

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

**Review Process by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Participants  
Committee**

**The Draft R-PP Argentina, Spanish version, has been reviewed  
by Germany, Colombia, Denmark and Mexico (LEAD).**

**General comments.**

1. The Argentina R-PP demonstrates that the country has a strong academic background in forest resource assessment. The proposed actions for REDD readiness is focused on strengthening existing scientific knowledge of forest DD and link it with GHG. Thus the document has a rather academic approach with a bias to the bio physical relationship between land use changes and not so much on the economic drivers of forest DD. The document provides vast information regarding types of forests in different regions of Argentina. Further, Substantial information are provided regarding socio-economic and identification of drivers. The document would gain from having this information better organized though a more clear definition and division between the different regions. Much of the presented information, although it is valid and important, is too poorly organized to provide an understanding of relations and magnitude of drivers. A presentation and outline of the regions (sub-regions, using tables and maps would improve the R-PP significantly. This would enable a meaningful organization of information regarding socio economic/physical background information, magnitude of forest DD and drivers of forest DD and stakeholder (JK).

2. This is a good proposal, one needs only consider the following issues: complement the executive summary, further develop the design of the REDD strategy consultation process, explain why the consultation process will last four years, standardize information about deforestation and degradation (especially in components 2 and 3), standardize the conceptual framework of the strategy, define what is meant by rural forest, native forest, forest land and other wooded land, indicate the definition of forest that Argentina has adopted for CDM and REDD, further explain the MRV mechanism, add the schedule of activities under component 5 and modify the amounts according to what the FCPF can give (the rest of funding needed must seek other sources of funding). Finally, include the necessary documents in the Annexes to give support to what is written, and standardize language, acronyms, names, tables and figures (R&G). Terms of reference for all components are missing. The document in general is very descriptive, without clear methodologies (Ben).

3. This advanced draft is an excellent basis for the future work until completion of the final R-PP document. We would recommend a thorough reading of the guidance the FMT has made available for the preparation of R-PPs. Gaps of information should be clearly indicated and activities to address these gaps should be systematically incorporated into the work plan. This holds especially true for aspects related to forest degradation. Broadening the basis of

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

available information in major aspects such as forest statistics, consultative processes with civil society, stakeholders and several other topics would be best achieved by inviting more institutions, universities, research centres etc. to collaborate in the final version of the R-PP. In doing so the current team composition would better represent sectors, fields and issues relevant to a coherent R-PP. This process might require an additional effort of several months (PS).

4. The REDD strategy should analyze trade-offs between different approaches/ options and conclude in a set of priorities. For these priority actions, investment costs and operational costs should be estimated. In addition, aspects of opportunity costs and transaction costs should be dealt with as much as possible. For each component, clear institutional responsibilities should be established. Regarding capacity development/ building, the text addresses several shortcomings in current institutional capacities. It would be important to “translate” these gaps into concise training/ capacity building activities and give them cost tags and a time frame. Here too, the preparation of terms of reference would be useful (PS).

5. The proposed R-PP does not explain from what base year is the projected reduction (15% and 30% of the rate for 2007-2008 or from earlier years?). It is not clear what is the reference scenario, as the graph appears to indicate reductions in accumulated areas. Since there is a strong impact by the change in law, it is prudent to incorporate this in the reference scenario. It would also be important to analyze further the impact of the law in reducing deforestation rates indicated for the 3 provinces (possibly increasing it for 2008-2009) and see if this process is similar in other provinces). Finally, this analysis should be disaggregated by the 3 classes of conservation importance. Projecting the results of this analysis into the future, incorporating the goals of national investment, should give a more realistic projection to reducing the deforestation rate for 2015 and 2020 (Ben).

6. Other general aspects should be also considered like including a list of acronyms, sources for tables, graphs, and a summary of each sub-component. Information on degradation would benefit from a more analytical and propositional description explaining gaps. Try to include cost categories and also scheduling and sequencing activities. The discussion about indigenous people should focus on more targeted analysis regarding their roles in D&D. We also like to recommend other minor adjustments: Final R-PP should be made available in English with all contact information, exchange rate for Argentinean peso and information for Component 6 (R&G).

### **Executive Summary**

7. This chapter should provide the reader with the overall picture of the current situation; analysis of gaps; outline of the proposal with its core elements, indication of duration and overall cost estimates. We did not find a list of expected results, nor a sub-summary in each

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

component. Terms of reference for all components are missing and the total implementation costs are not stated, which are necessary to consider in the final R-PP. We also need an introduction to the country's characteristics here. The features of the REDD strategy in Argentina needs to be addressed in this section (PS, LS, Ben, R&G).

