

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism  
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**  
(interim, January 12, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

**Guidelines for Reviewers:**

- 1) *FCPF REDD Country Participant R-PPs will be reviewed and assessed by the FCPF Participants Committee, the FCPF's governing body, taking TAP comments into account. External (Technical Advisory Panel or other) and Bank reviewers may provide recommendations on how a draft R-PP could be enhanced, using this template on a pilot basis until a process is approved by the PC.*
- 2) *One set of criteria should be used for review: specific standards each of the current this in mind when commenting. 6 components of an R-PP should be met.*
- 3) *Your comments will be merged with other reviewer comments (without individual attribution) into a synthesis document that will be made public, in general, so bear*
- 4) *Please provide thoughtful, fair assessment of the draft R-PP, in the form of actionable recommendations for the potential enhancement of the R-PP by the submitting country. A REDD Country Participant would be allowed three submissions of an R-PP to the PC for consideration.*

**Objectives of a Readiness Preparation Proposal** (condensed directly from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

*The purpose of the R-PP is to build and elaborate on the previous Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) or a country's relevant comparable work, to assist a country in laying out and organizing the steps needed to achieve 'Readiness' to undertake activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), in the specific country context. The R-PP provides a framework for a country to set a clear roadmap, budget, and schedule to achieve REDD Readiness. The FCPF does not expect that the activities identified in the R-PP and its Terms of Reference (ToR) would actually occur at the R-PP stage, although countries may decide to begin pilot activities for which they have capacity and stakeholder support. Instead, the R-PP consists of a summary of the current policy and governance context, what study and other preparatory activities would occur under each major R-PP component, how they would be undertaken in the R-PP execution phase, and then a ToR or work plan for each component. The activities would generally be performed in the next, R-PP execution phase, not as part of the R-PP formulation process.*

**Review of R-PP of (fill in country name): GUATEMALA**

**Reviewer: Juergen Blaser, Tomas Schlichter and six other reviewers**

**Date of review (fill in): August 27, 2011**

**Revised: October 4, 2011**

**Standards to be Met by R-PP Components**

*(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5:)*

**General comments:**

*This Assessment was made using the version of R-PP submitted on August 10<sup>th</sup> 2011. It is the first time that the TAP assesses the R-PP proposal of Guatemala. Nonetheless, Guatemala already had prepared a draft R-PP in December 2010 and consulted this document over the first 6 months of 2011 with key stakeholders in Guatemala.*

*Overall, the present version of the R-PP has its particular strengths in:*

- *The clear national ownership of the process that is recognizable throughout the document*
- *The good integration of important national programmes that are ongoing and that can help to shape a future overall REDD+ agenda*
- *The trustful attempt to make the process transparent, open and inclusive in Guatemala*
- *The good overview provided in most of the components with clear ideas how to proceed in general terms*
- *Also to note is the well justified approach to work at the level of clearly defined zones in the country and then to integrate the results of these zones at a national level(nested approach)*

*Where the plan can be improved is in particular in the following areas:*

- *Improve the level of precision in the information required under nearly all components*
- *Include the private sector, in special agricultural producers more clearly in component 1*
- *Identify more clearly deforestation drivers, in special policies that may be contributing to deforestation by promoting the expansion of the agricultural frontier, mining activities, etc.*
- *Provide more details about the Indigenous People organizations involved in the institutional arrangement and in special about the how representative they are in different regions of the country.*
- *State what Congress could do or recognize that REDD strategy may require new policy or legislation.*
- *Describe with more details which are the roles/functions of the 4 institutions involved in the Coordination Committee*
- *Linking closely sections 2b, 2c, 3 and 4 and maintain consistency throughout the document (e.g. in respect to the integration of the Readiness for REDD+ into a wider government programme.*
- *Clarify further the methods and approaches that will be used to address components 2 and 4*
- *Present a clear budget that also includes details on the sources of funding*
- *Provide details about how aggregation of subnational data into National information*
- *Complete the glossary*
- *Provide legends for all the maps*

**Recommendation:** The overall recommendations of the TAP are as follows (for the August draft):

- Clarify the REDD+ arrangements through indicating clearly the roles and responsibilities of the proposed partners. Be as inclusive as possible.
- Extend the analytical part on a sub-regional assessment that includes also the general governance situation in a specific region
- Be more precise on the various REDD+ strategy proposals considering the various socio-cultural and ecological particularities throughout the country
- Develop the RLs for the proposed 4 sub-regions simultaneously; do not only focus on lowland rainforest and deforestation issues. Add details with respect to aggregation of subnational information.
- Align the MRV with the proposed nested approach and describe shortly the proposed MRV

methods. Show how REDD-MRV is embedded in the wider deforestation strategy

- Improving the budget by matching it with the proposed activities. Specify which will be the source of the funds and how much is going to contribute the government of Guatemala

### **TAP Review October 4, 2011**

This revised draft of Guatemala R-PP shows very important improvements.

Institutional arrangement has been properly described, and includes institutions as the Secretaría de Planificación and the Ministry of Agriculture. Terms of reference of the coordination structures are included

The consultation process includes a wide range of stakeholders at the regional departmental and municipal level and mechanisms to ensure transparency of the have been included.

