few discrete activities it thinks are critical to achieve readiness, and then explain how it would do them.</p> <p>What the R-Plan does not explicitly indicate is in which areas information is readily available and what the data gaps are. In some sections (e.g. 3.1), an impressive catalog of activities is listed but the reader is forced to infer what the gaps are. The R-Plan also contains sequencing of activities, budgets and ToRs for all the components. However, a number of ToRs are not fully elaborated and need to be revised.</p>

	<p><u>In respect to completeness of information, the R-Plan could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider to include a main initial activity that develops the country's overall vision on REDD as basis for the development of the REDD strategy; 2. Revise the terms of reference and update to include short rational, objectives, characteristic of the tasks (individual or firm), methodology, deliverables and time frame.
<p>6</p>	<p>Clear responsibilities for the execution of REDD activities to be financed:</p> <p>Is a clear, inclusive, and functioning national REDD working group process and set of institutional arrangements for executing the R-Plan studies and activities presented?</p> <p><i>Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:</i></p> <p>The R-Plan provides the information necessary to broadly assess the implementation arrangement for the realization of the REDD activities. It does also provide a description of the composition and function the REDD Secretariat (RS) and other subsidiary bodies such as the National Climate Committee (NCC), the REDD Consultation and Outreach Committee (RCOC), and the Land Use Committee. While the institutional arrangements seem logical, the TAP questions the composition of the working groups as they all have very similar membership. The risk is that such arrangement could evolve in an inward looking process focusing singly on forestry and missing the opportunity for a wider REDD cross-sectoral approach (which at the end is the ultimate aim of REDD). While the revised R-Plan addresses the issue of key stakeholders in the REDD Process and their role, there is a need to further clarify meaningful participation by non-state stakeholders, including civil society, Indigenous groups, business community, NGOs, academics, local and regional government, an those government agencies in charge of the environment and rural development. Although it is mentioned that the REDD process will expand to include Amerindians in the next phase, a clear plan of how all these groups are to be involved is missing.</p> <p>There is also some ambivalence in terms of what is the exact arrangement for the execution of the R-Plan. For example, the RS is identified as both the Working Group and as a Policy-making body. The country should assess if such a double mission is of best use for the purpose or if there is a need to have a multi-stakeholder policy-making/advisory body to help to steer and oversee the process in line with the overall vision of REDD in the country.</p> <p><u>In respect to responsibilities for the execution of REDD activities in the country, the R-Plan could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Examine the TOR and composition of the REDD Secretariat and the other related committees to ensure a balance of cross sectoral expertise and experience and reflect on the need of an overall multi-stakeholder policy making/advisory body that steers the overall REDD agenda.
<p>7</p>	<p>Leveraging and coordination of international support:</p> <p>Does the R-Plan clarify how international support for R-plan implementation will be coordinated, including an assessment of initial funding needs and technical support requirements?</p>
	<p><i>Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:</i></p> <p>The R-Plan discusses coordination by the RS within the Forestry Commission and mentions several areas of international support. The R-Plan further identifies the various funding needs and technical support required (mainly in the form of equipment), but does not identify the human resource needs for REDD. Additionally, the Plan identifies potential funding sources, but only gives detail of funding from the FCPF; there is yet no indication in the R-Plan how the remaining 60% of the estimated budget will be secured. Efforts were made in the revised version (p. 58-59) to identify possible additional sources of funding but there is no indication on how additional resources will be raised. In general terms, the coordination should be</p>