**Component 1.**

8. Standardize the language in the document as there are parts (text and tables) in English and Spanish, and check the acronyms of all participating institutions.

9. Regarding the consultations described as the basis for developing the strategy, little information is provided about their results and how they will impact the development of the R-PP. In that same manner, the consultations to be conducted for the design of the strategy are unclear and unspecified (not addressed in the Annexes), the techniques that would be used are not defined (meetings, workshops, interviews, surveys, etc.) and there is no prioritization of relevant stakeholders, and it is unclear what the role of the group in charge of the consultation of this process will be (R&G).

**Sub-component 1a.**

10. Regarding the management of the process of readiness, we would ask if establishing a parallel structure for REDD management is the most appropriate approach considering that Argentina has a strong consolidated institutional framework for land management including forest and agriculture. However, we do believe that is advisable to have an independent monitoring unit for REDD preparation (GK).

11. We also would recommend analyzing the chair of the Intergovernmental Committee on CC to chair also the REDD Working Group, so that the Presidency would have a more visible stance in the process as a whole. We also recommend reviewing the proposed voting mechanism in the REDD WG: there may be the necessity for such a mechanism to come to decisions (PS & LS).

12. Minor adjustments are required as follows: Correct the name of the Governmental Committee on Climate Change; it is the Intergovernmental Committee/panel on Climate Change. The institutions are mixed with the activities and guidance documents. This should be categorized for better understanding. The table has a mix of Spanish and English; language used should be standardized. It says: "... NGO's and scientific bodies ..." Same comment, standardize the language used. Put in capital letters the name of the private sector representative. If the promotion of the Strategy takes place at the beginning of activities, why is there a budget for 4 years? (R&G).

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

**Sub-component 1b.**

13. It would be advisable to establish a clearer link between the direct and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation and the respective key actors, for a better assessment of the proposed strategy. Example: Argentina's indigenous communities are dealt with in much detail while soy producers are only summarily mentioned (PS).

14. There is no prioritization of stakeholders, which is essential for providing information to communities and producers. The consultations indicated seem unclear as regards to the steps to be taken, especially in terms of which results of the consultations will be used for what. The group in charge (GTN-REDD) has a coordinating role for this process. The techniques to be used need to be defined: workshops, meetings, interviews and more. Background and Plan of consultations and participation of indigenous peoples communities, should be included as an annex (R&G). More information is needed on the ratification of Act 169 and the legal status against the Argentinean constitution (LS).

15. Need to assess who are the stakeholders for each specific defined geographical area. What are these stakeholders relation to forest use and preservation/forest DD. Assess how the target group be affected by REDD and their role in the readiness/future implementation of REDD. Consider how tenure rights can be improved, and consider if an ombudsman function could be available for stakeholders (could be part of an independent monitoring body). Previous consultation rather superficial and is rather an academic exercise. Future actions should be built on Stakeholder in relation to cause/effect of DD (JK).

16. As in the previous table 1a, in this picture the work will be carried out in four years, why is this so? (R&G).

**Component 2.**

**Sub-component 2a.**

17. Authors of R-PP need to organize existing information before considering more studies, assessments etc. There is a vast amount of information that needs to be organized and related to specific defined geographical areas. Good description of some important drivers for change of land use not confined to forest DD but also conversion from grass land to crop land. Drivers are e.g. change and fluctuation of climate (pampa and Chaco) and economic incentives (e.g. demand for beef and soya) and there is description of legal framework not linked to its implication for REDD (JK).

18. Examples of information that need to be organized are as follows: The five regions mentioned in this section do not match the six regions mentioned to estimate the carbon content (page 60). The history of deforestation should be mentioned here, to see if new policies have affected the rate of deforestation. There should be noted what is meant by the

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

term rural forest land and forests, since it is not clear what the total forest area is. If authors do not have a figure that indicates the degradation level. A mechanism or methodology should be described to estimate a value if Argentina wants to consider degradation within the REDD strategy. The explanation of forest resources to the economy is biased towards a single region, rather than at the national level, which is fine but then MRV methodologies need to be clarified. The explanation of the 1948 Act would be better as an annex. There is a need to describe how to do the coordination needed among forests enforcement agencies. The explanation of "The provincial statutory" should be an annex. It is unclear what is meant by significant rates, because the reductions were 60 to 100%. The law addressed in the document is referenced several times and central to the document. However, there is no uniformity as to how it is referred to: Law 26,331, Forest Act, Minimum Budget Law for the Protection of Forest, etc. This is where it should be noted, and mentioned in a consistent way hereafter (R&G).