A comprehensive plan related to the understanding of direct and indirect drivers of deforestation has been included.

Strategy options have been very much improved by addressing issues related with governance, the need to understand effects of land regularization programs, and the proposal to implement payment for environmental services.

The proposal for the development of a reference scenario has been considerably improved by explaining clearly the relation between the activities to be carried out in the Tierras Bajas del Norte and the ones for the rest of the regions. The first one must be considered also a pilot case that will result in technical strengthening for all the Guatemalan institutions involved in this process. The development of the other subnational scenarios will benefit of this methodological capacitation but will be adapted to the characteristics of each region. Also the role of each institution involved in this component is properly described.

The Component 4a (MRV), presents significant improvements adding very important information concerning actual capacities, the capacities needed and the elements that would be necessary to move from the actual situation to an optimal one.

### **Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- The budget of most of the components should be improved, reflecting the activities mentioned in the body of the text. Also funds should be assigned to each activity, and the main sources of funding should be identified.
- It would be convenient to describe further characteristics of the indigenous groups involved in the process.
- Some further explanation about the deforestation drivers at the regional level as well as subnational options to decrease deforestation would be welcomed.
- More details could be provided with respect to national as well subnational frameworks for the REDD+ Strategy
- Component 4b should be completed and budget for component 4 a and 4 b should be presented separately

*The TAP assessment of the standards for each section is summarized in the table below.*

Sections	R-PP August-Submission	R-PP September - Submission
1a	Partially met	Largely Met
1b	Partially met	Largely Met
1c	Partially met	Largely Met
2a	Partially met	Largely Met
2b	Not met	Largely Met
2c	Partially met	Partially Met
2d	Largely met	Largely Met
3	Not met	Largely Met
4a	Partially met	Largely Met
4b	Not met	Not met
5	Not met	Not met
6	Met	Met

### Component 1. Organize and Consult

#### Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:

*The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process.*

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

The R-PP has been elaborated through a considerable effort by key institutions in the country. An organizational structure has been described, and in spite of a certain lack of clarify in respect to tasks and responsibilities, a useful structure has been proposed that will certainly be functional to develop the REDD+ strategy in the country.

Key government agencies, in particular those institutions that traditionally deal with forests (MARN, INAB and CONAP) as well as the Ministry of Agriculture (MAGA) play a driving role in the preparation of the R-PP. They coordinate upwards (“the political-governmental level”) and well as downwards (“the consultation level”). The later mainly consist of the so-called Grupo de Bosques-Biodiversidad y Cambio Climatico (GBByCC) that is composed of the key stakeholders, including *inter alia* research and education, private sector, civil society organizations and, to a certain extent major indigenous peoples’ umbrella organizations (not fully integrated, e.g. the *Red de Autoridades y Organizaciones Indigenas*).

However, it is not clear how this Committee will work. Is there any protocol showing roles of each institution?. Who is going to take the lead of the process and of each component?

It seems that the GBByCC depends in some way on the CICC, which includes 13 Ministries, among them the MAGA. Despite this, the Ministry of Agriculture is not at this time part of the Consultative Group. Taking into account the fact that many deforestation drivers seem to be related to agricultural actions it seems pertinent the inclusion of the institution to the GBByCC.

Also the proponents should consider the possibility of integrating private sector (farmers and others) to the Consultative Group.

The document does not reflect a strong commitment with institutions that may be very important in developing measures, policies tending to diminish deforestation, as the Ministry of Energy and Mines and the Ministry of Infrastructure. Also it seems that the engagement of the private sector (farmers, cattle ranchers, agro industrial producers) is weak.

A process that seems to have been omitted in the current R-PP is the mention of the National Roundtable on Climate Change (*Mesa Nacional de Cambio Climático, MNCC*). The MNCC had a high level of influence in the process of defining the national priorities in respect to climate change and also contributed in the political process of climate change, as well as in legislative texts relating to climate change. Also, stepping from the MNCC, there are roundtables at decentralized level (*mesas departamentales de CC*) in e.g. Red sur occidente (Quetzaltenango, Totonicapán, Sololá y San Marcos) y la Red Verapaz (Alta y baja Verapaz) and in Petén. The R-PP should explain how this process is/is not linked with the REDD+ process.

Other groups that have some stake on the preparation of the national deforestation strategy are the recently formed Red de Comunidades Beneficiarias del PINPEP that comprises nearly 200 small organisations as well as the *Alianza Forestal Comunitaria*. They have not been mentioned as Members or interested stakeholders in the process.

Inter-institutional coordination has been done by consulting the draft R-PP in various stages in the first half of 2011. Coordination measures have been agreed and put into place (e.g. validation of the draft R-PP, officialisation of the GBBYCC, coordination process and contractual arrangements between MARN/INAB/CONAP and MAGA).