	<p>expanded beyond the forestry sector and reflect a much wider segment of society to begin to build a national understanding of the issues and to begin to demonstrate the transparency and accountability that will be required to make a REDD process credible for long-term sustainable funding.</p> <p><u>In respect to leverage and coordination of international support, the R-Plan implementation could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seek to establish synergies with existing donor-funded programmes, including in other sectors than forestry.
<p>8</p>	<p>Feasibility of proposed activities to achieve REDD Readiness, and their likelihood of success in achieving Readiness (once fully funded and implemented):</p> <p>Does the R-Plan include adequate description of a proposal for the design of an integrated system of measurement, monitoring and reporting of changes in deforestation, forest degradation, rural livelihoods, forest governance, and conservation of biodiversity? Does the R-Plan consider participatory approaches to monitoring that involve forest-dependent peoples? Full MRV design may occur at a later stage, informed by the needs of the policy process.</p>
	<p><i>Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:</i></p> <p>The R-Plan contains a notable system for forest measurement, monitoring and reporting of changes. Without doubt, the capacities of the GFC will be enhanced in terms of law enforcement, forest management, carbon pools assessment and monitoring. The legislative framework has been recently updated and most probably, the enabling conditions for carbon sequestration and committing existing forests as carbon pools will be met. In respect to socio-economic conditions, recommendations have been made in the REDD Strategy to include the indigenous and forest dependent population in the monitoring of the forests. However, in the TAP's view, the actual approach is considered as too focused on forest management and forest conservation activities with the risk that major economic deforestation players are not sufficiently engaged in the process and that rural people who depend to a great extent on forests for their livelihoods are not fully involved in the process. The risk associated is that there might be great progress on technical ground over the next few years, but with little chance of reaching sustainability and long-term "buy-in" by other land-users than the forest administration. Thus, the TAP enumerated a number of issues in respect to the feasibility to achieve REDD Readiness in Guyana and the likelihood of success, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full readiness would need an integrated approach endorsed by all land users, including those who are the main drivers of deforestation and forest degradation (economic users) and those who use the forests to secure their livelihoods. While there is full ownership and dedication by the Guyana Forestry Commission, it is not obvious from the R-Plan that other governmental agencies and private economic drivers will endorse a country-wide REDD strategy and accept working towards such endeavor over a long period of time. Clear indications have to be given that there is full political and societal endorsement to reform and implement land-use policy and balanced policies, in particular in relation to the mining sector. • The R-Plan should reflect further on the type of consultation and involvement of local communities and Indigenous people. It is not obvious from the R-Plan what issues local people have or what is the baseline of knowledge in the population in respect to REDD; Without raising unrealistic expectations, the R-PLAN should also reflect better on what people's expectations to REDD are and where and how they can participate as active players in a REDD scheme. Some TAP members had particular difficulty with the stated approach in the R-Plan that "Indigenous people and forest dwellers have an important and direct role to play in ensuring their benefits are secured". This is a very limited perspective and does not give them an active and positive role in the REDD scheme. • The R-Plan does not lay out any plans for addressing rural livelihoods. There are no plans for establishment of procedures for expenditure of funding from REDD programmes in this regard. • Too many activities are listed that need considerable outside support. It might be a better approach to reduce the number and type of activities and better describe the core activities that will be conducted while implementing the