19. We suggest starting this chapter with all available spatial information on different types of forests and D&E. Are there pieces of information on the existing areas under forest plantations, afforestation and reforestation? This type of information might be useful for an overall assessment of carbon stocks in forest resources, and D&D trends. From a technical perspective, it would be important to find in this chapter a definition or definitions of what "forest" means in Argentina and to compare them with internationally used definitions on forests (e.g. FAO; CDM-LULUCF); similarly, more references to the process of D&D are available and should be put together here (FAO Forest Resource Assessment 2000, 2005, in press: 2010 with data as recent as 2008; World Resources Institute, others) (PS).

20. Little information is given on land use-related policies and their implications on deforestation outside the environmental and forestry sectors. More substantiated information would be appreciated to grasp the full picture of drivers of D&D. In this sense, a presentation of forest and environmental policies and legislation should go more in depth. Land use planning is a potentially important tool or opportunity. I would give this instrument and experiences with it sufficient space in this component going beyond the observations on p.33 with the perspective on infrastructure planning (PS).

21. Reasons for lack of law enforcement are only summarily addressed: institutions responsible etc. Since enforcement might well become a major component in readiness activities, more information and analysis would be helpful. Forest Governance has to do with process – that is how decisions are made, rather than what those decisions are. Actors and stakeholders beyond the government and beyond the forest sector are involved in governance. Consequently, under REDD we should focus on "governance of forests" to capture the full range of actors and interests that affect forest management. Finally, governance is contextual. While it is possible to identify principles and concepts that are

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

universal the individual circumstances of Argentina will show unique constraints and opportunities for achieving good governance. The R-PP could be enhanced in this regard (PA). In addition, a more comprehensive description and analysis of roles and functions of provinces in the legal and governance context would give a better understanding of conflicts and convergence between the different levels of government, the necessary cooperation and division of responsibilities for a successful REDD system. It would be helpful to have the best available information on land tenure (per region, per stakeholder group, collective rights of indigenous communities, municipalities, etc.) and their implications for REDD to get a better understanding of processes and the proposal (PS).

22. It is suggested to clearly indicating gaps in this body of information to be filled throughout the readiness phase. This should be reflected in the activities proposed, Terms of Reference where needed and costs. It is also recommended a synopsis with the main findings in component 2a for better visualization. From the current presentation it does not become clear where opportunities for eventually reducing D&D might be. It is important to prepare a logical link to component 2b (PS).

23. While there is much emphasis given to indigenous participation in the consultative process, the document does not offer much information on these groups in this component: where do they live, what is their relevance for the process from the authors' views, what are their specific rights and duties? Some of the rather detailed information might better fit into respective annexes (e.g. provincial provisions and processes). (PS).

24. The total amount needed to implement this sub-component was erroneously transferred to the consolidated budget, instead of forwarding only the amount proposed for Forest Carbon Partnership Facility support (see also comment under component 5).

**Sub-component 2b.**

25. In the view of the reviewers, the background described in previous sections is not sufficient to define a REDD implementation framework. Prior to defining REDD implementation framework the previous sections need be improved especially in relation to 1)group information and analysis according to specific defined geographical areas 2) analysis of drivers, 3) stakeholder analysis and plan for involvement of stakeholder (JK).

26. At this point of time reviewers recommend to be careful not to pre-empt approaches or anchor points of the strategy to forest legislation only. A clear analysis in component 2a will help in this. Wouldn't land use planning policies, instruments and institutions be worthwhile considering in more detail in potential contributions to REDD? Results to date with land use planning, role of provinces and National Govt. (PS).

27. The Proposal is based on three lines of action (see p. 41 first para): (i) "reducir la renta del uso... en la frontera agrícola"; (ii) "aumentar la renta... forestal", (iii) "regular uso de la tierra". What (i) means is it to make the agricultural frontier in general less attractive or rather

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

make forest conversion to other land uses more costly/ more difficult? If We look into the first activity given in table No XXX on page 41, the meaning of this seems to be of a different nature. Since this is a very sensitive point, I would need more information on this point to come to grip with this aspect. In the same table, p. 42, several actions are mentioned to increase the income from forests. We wonder why authors almost “hide” the REDD-mechanism and respective payments among many other programs (bee-keeping, ecotourism, among others) (PS).