The Technical Secretariat consists solely of representatives of MARN, INAB and CONAP. Their TORs have not been specified and the process of consultation with the GBBYCC as well as the link with the Inter-institutional Coordination Committee (that includes in addition to the three “traditional” forest-oriented institutions as additional member only MAGA. Also, more clarity should be provided on the role of the high-level *Gabinete Socio Ambiental/CICC* in respect to the readiness process. The roles and responsibilities, as well as the line of commands should be better articulated.

More information should be provided with respect to Indigenous People Organizations, describing specifically their history and how representative they are in the different regions of Guatemala.

The budgeting for “political operations” and “technical facilitation” needs to be specified and eventually revised.

The level of implementation so far infers a sectoral leadership which increases the risk to maintain REDD as a project or program with little consideration in the development plans of Guatemala

Since the implementation of REDD+ may have an important impact on the economy of the country, it seems convenient to include the Secretaría Nacional de Planificación, to consider this fact and harmonize the process with other public policies.

The inclusion of legislators in the institutional framework could provide for stability of the whole process as well as to facilitate the development or modification of policies.

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Prepare the TORs of the Technical Secretariat and the CCI, and define with more

detail the “modus operandi” of the GBBYCC as well as a working plan for the whole institutional arrangement

- Give clearer indication on the role and responsibilities of the GBBYCC in respect to the Technical Secretariat
- Reflect on the membership of the GBBYCC respectively on a wider consultation mechanism that would allow to include all interested stakeholders
- Describe better who takes operational decisions in the implementation of the R-PP providing details about the role/responsibility of each institution and who will lead the whole process as well as each of the components.
- Justify some of the budget items (see above)
- Indicate the national contribution to the budget of component 1a, as well as the contribution that is expected from the FCPF and other donors/programs
- Clearly review and analyze the community represented in existing organizations and evaluate options based on strengths and weakness identified, and provide some plan regarding how to move forward.
- Include the Secretaría Nacional de Planificación in the structure of the RPP (the Coordination Committee)

**Assessment:**

→ Standard 1a has been partially met

**TAP Review October 4, 2011**

Important additions have been made, including *inter alia* reference to the Climate Change Unit that has been created in mid July 2011. Also, a representative of that new unit has joined the interinstitutional technical coordination group on REDD. Thus, the Ministro de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación has been integrated into the REDD+ process at high level.

Also, criteria for participation have been elaborated and more details have been provided on the functioning of the consultative group (Grupo de Bosques, Biodiversidad y Cambio - GBBYCC) in the revised document.

References have been made to recent organizational development related to REDD and recent administrative decisions in respect to the institutional environment have been added

Following the TAP recommendations it is also explained the ways in which the Secretary of Planification is going to participate in the coordination group.

What is still needed is more information about characteristics of the Indigenous groups, their geographical representativity, and historical evolution

Also improvements in the budget should be necessary representing in a consistent way the working plan of this component. Different funding sources should be indentified.

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- Provide more details regarding the indigenous communities involved in the R-PP
- Present a detailed budget reflecting all the activities mentioned in the text, including also funds provided by the government of Guatemala an other sources.

**Assesment October 4, 2011**

**- Standard largely met**

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

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

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

A strength of the R-PP is the ability to extract lessons from the dialogue that has already taken place.

The GBBYCC is instrumental in the preparation of the national deforestation strategy (ENRD) in which the readiness process for REDD+ is embedded. While there has been a certain level of information sharing on the management of the ENRD (outside the GBBYCC), the participation of interested wider stakeholder groups has been somewhat limited so far. Here some additional effort could be made.

The document recognizes that, given that Guatemala presents a ethnical heterogeneity, capacity of facilitators is needed to ensure that information is providede adequetely in each region of the country. An ambitious plan is presented with this respect. In addition, capacity of government staff is also considered. This comoponent seems to be in a preparatory phase.

The main information sharing has been at technical level and at centralized level, as well as forestry-focused. Major other stakeholders still need to be addressed, including *inter alia* the municipal governments (an important forest holder that seems to have been left out), the *Red de Comunidades Beneficiarias del the Alianza Forestal Comunitaria* and the *Allianza Forestal Comunitaria*, other public and private institutions, e.g. those dealing with territorial management at decentralized level, e.g. in Petén, Izabal, Cobán and in the western part of the country. Also, there are important players in the private sector that would need to be addressed, e.g. *AGEXPORT, la cára del Agro, ANACAFE, Asociaciones de Ganaderos, agroindustria de caña de azúcar y Palma Africana* amongst others.

It would be wise to go beyond the usual organizations representing vulnerable groups to ensure widespread representation.

Capacity building on REDD+ for different level of governmental agencies is proposed to take place on the second semester of 2011. It makes sense to do this at a later date, when REDD+ strategy has been developed completely.

The budget does not mention any activity related to the capacitation of facilitators for IP. It es not clear how the resources will be spend to address this issue.

Generally, it seems that the main drivers of deforestation (as they have been well described in section 2a) have been left out of the information sharing process so far.

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Identify as far as possible all relevant stakeholder groups that need to be informed and eventually been integrated in the further consultation process
- It would be helpful to clarify how Guatemala plans to incorporate feedback and dialogue into these mechanisms
- Improve the budget including all the activities mentioned in the text.