	<p>R-Plan over the next 3 years.</p> <p><u>In respect to the feasibility of proposed activities to achieve Readiness and the likelihood of success, the R-Plan could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carefully revise the proposed REDD-strategy, reflecting on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national vision for REDD based on a clear understanding of the current and feasible future drivers of forest loss and degradation and the likely trade offs and incentives that will be needed to address these drivers to achieve real and measurable reductions in forest loss and degradation. This vision should outline where ideally Guyana would like to get over time, and adapt the R-Plan accordingly in order to define those activities that can be realistically be done in a first phase under the R-Plan implementation • Define more carefully the baseline of working with other ministries, including environment, mining, sustainable development and Amerindian affairs. Define in which aspects the REDD strategy meets with current policies, legislations and programmes of other sectors. Develop, based on such an assessment a realistic roadmap for REDD • Consider to make the institutional arrangements for REDD more inclusive in order to broaden responsibility for REDD implementation and improve transparency and accountability. 2. Based on vision and proposed longer-term strategy for REDD readiness, carefully define those activities that can be done and accounted for in a first phase of 3 years. Focus, in such a first phase, more on a solution package in respect to the major drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, in particular in collaboration with the mining sector 3. Consider to better integrate the wider options of a REDD+ approach in the R-Plan in order to give more options for future REDD implementation 4. Take more into account the barriers to implementation as well as the constraints that REDD would impose on local populations when engaging in capacity building at the local level
<p>9</p>	<p>Variety of approaches (defined as approaches that can contribute to the learning objective of the FCPF), that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Propose innovative and/or comprehensive strategies or programs and approaches appropriate to a country's circumstances on how to tackle deforestation and forest degradation; b. Focus on innovative and/or advanced concepts of monitoring, reporting and verification, including remote sensing, for forest degradation, biodiversity protection and social benefits, and/or the exploration of third-party monitoring or verification approaches; c. Propose to test new mechanisms and distribution methods of REDD revenues and benefits; and d. Provide regionally important leadership in addressing REDD or in certain technical areas relevant to REDD Readiness.
	<p><i>Reviewers' assessment of whole R-Plan for this criterion, and recommendations:</i></p> <p>The draft R-Plan in itself in an innovative idea. Its full implementation would greatly advance the concept of sustainable forest management in Guyana. The Plan is fairly comprehensive, though it can be improved along the lines as outlined in §1-8 in the present TAP report. The TAP debated how much and how far the country needs to go toward addressing key governance issues, such as the forest/mining link and participation of rural people in decision-making and implementation of REDD. The TAP concluded that solving such issues should be part of the work program in the readiness phase and that progress should be made according to deliverables that are clearly stated in the R-Plan. Taking this approach into account, the Guyana R-Plan would have an interesting demonstration element for other countries in the region. Another innovative element would be added if the R-Plan is revised in line to get a clearer vision of how consultations would occur and what capacity is needed to accomplish them.</p> <p>In order to play a role in regional leadership, it would be important that Guyana closely links with Panama as the second country of the region that has prepared a R-Plan. There are many elements that are similar in both countries, and a closer collaboration in the R-Plan formulation and implementation would be beneficial, not only for the two countries, but for other countries in the region as well.</p> <p><u>In respect to variety of approaches, the R-Plan could be strengthened by addressing the following recommendations:</u></p>

1. Consider a close exchange and mutual learning with the Panama R-Plan preparation team and discuss how such exchange could be made functional in the implementation phase of the R-Plan
2. Reflect on the issue if GFC has enough capacity in human resources to sufficiently address all proposed components in the R-Plan.
3. Ensuring that the REDD Secretariat has sufficient cross sectoral expertise and understanding to effectively involve key stakeholders out side the immediate forestry sector

C Standards to be Met by Individual R-Plan Components

(from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 2:)

1. Land use, forest policy and governance assessment:

Prepare an analytic assessment of drivers of deforestation and/or degradation, and of past experience to reduce deforestation and/or degradation, to identify promising approaches and lessons learned for use in the R-Plan and in development of the REDD strategy. Analyze key governance and legal issues related to land use pertinent to REDD actions.

Component Standard S-1: A completed assessment is presented that identifies major land use trends, land tenure and natural resource rights and issues, and direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD. Provides insightful assessment of efforts to reverse these trends and their outcome, and identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD. The assessment sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The revised draft refers to a number of the governance issues in the forest sector, but does not specify them further. The major land use trends are described and the major direct and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are listed. However, the drivers in the most relevant economic sectors are not clearly identified and the problem is insufficiently described. The report does not draw on all available information. For example, it states that it is difficult to estimate the emissions from logging and until further studies of the biomass of forest before and after logging are undertaken. However in the Iwokrama International Centre such a review was undertaken in 1999; it concluded that there was only very modest scope for savings from reduced impact logging due to the prevailing low intensity of conventional logging in Guyana's low productivity forests where only a few species were commercially attractive to the international timber market. In common with many tropical countries, much of the forest estate allocated for commercial logging is either biophysically or commercially not suitable for logging and the soils derived from the highly weather Precambrian geological substrate have extremely low fertility and very low suitability for agriculture. Current patterns of under development despite decades of effort to encourage agriculture and forestry development reflect these underlying biophysical constraints.