28. The list of proposed REDD activities for the Readiness Phase would benefit from a more analytical approach in component 2a); a balance between incentives and disincentives, for desired and undesired land use decisions, including a clear commitment to law enforcement which should be worked out a bit more in this proposal; a clear prioritization of activities in each of the three lines of action; in addition. The list gives the impression that it contains many desirable programs and plans (in too general way) which leaves a bit reluctant to assess it. More information would be needed for that purpose, besides clearly established priorities, background information and discussion of each priority action in much more detail. A guiding question for the strategy would be: who is in charge/ entitled to make provisions, implement them, and enforce them and: are these entities already part of the current discussions and proposal? Example: where legislation is involved, Parliament has the saying. In the end, this is a core chapter in the R-PP and therefore needs to be conducive, explicit and fit for a clear understanding of both national decision makers and an international audience (PS).

29. “En este sentido, sería preferible iniciar identificando claramente las opciones de la estrategia REDD que son una respuesta a las causas de la deforestación analizadas en el componente 2a y luego si hacer el vínculo con la ley de bosques, el cual será ampliado en el componente 2c, donde se trata expresamente el marco de implementación de REDD”. Por otro lado, no queda claro como la regularización de la tenencia de la tierra de comunidades de Pueblos indígenas es una opción de la estrategia REDD. El vínculo entre deforestación y tenencia de tierra por parte de comunidades indígenas no está analizado en el punto anterior. Se entiende que la regularización de la tenencia de la tierra corresponde más bien al reconocimiento ancestral en la ocupación del territorio, enmarcado en las diferentes obligaciones que adquirió el estado con los pueblos indígenas luego de la ratificación del convenio 169 de la OIT. Por lo tanto, este es un aspecto que debería más bien enmarcar el componente de consultas y participación de actores, ya que tiene que ver directamente con los territorios que serán reconocidos y sobre los cuales se debe consultar la implementación del mecanismo REDD” (LS).

30. Indigenous issues are addressed as a logical sequence from components 1b and 2 a (see pages 43 and 44) but no recognizable activities are deduced from the descriptive part

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

(which could as well go to component 1b) except for a study on the creation of new indigenous territories/ lands (PS).

31. This component presents two tables with core readiness activities (preliminary proposal of REDD strategy activities, pp. 41 -43 and schedule and costs of activities, pp 44-45). The component would benefit from a better coherence between these two. Example: the first table does not mention, inter alia, capacity development and law enforcement activities which appear in the second table. The second table gives important elements such as “Diseño de un programa de inversion para la recuperacion del bosque degradado” (last activity in table p. 45) which does not appear in table 1 (PS).

32. Budget of 2 b sums up to 2.605 mn US\$. There is a difference between this total and the contributions of Government of Argentina and Forest Carbon Partnership Facility respectively (running up to 1.395 mn USD). For clarity reasons, we recommend to include this difference in the consolidated budget under component 5 and clearly mark it under 2.b as “funding not yet secured” (PS).

**Sub-Component 2 c:**

33. The guiding questions of the R-PP form give excellent indications for this sub-component, they should be thoroughly addressed. General remark: how should the implementation framework look like to provide for the “transparent institutional, economic, legal and governance arrangements that may be necessary to enable Argentina to implement its provisional REDD strategy options” discussed under 2 b? The draft offers a wealth of relevant legal dispositions to make REDD happen. Yet reviewers would recommend to transfer this information to component 2a thus limiting the legal aspects here to the analysis of those gaps that need to be filled for successful REDD readiness/ REDD activities (PS).

34. “Los elementos de análisis presentados se enfocan principalmente en cuestiones relacionados con aspectos económicos y de propiedad de los CERs. Deberían incluirse además, entendiendo que se está en una fase de formulación, elementos o ideas sobre las cuestiones institucionales y de gobernanza para la implementación del mecanismo REDD.

35. Las diferentes analogías que se presentan entre MDL y REDD, permiten pensar que en la práctica se están considerando el desarrollo de proyectos REDD como mecanismo de implementación. Conviene tratar esta opción especial atención dadas las implicaciones de estas analogías en el marco de las negociaciones internacionales” (LS).

36. Other questions to be addressed as specifically as possible under this subcomponent: Who owns the carbon? Who may participate in transactions based on REDD “credits”? What kind of mechanism for generation and distribution of revenues is best for Argentina? How shall the mechanism of distribution of revenues operate? National REDD registry? Reporting vis a vis UNFCCC; Checks and balances to be included in the implementation framework to ensure transparency, accountability and equity? (PS).



Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

37. Cost table of component 2c: Duration of some of the listed activities suggests a four year period: can Argentina afford such a lengthy process e.g. for the design of a system for incentive payments and management of this system? Would it really require so much time? What would be the implications for disbursement before year 4? The cost table gives the impression that no pilot implementation of the Implementation framework is intended as suggested on page 50 first para of “Actividades”. The calculated costs seem rather low for this complex, time and resource consuming sub-component! (PS).

**Sub-Component 2d:**

38. “Es clave incluir un análisis ex – ante de los impactos ambientales y sociales, a partir de las opciones de estrategia REDD y del marco de implementación mencionado en los numerales anteriores, acompañado del análisis del contexto social y ambiental. No están aun los TdR, elemento fundamental de este componente” (LS).

39. FMT has produced guidance on SESA (Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment in REDD Readiness and its Relationship to the World Bank Safeguard Policies (see FCPF website). I consider it key for the request for funding to be successful that SESA guidance be fully understood and dealt with in this chapter. In this sense, a central aspect of SESA is the assessment of expected REDD plus options of the proposed R-PP. The document needs to be more specific in this aspect. Starting point for the social impact assessment would be a more thorough analysis of key stakeholders involved. Techniques, methodologies, and specialized know how are very far advanced in Argentina. Therefore, the reviewers suggest the authors of the R-PP contact respective specialists for a comprehensive formulation of work plan, strategies etc. Similarly, environmental impact assessment can build on many excellent in-country experiences and professionals. They should be consulted during consolidation of the current draft (PS).

40. The respective budget seems rather modest with regard to the challenges ahead in a complex and huge country like Argentina (PS). If the promotion of the Strategy takes place at the beginning of activities, why is there a budget for 4 years? (R&G).

**Component 3.**

41. “El enfoque propone que de no realizarse acciones adicionales (mecanismo REDD) habrá una reducción del 15% para 2015 y 30% para 2020, sin embargo el documento no refleja la metodología de modelación y las variables que se tuvieron en cuenta para llegar a esta cifra, lo cual debería incluirse para justificar dichas cifras. Aparentemente el resultado parcial de deforestación cuantificado post ley 26.331 fundamenta la proyección del escenario de referencia, pero no se incluye un análisis de otros factores que pudieron influir en la disminución de la tasa de deforestación, como por ejemplo la caída de los precios de los commodities a final de 2008. En un estado tan temprano de la definición de la estrategia

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

REDD, y en un marco de negociaciones todavía incierto, es prudente considerar la conveniencia de proponer metas de deforestación. Sería conveniente indicar desde el principio del capítulo que el escenario de referencia esta aun en fase de definición, como se puede concluir de las actividades propuestas al final del componente y que por lo tanto las cifras de disminución de tasas de deforestación podrían variar. En el orden metodológico debería incluirse el periodo de referencia al que hace alusión la meta de reducción del 15 y 30%” (LS).

42. From what base year is the projected reduction (15% and 30% of the rate for 2007-2008 or from earlier years? It is not clear what is the reference scenario, as the graph appears to indicate reductions in accumulated areas. Since there is a strong impact by the change in law, it is prudent to incorporate this in the reference scenario. It would also be important to analyze further the impact of the law in reducing deforestation rates indicated for the 3 provinces (possibly increasing it for 2008-2009) and see if this process is similar in other provinces). Finally, this analysis should be disaggregated by the 3 classes of conservation importance. Projecting the results of this analysis into the future, incorporating the goals of national investment, should give a more realistic projection to reducing the deforestation rate for 2015 and 2020 (Ben).

43. The GRAPH is not clear, what does it represent? Which would be the impact of financing REDD in this graph? We suggest to put three lines on the chart: 1. Expected deforestation without the fund; 2. Expected deforestation with the fund (based on an analysis of the impact of this fund in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 for each province and conservation importance area). As it appears now, it seems that the fund can achieve a reduction in deforestation > 50%, see previous table; and 3. Expected deforestation with the fund and financing. This graph is not understood. What do the lines and numbers represent on the y axis? Why are the lines not in parallel? The 45 M tCO2 are annual or cumulative reductions? (Ben).