**Assessment:**

- Standard 1b partially met, but consultation and information sharing process still need to be conducted in order to be inclusive enough

**TAP Review October 4, 2011:**

No new elements were added with respect to information sharing and early dialogue in this version of the R-PP. Component 1c provides details of the stakeholders at the Regional, departmental and municipal level, as well as procedures to carry out the consultation process.

It may be assumed that the stakeholders included in component 1c are the same that the ones for this component but this should be made clear in the text of the document

The budget still needs to be improved

**Recommendations(October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- Complete the information about the stakeholders involved in the process as asked the TAP review of September 13
- Improve the budget by reflecting with detail the main activities mentioned in the body of the text

**Assessment:**

**Standard Largely Met**



**Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process**

*Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far<sup>3</sup> (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP; (v) and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.*

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

While the initial consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far was conducted with care (see 1a and 1b), the further consultation process in the readiness phase needs to ensure that other key groups that have yet not been fully integrated in the process are part of the R-PP participation and consultation process, such as the indigenous peoples, forest enterprises, agribusiness, the energy sector, legislators from the congress, representatives from finance and the economy. For REDD+ to succeed, it is important that a better internalization of the concepts and the challenges and opportunities are known and thoroughly consulted with such wider stakeholder groups. Thus, the proponents might want to consider in the further process to gain even wider ownership (compared to what has been reached until today), e.g. within government and with other national stakeholder communities.

As the proponents have placed REDD+ into a wider Deforestation Strategy, it is important to coordinate and consult with all other strategies and initiatives that also address deforestation (e.g. the conservation agreements in the RBMs). Thus, the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase needs to consider such wider strategies as well.

There appears to be very limited involvement of non-governmental stakeholders in the R-PP, limited to MARN, INAB, CONAP, and perhaps MAGA, in addition to a few NGOs, and some community groups. Major sectors with key roles in deforestation are listed in the map of actors, but no evidence is provided of their involvement, much less commitment, to the R-PP.

There is little detail regarding the processes, rules and methodology of consultation. Many of these details are supposedly to be addressed in a national workshop which will bring together a ‘wide range of (unnamed) actors’, though little detail is provided of how this to be done, placing doubt as to the feasibility of resolving all of these issues in one meeting.

---

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

Indigenous Peoples initial concerns have been received and included in this document, nevertheless in the Budget lines consultation plan for IPs is not specifically mentioned.

It is mentioned that for resolution of conflicts, existing mechanisms will be used, as developed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Given the serious and sometimes violent disputes over land and resources in Guatemala, and especially in REDD+'s starting point (the Northern lowlands), in addition to the serious governance and rule of law crises in Guatemala, this section does not provide any compelling evidence that would suggest the rights of the weakest actors in Guatemala would be protected by these mechanisms, nor that conflict and redress of grievances could be appropriately and effectively handled.

Some acronyms, as TFD, should be included in the glossary. It was also impossible to accede to the proposed internet link [www.tfd.org](http://www.tfd.org))

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Consider to clearly list and define all relevant actors that would need to be included into a formal consultation and participation process
- Greater detail and thought must be given to how the consultation process with indigenous peoples and communities will be carried out, especially to avoid abuse and ensure legitimate representation. This could include defining methodologies in different territories, and providing criteria and a definition for a legitimate consultation. Although the R-PP appears to ask for funds to develop these issues, the reviewer's understanding of the criteria is such that they must be developed in greater detail prior to approval.
- It would be helpful for the R-PP to explain why they believe existing conflict resolution mechanisms are adequate, even amidst the conflicts and governance crisis in the country and especially in the Peten and the Northern Transversal Strip (areas key to the strategy). Alternative conflict resolution mechanisms should be considered.
- The budget lines need to be revised to include all the elements mentioned in the description provided in the document.

**Assessment:**

- Standard 1c partially met

**TAP Review October 4, 2011**

More, and important, details on social organization and participation has been provided. The R-PP now clearly expresses the intention that the process of implementing the R-PP will be conducted through an extended stakeholder consultation process. Relevant stakeholders to carry the consultation process are identified for regional and municipal levels.

Also mechanisms to ensure transparency of the consultation process was added in this new version of the R-PP.

Additional information has been provided with respect to mechanisms to solve possible conflicts.

The budget does not represent the activities described in the text

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- Improve the budget reflecting the activities mentioned in the main body of the text. Identify the sources of funding including FCPF, other donors and the government of Guatemala

Assessment:

Standard **Largely Met**

**Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy**

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

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

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

Assessment is complete but somewhat superficial.

In general terms, this chapter provides a good general assessment of land-use, forest law, policy and governance. The R-PP further makes the point that deforestation appears uncoupled from human population size since the Peten is one of the area of highest deforestation although population size is low. The R-PP presents sufficiently well past initiatives that have been implemented to address deforestation in the country. However, there is no ranking reflecting the importance of the different deforestation drivers at the national level or in the different forest regions. It seems the Guatemala lacks of a systematic study about this issue. Considering the great ecological and social variety in forest types and forest use in Guatemala, the analysis would gain in value by introducing a better articulation (e.g. through ranking) of the deforestation and forest degradation drivers in each of the particularly chosen regions.