The suggestion that deforestation rates will dramatically grow in Guyana as a business as usual scenario is questioned by the TAP. It is the TAP's view that the future deforestation rates estimated in the McKinsey report imply the risk of inflating emission baselines and thus embark the risk of producing hot air. Infrastructure upgrades such as road from Brazil will have impacts but these impacts will be spatially explicit and require special protection efforts focused on the lands likely to be affected eg for the Linden to Lethem Road to Brazil, these will be the forests in the lands of the Annai Amerindian communities, the Iwokrama Forest Reserve, and the forests covered by DTL concession. These areas have been traversed by the road for more than decade but pressure for approaching and encroachment will grow as the standard of the road is upgraded and traffic volumes increase. The major challenge will be control of small scale miners who will find areas in Guyana attractive in times of high gold prices. They are much less dependent on infrastructure development to commercially access areas for exploitation. Furthermore, the Plan does not yet address the main land tenure and natural resource rights and issues. Lastly, it does not outline any significant assessment of efforts to reverse the deforestation and forest degradation trend or gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD.

In the TAP's view, it is necessary to address the following issues in the further process of developing and implementing the R-Plan to:

- Identify better the main direct and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in the main economic sectors and provide realistic assumptions on the future trends for each driver;
- Develop an understanding of the economics of these drivers in order to assess the feasibility of developing policies and measure that can achieve sustainable reductions in forest loss and degradation under a feasible range of carbon pricing scenarios. There is thus a need to undertake a detailed evaluation of the economics of forest loss and degradation in the major sectors as part of the TOR-3 on Development of the REDD Strategy; this is a prerequisite for developing credible alternatives in the REDD-strategy.
- Summarize clearer efforts that have been made to reverse the DD trends and their outcomes;
- Identify the gaps, challenges and opportunities to address REDD.

Furthermore, with regard policy and legal issues related to land use pertinent to REDD activities, the R-Plan needs to recognize that there are a large number of institutions created by the land and natural resource law: Forestry is regulated by the Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC), mining in forests by the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC) and agriculture within State Forests by the Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission (GLSC). Other bodies with similar or overlapping mandates are the National Parks Commission, the Wildlife Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Guyana Natural Resources Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Amerindian Affairs' Ministry which addresses Indigenous peoples land tenure issues. While it is appropriate that these bodies regulate their own sectors, there is a need for coordination between them where there is overlap as the majority of these agencies now have a role in REDD activities. The revised draft includes a new listing of and description of existing government institutions such as CGMC, NREAC, GLSC, EPA etc. What could be further improved is a clear strategy for such bodies to adopt a common understanding of REDD and agree on a national REDD policy and accept it as a nationally recognized land use option. This would directly entail a description of existing and potential conflicts between these bodies and possible mitigation options. Furthermore, such coordination between sectors and institutions could also be crucial in the issue of trade-offs analysis and any negotiations or considerations thereof.

Thus, in respect to policy and forest law coordination the R-Plan should consider that a national policy on REDD needs to be developed to allow for clear mandates to all who are working in or affected by REDD. This policy should include a clear separation of tasks for the ministerial and departmental institutions involved in REDD activities.

➔ **Standard not yet met.**

2. Management of readiness:

2a. Convene national REDD working group:

Present the design of a national working group to coordinate Readiness activities and ultimately REDD implementation, its methods of operation, and how REDD will be integrated into the existing land use policy dialogue. The working group process should include relevant internal and external stakeholders, ideally including representatives from forest dependent people, civil society and private sector, and the coordination of donor efforts supporting REDD or land use activities.

Component Standard S-2a: A clear description of the existing or proposed coordination of REDD activities nationally, adequately integrated with the existing land use policies and policy dialogue, that is inclusive of relevant government agencies and other major stakeholders that likely need to be involved in addressing REDD. The functions, membership, decision making process, and dissemination of information are adequately described, as well as procedures to ensure transparency and opportunities for public participation. Summarize a work plan to synthesize and manage the REDD program; and prepare the framework ToR for that work plan.