44. It is likely that there will be a proposed flexible definition of forest for REDD that can be adjusted for each country, similar to the definition under the CDM. Argentina may aim to define and adopt one, and make calculations based on this definition. It would be important to present the results with the two definitions in the document, particularly the impact of applying each definition in deforestation rates. It would be useful to add a table that provides the areas of each region's forests and forest conservation classes. In what period? is it cumulative or on a yearly basis (which year?) The total expected emission accounts for 60% of the total stock. It seems quite a large figure! Includes soil? The methodology for estimating the change in land use in the future is not very clear in Sub-component 2a (Ben).

45. Since the new law already has a positive impact on the reduction of deforestation, it is important to include in the baseline analysis, a vision of the impact of this law in the future

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

(perhaps include a preliminary analysis of the impact in the last two years). It should be indicated whether it is intended to make future adjustments to the reference scenario or for how many years would it be. See also comments from page 57 (Ben).

**Component 4.**

46. Uno de los componentes esenciales mencionados en la estructura del sistema de monitoreo es la creación de un sistema MRV regional. Pero no queda claro cómo se integraría con el escenario de referencia propuesto en el numeral 3, sobre todo cuando las diferencias en las dinámicas de deforestación en las diferentes regiones son tan pronunciadas. Para monitorear la deforestación se propone seguir con el método de interpretación visual de imágenes de satélite Landsat, sin embargo en el presupuesto se incluye la aplicación de un software para la automatización del proceso, lo cual entonces debe explicarse dentro de las actividades a realizar para implementar el sistema de monitoreo, para ser coherentes entre lo que se plantea en el texto y en el presupuesto. A nivel más técnico, dado que se planea seguir trabajando con imágenes Landsat, es necesario prever cómo se va a manejar la pérdida de calidad de estas imágenes de satélite o si es necesario evaluar otras alternativas de monitoreo como plan B (LS).

47. Argentina possess vital elements for a REDD monitoring system at different levels from remote sensing to ground truthing. The challenge is to define how existing elements of existing monitoring capacity can be used in forest DD monitoring. Consider establishing independent monitoring body (JK).

48. It is unclear whether they will develop biomass equations locally or will they use the equations of IPCC? Equations are not estimated! It is important to clarify this, because this determines the tier which applies (Ben).

49. The reviewing team also brings to the attention of the R-PP authors the following minor details: Throughout the paper there was no previous mention of REDD +, this needs to be explained. This component mentions five phases of MRV but it actually talks about six. The issue of "Causes of deforestation and degradation" should be part of Component 3. The issue of "Causes of deforestation and degradation" should be part of Component 3 (R&G).

50. In addition to the methodological questions regarding deforestation, degradation and activities leading to the enhancement of carbon stocks (through SFM, regeneration; afforestation and reforestation) seems to require additional attention in methodology (PS), to answer questions like: What will the monitoring system be designed for? D, D&D, REDD plus? How will it operate? Who should operate it and who has to provide information? What are the Success indicators for the monitoring system? What will be done in order to guarantee compatibility with future UNFCCC arrangements for monitoring and MRV? Visual interpretation of LANDSAT imagery might not do to produce necessary information in a timely fashion. How

PC Reviewers Team for Argentina; February 22, 2010

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK

will emission reductions be measured, verified and reported? These and other questions are not yet fully developed in the draft (PS).

**Component 5:**

51. In general terms, we suggest a slight modification of the information contained in the table. Activities should be referentiated to the respective components/ subcomponents. The table should report all costs, independently from the funding source (government, Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, others). This would give a better idea of the overall effort and costs the readiness phase will imply. Funding requirements could then be presented according to sources/ N.N. According to the logic behind the table, the correct sum for Forest Carbon Partnership Facility contributions would be only 4.835 mn USD instead of the 5.385 mn USD shown; the error is in Sub-component 2a where total cost is given instead of FCPF share only (PS, R&G).

52. El monto solicitado al FCPF debe ajustarse al que éste se compromete apoyar (\$3.6 millones de dólares), el resto buscar otras fuentes de financiamiento (aunque aun no queden establecidas).

**Component 6.**

53. This component is to deal with the design of a program monitoring and evaluation framework. It is not available in the current draft.

**Final remarks**

TAP should seek to establish a dialogue with Government of Argentina to help address the open aspects in a timely manner. We are confident that Argentina is in a good condition to present its final R-PP still in year 2010.

SINCERELY,

PC Reviewers Team for Argentina; February 22, 2010

Leonel Iglesias (LEAD)	Peter Saile	Lucio Andrés Santos Acuña	Jorgen Karlsen
MEXICO	GERMANY	COLOMBIA	DENMARK