The proposal emphasizes in several paragraphs the importance of public policies in promoting deforestation. It may be convenient to include a list of policies or policy instruments, (laws or regulations, credits, etc.) that contribute to deforestation with a short explanation of its most relevant contents. This would help to identify the need of new policies and therefore help in developing a strategy to diminish deforestation rates.

The TAP in particular agrees with the proponents of the R-PP that the experience of PINFOR and PINEP (*Programa de Incentivos Forestales para Pequeños Poseedores de Tierras*) should be fully used in the implementation of the R-PP. PINFOR-PINPET can not only serve as a source of information, but also be an approach used for improving governance structures and applying an effective incentive system. The experience made in these programmes thus should carefully be analyzed and applied in the further development of the REDD+ strategy.

The data provided are mainly from the national environmental profile (*Perfil Ambiental Nacional*) and a number of specific studies realized with support of INAP and CONAP, There are a

number of recent studies conducted by non-governmental organizations that deal particularly with communal lands that can be used in complement to the presented data. Also, some regional studies eventually could provide valuable complementary information, such as GLOBIO, IRBIO/ZAMORANO and PERFOR. Also information available in the “Plan de Acción Forestal de Guatemala”, as well as in the Programa Nacional Forestal, both with FAO, may provide some further information

As some of the main deforestation areas are located in protected areas (e.g. in the Reserva Maya and the Caribbean area of Guatemala), it is important to relate in the analysis to some extent to the loss of biodiversity and the loss of high-conservation value forests.

The lack of understanding of the drivers of deforestation is reflected in the list of gaps, challenges and opportunities for REDD+, which are summed up in a bulleted list of 13 points. Though the points reasonably cover the range of drivers of deforestation, they should be described with more details, including some early ideas how the measures will be achieved.

A considerable experience has been accumulated in the management of forest by traditional communities forests in respect to water, e.g. the experience gained by the 48 cantones de Totonicapán (Uleu-Che -HA) or the experiences gained in the región of Chilar Escuintla where integrated models to manage water and other services, as well as forest products and downstream agriculture have been made.

The governance section is almost completely made up of governmental institutions, agencies, platforms and programs. Little attention is given to the very real territorial conflicts occurring over natural resources, and how these relate to deforestation and degradation, and the REDD+ strategy. It does not reflect an awareness of the role that communities play in governing forests, many times with very little state support.

The description needs to include the level of development of Guatemala the relative importance for the economy of the agriculture and forest sector or others that are the key drivers for growth in the economy. The Development Strategic Plans of the country and also the structure of the private sector in the agriculture sector, among the barriers for REDD and among challenges the drug production is also an element that needs to be consider in some areas of Guatemala.

The budget includes a study to analyze the regulatory framework for rights over the reduction of emissions that constitutes over 20% of the budget for this component (\$110,000). This has been an ongoing issue in Guatemala with significant funds already dedicated to other legal studies ostensibly of the same kind - but it is unclear why additional studies will resolve the problem, especially when other parts of the R-PP seem to suggest that it will be resolved in the pending legislation on climate change

The budget should reflect activities that are previously mentioned in the Action Plan. Table 2a mentions studies of firewood use, carbon rights and impact of present laws on governance, all activities that should be included, and explained, in the action plan.

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Besides the analysis of hot-spot deforestation areas, prepare a short analysis of deforestation and degradation drivers in main eco-social regions. The inclusion of a table showing the public policies that promote deforestation could be helpful.
- Consider to complement the analytical part with the management experiences by local communities

- It would be helpful to have greater efforts to more adequately understand the direct and indirect drivers of deforestation and degradation, including attention to disputes over resources and territories and the contributions of communities in managing forests
- The budget lines, needs also to include Studies related to economic impact on the Guatemala economy of different deforestation levels scenarios, that include the total costs for the economy with agricultural land reduced or agricultural land maintained. This is especially key for a economy that relies heavily in the agriculture sector

**Assessment:**

- Standard 2a is partially met

**TAP Review October 4, 2011:**

The comments of the TAP were partially addressed although there is still a lack of details about deforestation drivers in the different regions A well organized work plan reflecting the concern of the TAP review was added, including activities and a time frame. Other comments of the TAP relating to experiences in community managed forests were also included.

The work plan was added into the budget but no funds were assigned to each of the mentioned activities

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- Improve the budget by assigning fund for each of the activities, and identifying also funding sources

**Assessment:**

**Standard Largely Met**

**Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:**

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

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

The proposed strategy is consistent and well presented in a concise way. It includes the need to

harmonize policies related to land use change that impact on deforestation, and land use planning in order to fix or reorient the areas that are devoted to agro - industrial crops such as sugarcane and African palm, among others.