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The R-Plan provides a proposed coordination of REDD activities, with the REDD Secretariat identified as the main executing

agency. Furthermore, efforts are made to indicate how the REDD activities will be integrated forest policies, and issues related to the Land Use Committee and the Natural Resources and Environment Advisory Committee (NREAC). The TAP noted that the REDD Secretariat's needs to have cross sectoral expertise and understanding and that it needs to work closely with the broad-base NCC that allows a number of GFC/RS' issues to be addressed. Lastly, the R-Plan makes references to improve, during implementation, transparency and opportunities for public participation via the RCOC. Also, a consultation plan to achieve these objectives is provided. Capacity building and dissemination of information amongst the various stakeholders still need to be improved, as well as the composition of the various REDD working groups.

In respect to criteria for selection of NGOs for RCOC, the R-Plan states "there must be full representation by all indigenous groups on the RCOC." While this statement indicates an intention to ensure inclusivity it does not clarify procedure or process for selection of groups and in the absence of clear procedure and criteria could result in exclusion. Given that certain criteria have been stated regarding which NGO groups can participate, it is important that clearly defined procedures and criteria be established to ensure transparency in selection. In this regard, selection should take into consideration the right of Indigenous Peoples under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples "to participate in decision-making in matters that could affect their rights through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures"

→ Standard (in general terms) met.

2b. Prepare a REDD consultation, participation, and outreach Plan:

Prepare a REDD consultation, participation, and outreach plan, to ensure continuous, inclusive consultation and participation of a wide range of non-government and government stakeholders during the development (and eventual implementation) of your REDD strategy, implementation framework, reference scenario, monitoring system, and other R-Plan components during the Readiness phases.

Component Standard S-2b: A full consultation, participation and outreach plan (not ToR) is presented that incorporates a reasonable process of continual consultation, participation, and outreach that ensures stakeholder involvement in REDD deliberations and implementation at both the national and relevant subnational scales.

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The draft R-Plan presents a consultation, participation and outreach plan. This is a commendable effort. Nonetheless, Guyana's consultation process will require considerable efforts to meet the standards that are asked for at international level for REDD. The R-Plan needs to continuously assess if there are groups that have been omitted from the process and most seriously if the concerns of Indigenous People are included in any significant way in the implementation of the R-Plan.

Some observations that need the R-Plan developers' attention, include:

- Guyana has acceded to a number of international conventions which have been incorporated in Guyana's national laws through the Constitution which is the highest law of Guyana. The protections provided by these treaties are applicable by virtue of Constitutional Article 154A and should be used as the framework to develop clearly established procedures regarding how indigenous rights issues should be addressed in national REDD processes. These procedures should meet standards should as fee, prior and informed consent requirements which can be found in the jurisprudence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the United Nations treaty body which monitors the implementation of the International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination which is one of the international treaties incorporated into Guyana's domestic law.
- The World Bank's Operational Procedure 4.10 should be duly taken into account when conducting consultation processes.

→ Standard (in general terms) met.

3. Design the REDD strategy:

3a. Assess candidate activities for a REDD Strategy:

Summarize the outlines of a REDD strategy and candidate activities, building on and addressing the land use and policy assessment of deforestation and forest degradation drivers (in component 1), stakeholder consultations, and analytic work.

Component Standard S-3a: ToR or other information is provided to elaborate analytic work and studies needed to move from this preliminary assessment to the elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD strategy over time.

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The identified drivers do not match up with the planned approach to address deforestation and degradation. Land use policy is a major area that needs reform in Guyana but has not yet been recognized as an important step in the REDD process. It needs to be integrated as a core activity in a phased approach towards REDD. A summary list of the drivers of deforestation could be given here along with an assessment of the economics of the major land use practices leading to forest loss and degradation,. Clear links between the drivers and suggested strategies should then be made to improve the component

It will be important that the Strategy include a longer term vision for REDD, goals, objectives and guiding principles. As the country has only limited human resource capacities to implement all proposed activities in the R-Plan, there should be some thinking about concentrating on a number of core activities that needs to be addressed in a first phase (R-Plan implementation) in the framework of a longer-term readiness approach.