The options have been presented in a clear and systematic way and have been complemented by an analytical table. However it is difficult for the TAP to fully understand the linkage between the causes of deforestation listed and the strategies proposed under this component. Some of the important elements that have been listed in section 2a are omitted in the strategy part (e.g. land tenure issues). In addition, the important questions of social insecurity and violence have not been addressed to the extent necessary. This is important in particular considering that an important REDD+ strategy element relates to good governance in forests and forestry.

Institutions related to the environment are proposed to study and propose solutions to very important aspects as land use change. The proponents should consider the benefits of including the Ministry of Agriculture (MAGA) in the group that is going to carry out these studies. As the document acknowledges, migration of peasants to forest areas (expulsed from their regions due to the establishment of agro- industrial crops), extensive cattle ranching and others, are main deforestation drivers, and the institutions involved with these problems are related to the agricultural sector.

The country proposes to analyze costs and benefits at three different levels: local, subnational and national. The methodology for implementing this analysis will be participatory and has yet to be developed, though IUCN's poverty toolkit is mentioned as one option. Evaluation is proposed, though not delineated in detail, for employment generation, livelihoods, ecosystems, biodiversity, conflict resolution, and economic growth, while the SESA component will address social and environmental impacts (though it does not discuss what these might be). Given the importance of agricultural production for the economy of Guatemala, more details should be provided related on the impact that the implementation of REDD+ would have over this sector.

There is a discussion regarding the land regularization program. The document has previously recognized that the program has generated negative outcomes, and in this section describes these programs as potentially synergistic with a REDD+ strategy, as long as they are 'compatible and integrated'. Greater detail could be provided to understand why they believe this is possible and how it could be achieved.

Also, the strategy is very much focused on the question of reducing deforestation although that this issue is of importance only in certain regions of Guatemala. In other regions, where the fragmentation of forests is the key factor in respect to forest-based mitigation, the "plus options" of REDD+ might need to be more prominently promoted (e.g. through an extended incentive programme on the model of PINPEP).

In respect to forest degradation, the document remains silent on the important initiative conducted under the auspices of the Vice-President office together with 13 institutions to combat illegal logging in Guatemala. Such initiatives that clearly focus on degradation issues might have the potential to be integrated in a REDD+ strategy. A definition of forest degradation would be welcomed.

Table 2 b mentions activities related to institutional strengthening. While this is surely an important activity and should be addressed, it would be convenient to provide in the body of the text, some details about these activities, as which would be the institutions involved and kind of strengthening they need.

The cost benefit analysis of each option presented, at national, regional level is not included in the budget

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Address, to the extent possible the wider concept of REDD+ in the strategic options
- Explain how the governance issue can be successfully addressed considering the current high level of violence and social insecurity in the country
- Consider adding details to aspect related to land regularization and its effectiveness in controlling deforestation.
- Consider REDD+ approaches that address issues outside the hot-spot deforestation sides
- Reflect on how to integrate the initiative to combat illegal logging in the REDD+ strategies
- Provide details about institutional strengthening.
  
- This section could be strengthened by greater detail and understanding of the direct and indirect causes of deforestation in order to understand the feasibility and cost effectiveness of each component
- More detail could be provided regarding how social and environmental impacts will be considered - greater discussion of the land regularization program's role in the REDD+ strategy would be helpful to understand concretely how Guatemala plans to avoid negative outcomes
- Include the subnational approach in a regional analysis of each option or measure.
- The budget should match with the proposed activities

**Assessment:**

→ Standard 2b is not yet met

**TAP review October 4, 2011**

This component has been very much improved by addressing issues related with governance, the need understand effects of land regularization programs, and the proposal to implement payment for environmental services.

The need to improve the understanding of direct and indirect causes of deforestation, as recommended by the TAP on September 13, was included in the work plan of component 2a.

The R-PP in the present version acknowledges also the need of institutional strengthening at various levels, in order to achieve successfully a decrease in the deforestation rates.

Some additional information regarding subnational options would be welcome.

As in the component 2a, new activities are includes in the budget table, but no funds are assigned to them.

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- Provide additional information about measures to decrease deforestation and degradation at the regional level. Improve the budget, providing details about funding sources and assigning to each item the funds required.

**Assessment:**

**Standard Largely Met**

**Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:**

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

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

The document presents a coherent three phase plan which includes:

- development of the REDD+ strategy, identifying component and their roles
- Policy development for the implementation of REDD+
- Development of mechanisms for the payment and distribution of benefits

An important element in the REDD+ implementation is using PINFOR and PINPED experience to address the national deforestation plan an REDD+. In order to fully meet the objectives, it is important to include those actors that work on territorial level (see section 1), municipalities and local communities.

In the implementation of the REDD-Plus framework, it is also important to look for the synergies with other closely related programs to the objectives of the R-PP, e.g. the inter-institutional committee on illegal logging. Also, a good analysis of the general governance framework is needed in order to develop an implementation framework for REDD+ that is achievable in a reasonable time period.

What is needed in the framework of implementing the REDD-plus strategies is to have a specific focus on capacity building and joint learning, in particular in the hot-spot regions of deforestation ("*frentes de deforestación*"), as e.g. in Petén, Izabal, Cobán and in the western part of the country.

It would be convenient to present some links with the results of the consultation process

Although carbon rights and distribution of benefits are discussed properly, a diagram or table showing the activities sequence and institutions involved, would be convenient to better understand the work plan related to this issue.

The budget reflects properly the activities proposed in this component

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**



- Based on the revised REDD+ strategy options, adapt the implementation framework accordingly.
- The framework needs to be consistent with the subnational approach where a decentralize initial implementation is required and provide the balance budget for the national framework development as well as the regional framework.
- Activities for REDD implementation are clearly identified. Given the challenges to overcome institutional gaps some Congress representatives from relevant commissions (agricultural, environmental?) should be included among the stakeholders consulted and engaged

**Assessment:**

➔ Standard 2c partially met to be revisited based on the review of component 2b.

**Tap Review October 4, 2011**

This new R-PP version includes aspects related with the TAP recommendations, as the need to consider national and subnational frameworks, but does not provide enough aspects about them. Inclusion of other institutions as parliamentary commissions was not considered

The budget presents new items that are not mentioned in the body of the text. No funds, as in previous cases were assigned to these items.

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- Provide more details about subnational and national frameworks as well as for the need of institutional strengthening
- Include, and describe in, the text, activities included in the budget
- Complete the budget

**Assessment:**

**Standard Partially Met**

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

*The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the World Bank's or UN-REDD Programme's safeguard policies, including methods to evaluate how to address those impacts via studies, consultations, and specific mitigation measures aimed at preventing or minimizing adverse effects. For countries receiving funding via the World Bank, a simple work plan is presented for how the SESA process will be followed, and for preparation of the ESMF.*

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

SESA timeline and main activities are included and seem to be aligned with WB policies. However the workplan is not developed. There has been little developed in the way of groups to

be included, types of consultations and studies to perform, and the nature of efforts to minimize negative impacts. This section is more generic than previous ones where the country specifics and context are laid out.

Considering the importance of indigenous and traditional communities in forest and land use in Guatemala, the work on social and environmental impact is of particular importance. REDD+ has a particular significance in indigenous territories in the lowlands and in the community-managed upland forests, as not only climate change mitigation is addressed, but in particular the livelihood concerns of the people.

In general terms, the proponents have followed the prescription given by the World Bank for SESA. The question remains that, considering the particular situation of Guatemala, the proposed work program (volume) and budget is sufficient to conduct a sufficiently grounded SESA.

**Recommendations (for the August draft)::**

- Reflect further on the proposed work programme and budget.
- ➔ Standard 2d largely met.

**TAP Review October 4, 2011**

This component presents no changes with respect to the previous version

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

The author should reflect about the possibility of accomplishing the work plan with the proposed budget

**Assessment:**

**Standard Largely Met**

**Component 3. Develop a Reference Level**

**Standard 3: Reference Level:**

*Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design).*

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

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

Guatemala counts with a considerable list of studies and data which the country proposes to use for the establishment of an historical reference level (e.g. several forest cover maps prepared

over the past 30 years, including the recently finalized *Mapa de cobertura forestal*). A short critical analysis of the existing data has been provided and it was stated in the document that the existing forest inventories - including a FAO supported National Forestry Inventory implemented between 2003 and 2005 - can be used to a certain extent to estimate forest carbon stocks. More detailed and accurate data is available for the production forests in the Maya reserve of El Petén, where the certified forest management units count on detailed information on timber stocks and other resources.

Due to the highly diverse ecological and socio-cultural context of Guatemala, the country proposes to work with a nested approach, distinguishing reference scenario levels for four pre-identified sub-national zones. This nested approach in developing a national reference scenario is considered adequate by the TAP. Figure 6 presents the different forest regions of the country (legend is missing).

Based on preliminary work implemented since 2010 and a methodological scheme that is currently under preparation, emphasis is given in the R-PP on the establishment of a reference level for the humid forest area of El Petén where 80% of the total deforestation of the country is taken place. What still needs to be addressed in this important REDD region is the assessment of forest degradation (considering the supposedly high level of illegal logging), and the establishment of a methodology to develop a reference level.

Little detail is provided with respect to the methodology to be used in developing the reference level in the northern lowlands (El Petén). An external consultancy is going to develop the methodology. It would be useful to understand how the national institutions will be involved in this plan, in order to get total ownership of this process. The proposal mentions that an interinstitutional group composed by CONAP, INAB, MARN and MAGA, will promote the estimation of a reference level, but no details are given describing the roles that each institution will have in this process

The experience in the northern region will be used to work on a reference level for the other forest regions.

Nonetheless, the TAP considers that the situation in El Petén is quite different from what is found in the other proposed REDD+ zones in the country, e.g. the natural pine forest area in mountainous areas. While it is important to take a stepwise approach for establishment of the RL, the TAP questions if the country should not have the ambition to immediately start developing the corresponding RL for the 3 other zones in parallel to the ongoing work in El Petén. As the situations are quite different, not only with respect to the forest types but also in cultural aspects and deforestation drivers, there is only little experience that can be carried over from the El Petén' methodology to the other zones. The TAP recommends to address the issues for the RL of the 3 other zones in the present R-PP and to present some concrete ideas on the proposed approach and methodologies developing the RL for the other 3 zones outside El Petén.