→ Standard partly met.

3b. Evaluate potential additional benefits of REDD, including biodiversity conservation, and rural livelihoods:

Conduct an assessment of potential benefits of the REDD strategy for biodiversity conservation, rural livelihood, and other benefits deemed important by a country (e.g., ecosystem services, water supply).

Component Standard S-3b: A set of ToR or a plan for how to more fully assess these potential benefits and potential adverse impacts is provided, that seem likely to adequately address the integration of major benefits and potential impacts (e.g., on livelihood, biodiversity, ecosystem services) and minimize adverse impacts over time in relation to the REDD strategy and evolving monitoring system.

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

The R-Plan notes that this is one of the areas to be covered in the ToR appended to the Component 3 – Design the REDD Strategy. It does not attempt to address this issue within the Plan. It is the expectation that these issues will be dealt in the implementation phase through a consultancy. Nonetheless, this part can be improved along the recommendations made by the TAP under §4 on page 6.

→ Standard partly met.

3c. Trade-offs analysis:

Assess the trade-offs across candidate elements of your REDD strategy in terms of your broader land use policy dialogue in the country, sustainable development policies, biodiversity impacts, and early estimates of benefits and costs, to help define an integrated REDD strategy.

Component Standard S-3c: ToR or a plan to further develop the capacity to conduct such a trade-off assessment is presented that seems likely to eventually ensure a reasonably robust and balanced assessment of such trade-offs (e.g., broader impacts on forests from planned developments in, inter alia, industrial logging, industrial agriculture, the energy and transportation infrastructure, and extractive industries).

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The R-Plan notes that this is one of the areas to be covered in the ToR appended to the Component 3 – Design the REDD Strategy. It does not attempt to address this issue within the R-Plan. It is the expectation that these issues will be dealt with thoroughly via a consultancy in the implementation phase. Some preliminary thoughts on how to conduct a trade-off assessment have been included in the revised R-Plan (p. 46).

It is noted that the original draft for these OTR indicated that the REDD strategy would address three major elements but only defined two of these – Technical Strengthening: Methodology and Assessment; and Demonstration Activities. This same framework is maintained in the current draft of the R-Plan and it will be important that the TOR's for this strategy include the requirement to assess the economics of the land use activities of that are the immediate drivers of forest loss and degradation so that the feasibility of proposals for the Demonstration Initiatives can be rigorously assessed.

→ Standard partly met.

3d. Risk assessment of your REDD strategy

Evaluate barriers to successful implementation of your REDD strategy, risks associated with the strategy elements you propose, and ways to reduce or compensate for those risks.

Component Standard S-3d: ToR or a plan to further elaborate such barriers and risks is presented that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual REDD strategy (e.g., capacity constraints, elite capture, perverse incentives, political economy considerations, biodiversity impacts, etc.).

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The R-Plan notes that this is one of the areas to be covered in the ToR appended to the Component 3 – Design the REDD Strategy. It does not attempt to address this issue and that it will be dealt with thoroughly via a consultancy. However, as noted in 3c above, the TORs of this consultancy need to be explicitly modified to include an economic assessment of land use activities causing or potentially causing forest loss and degradation. This will enable more informed scenario development in the strategy and risk assessment.

→ Standard met with recommendation taken into account.

4. REDD implementation framework:

Assess the institutional arrangements and legal or regulatory requirements needed to implement REDD activities, including potential reform of specific elements of the policy framework for forest governance, and design of an equitable and sustainable payment and benefit-sharing mechanism for REDD.

Component Standard S-4: ToR or a plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD in the country setting that identifies key issues, explores potential arrangements to address them, and offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. (Plans in this component may depend in part on outcomes in international negotiations).

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The revised R-Plan provides a general Implementation Framework and shortly describes who will be doing what, the legal mandates of the actors, the links of the REDD-strategy with international treaties and processes on forests, as well as the financing necessary to implement each component and the source of this funding. However, the actual modalities are likely to be set out after one or more consultancies are undertaken in the implementation of the R-Plan. What also need to be more specified and clarified in the further course of action are

- The system for in-government coordination e.g. planning and oversight committees;
- The policies and measure that will need to be implemented to achieve reductions in forest loss and degradation;
- The changes necessary in regulatory and incentive structures including mechanisms for the flow of funds; and

- The system for engaging with private entities, NGO's and local communities.

➔ Standard partly met.

5. Assess the social and environmental impacts of candidate REDD strategy activities:

Assess potential impacts by performing an impacts assessment, using the Environmental Strategic Management Framework or another analytic approach. Potential impacts may include, *inter alia*, effects on livelihoods and communities of forest-dependent peoples, and the environment.

Component Standard S-5: Identify potential key impacts, and present a ToR or plan to evaluate how to address those impacts via studies, consultations, and specific mitigation measures aimed at preventing or minimizing adverse effects.

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The R-Plan provides a generally satisfying framework for assessing the environmental and social impacts. However, this needs to be informed by an understanding of the economics of the land uses causing forest loss and degradation so that opportunities and trade offs can be identified and evaluated. It is commendable to add in the Expected Outcome section, the following provisions:

- an Environmental Management Statement
- an Environmental and Social Management Plan.
- The TOR should include in a specific term for meeting with "indigenous communities and forest dependent communities."

➔ Standard met.

6. Assess investment and capacity building requirements:

Assess candidate REDD strategy elements and the REDD implementation framework, in terms of capacity requirements, financial support needed, and gaps existing with regard to potentially available resources.

Component Standard S-6: Summary of rough estimates of investment requirements, capacity requirements, and gaps for your major REDD strategy elements. Present ToR or a plan for how to estimate investment and capacity needs to eventually implement the REDD strategy.

Provide the spreadsheet in Excel, including the three sheets listed below:

1. Summary of R-Plan implementation, across Donors, including dates
2. Detailed Budget, across Donors

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

Well elaborated section in the R-Plan. Some remarks in respect to the contents of the capacity building programme have been met in the first section of this report. Community-based training should be adapted to the direct needs and aspirations of communities to REDD. This section could also be improved if the main challenges to SFM and REDD were listed

- ➔ to justify the 'investment needs.' For example monitoring capacity is recognized as an important component of sector performance but the section is fairly general – one would expect more specificity on needs and one would expect a listing or description of existing capacity on REDD matters. **Standard met.**

7. Develop a reference scenario of deforestation and degradation:

Develop objectives; a work plan to realize those objectives during the R-Plan implementation phase; and prepare the ToR for the majority of that work plan.

Component Standard S-7: Present ToR or a first-order plan for how the reference scenario for deforestation, and for forest degradation (if desired), will be developed, including major data requirements, early ideas on which methods to use, and how a reference scenario would be presented for consultation. (FCPF recognizes that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. R-Plan states what is planned as early activities.)

Reviewers' assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The revised draft still falls short on a framework for how to develop a reference scenario. The section contains some discussions on what is planned to implement, but there is still a need to develop the steps required to estimate the emissions, and to assess the uncertainty. To be internationally credible, any projection of future emission baselines must be grounded in rigorous assessment of land capacity and potential development pressures. However, it is understood by the TAP that Guyana would still need to develop the capacities to undertake a thorough work on referenced scenario in the first stages of the preparation of readiness.

The first step surely is to develop a robust and credible historic emission scenario for all sources of emissions, recognizing the difficulties of obtaining credible data for degradation. There is a need to relate to previous sections of the Plan, identifying the main drivers of changes in forest cover and mention on what activities based on their current assessment are the main causes of emissions. This would be followed by discussion of what data are likely be available to actually estimate emissions from each source, and over what period to base emission estimates on, and time intervals (e.g. every couple of years or annually). A decision needs to be taken to decide on the time period by keeping up on international policy discussions on this topic. Even with the fact that secured historic data are only available from the 1950s or so, it is questionable to develop a reference scenario on data 60 years back from now. Once a credible historic emission scenario over a given time period is established, the country can then propose how this might be modified by other factors to reflect national circumstances such as GDP.

The TORs are still too vague—the goal of the TOR should be to produce a credible historic emission scenario. The first step would be to assess the conclusions on international policy discussions as to which approach is likely to be adopted and use this to guide the work. It seems clear that new remote sensing data would be needed, and any analysis would need to be aware Guyana's definition of forest (which has been provided in the revised R-Plan).

The revised R-Plan has incorporated most of the recommendations given by the TAP on the May version, but it still has not articulated the major difficulties or limitations that developing a robust reference scenario would entail. The revised document, nonetheless, addressed, in a summarized form, some of the issues raised above, including :

1. a short assessment of recent international policy discussions related to REDD and the reference emission scenario
2. a general framework for establishing the historic reference scenario—based on IPCC guidelines and good practice guidance
3. a discussion of time period over which historic emissions estimated
4. an assessment of existing data and its quality and what new data will be needed both for area change and C stocks
5. some mention of likely pools
6. discussions on how historic emissions be projected into future; and
7. the definition on forests.

➔ **Standard not fully met (need more discussion on what this means for undertaking initial activities in the readiness phase)**

8. Design a monitoring, reporting and verification system for REDD: Provide the capacity to

monitor:

1. deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), and forest sector carbon emissions over time, in relation to the Reference Scenario, and leakage or displacement of deforestation or forest degradation elsewhere within the country; and
2. impacts of the REDD strategy in the forest sector (including, for example, rural livelihoods, social and environmental impacts, forest sector governance, and biodiversity).

Component Standard S-8: ToR or a first-order, draft plan for how the monitoring, reporting and verification system will be developed, including major data requirements, the need for transparency of the monitoring system and data, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would be presented for consultation. Early ideas on how the system could incorporate periodic monitoring of:

1. *deforestation and forest degradation (if desired); and*
2. *impacts of a REDD strategy in the forest sector, as described above,*

into an evolving REDD monitoring system. (FCPF recognizes that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-Plan should state what early activities are planned to begin development of the forest and forest sector monitoring system.)

Reviewers's assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

The MRV system seems appropriate and the capacity to implement it is apparently being built (though it might need more time than foreseen in the plan). The proposed system should provide confidence that Guyana will be able to engage in performance-based REDD activities over time (probably not reachable at the end of the first phase of the Readiness).

Some details of the monitoring plan on a design for estimating emissions/removals from changes in forest cover by a variety of degrading or deforesting activities have been given in the revised R-Plan. As with the reference scenarios there is a need to develop a short framework. For emissions/removals under REDD not all forests may need to be monitored. Thus there is a need to give an indication of stratifying the forests to account for the different processes that could reduce emissions or enhance removals. Areas likely to undergo change in forest cover are likely to need more intense sampling than other areas. Also, depending on the activity that causes the change, some pools will likely not change therefore there is no need to monitor them (e.g. soil C when forest degraded versus forest converted to annual crops). In the details of the monitoring system it was initially planned to monitor all pools, which is probably not needed. A national monitoring system for REDD should focus on "national emission/removal monitoring system". The focus of much of the discussion was on project-based interventions. The MRV system should also define how leakage will be assessed and the monitoring of project based activities will be harmonized with national baseline assessment, monitoring and reporting.

Under reporting there is still a need to have a mention about accuracy and completeness of the monitoring system; a reference to an uncertainty analysis in the monitoring results also needs to be mentioned.

➔ Standard partially met.

9: Design a system of management, implementation, and evaluation of readiness preparation activities (Optional):

The REDD management system is **optional**, but beginning one is recommended, to develop a means to synthesize and manage the REDD program, including evaluation of progress at regular intervals.

Component Standard S-9: (Optional): Present a summary of your thinking on how to develop a REDD management system to keep track of REDD activities, responsibilities, funding, funding needs, and evaluation of activities to date.

Reviewers's assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

Synopsis of this section has been provided.

➔ Standard met.

[[end]]