In addition, the document needs to present in some more details the methods and models used for establishing the 4 RL proposed (and the aggregated national RL), on major data requirements, the current capacities to do so and the capacity requirements that are needed to develop RLs. As the existing reforestation incentive programs are proposed as an important model for REDD+, more information should be given on RL in respect to the carbon sinks enhancement approach (reforestation, restoration, agroforestry) are important in the three other REDD+ zones outside El Petén.

The budget only includes funding for one reference level. Therefore risks to not finalize the

national reference level are high.

The budget is incomplete including activities for which no funding is required, as the development of a model and the estimation of carbon density for the different forest types. This may reflect the lack of clarity at this moment with respects to methos to be used to deal with these aspects.

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Give more information on the establishment of the RLs in the various zones proposed
- Give ideas on the data requirements, methods (inventories, remote sensing, etc) used for establishing the 4 proposed sub-national RLs
- Give an indication on the current human and technical capacities and present a clear capacity building program based on the analysis.
- Provide information about the involvement and roles of national institutions
- Reassess the use of the funding or include potential additional sources of funding for the national reference level.

**Assessment:**

→ Standard 3 has not been met.

**TAP Review October 4, 2011**

This component has been considerably improved by explaining clearly the relation between the reference scenario to be developed in the Tierras Bajas del Norte and the ones for the rest of the regions. The R-PP also contains a well elaborated and convincing section on the participatory method that they are testing in TNP and show how it can be applied later to other zones of the country. So although others zones are still not explicitly discussed, the current document gives a sense on how Guatemala could proceed in the future. More information is provided on the subnational TNP REL work, e.g. figure 6, but questions remain unanswered. For example, p. 83, there is mention that all information was compiled but no sense is given of “what information”. Fig. 6 shows forest inventory plots, but their number is not mentioned nor the method employed to calculate the carbon. The diagnostic of current human and technical capacities has not been made nor does the R-PP present a plan for the transfer of capacity from the international firm with which the TNP baseline is being developed. The budget has not been modified.

Finally, while the specific recommendations have not all been explicitly met, the present document is providing more information on the vision of Guatemala. First the document now articulates clearly why they primarily focus on TNP (e.g. p. 82-91). It makes sense to tackle first the ones of high deforestation.

The first one must be considered also a pilot case that will result in technical strengthening for all the Guatemalan institutions involved in this process. The development of the other subnational scenarios will benefit of this methodological capacitation but will be adapted to the characteristics of each region.

A new table is included in which the role of each of the institutions involved is properly specified.

What is still needed is a description of human resources and capacity building.

The budget is incomplete. There are several activities for which no funds were assigned.

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

Provide details about needs of capacity building  
 Improve the budget assigning funds to all the activities.

Assessment:

Standard largely Met

**Component 4. Design a Monitoring System**

**Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:**

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

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

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

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

The proposal identifies one institution, and this is welcomed, that will be in charge of developing the MRV system. The document acknowledges that one challenge will be to transform the actual monitoring of forest cover, that runs actually as a project in a long term program.

Guatemala intends to develop a MRV system based on the guidelines provided by the IPCC good practice guidelines and also the various concepts proposed by GOF-CGOLD. This approach is considered as adequate by the TAP. However, some more details should be given on the major data requirements, ideas on methods used, on the way participatory monitoring is organized and how findings from the MRV process will be integrated in an adaptive approach of managing REDD+. Also the capacity needs for organizing MRV should be more specified and a capacity building program should be shortly described.

As the country has aligned the REDD+ readiness process as an element in the broader national deforestation strategy (Estrategia Nacional para Reducir la Deforestación y el Deterioro ENRD), it would be appropriate to give some indications how the ENRD with its wider objectives will be monitored. Elements for such a wider approach (e.g. ilegal timber registry, registry of forest fires, etc) are described but not embedded in a more concrete monitoring plan.

Thus, more technical details should complement the present draft.

Some links should be provided with respect to the relation of the MRV with the consultation process and SESA.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how

the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review.

In regard to the firewood monitoring proponents should provide more details about how effective the current methods, and if it necessary, explain better the alternatives.

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Give more ideas on the monitoring methods (according to the 5 REDD+ zones) and how they are implemented
- Reflect on the capacity building needs and eventually prepare a simple capacity building plan
- Show how REDD+ MRV is integrated into the wider monitoring of the ENDR.
- Provide links with other components

**Assessment September 13, 2011:**

→ Standard 4a has partially been met.

**TAP Review October 4, 2011**

Guatemala, in this revised version of the R-PP presents significant improvements adding very important information concerning a gap analysis: actual capacities, the optimal level of capacities need to carry out a comprehensive MRV, and actions needed to move from the actual to the desired situation. These actions include necessary activities, and the development of capacities at different levels.

Actual monitoring methods are presented as well as actions needed in order to develop more accurate information.

It would be very convenient to complement this information with a workplan showing a timetable and the responsible of each of the proposed activities. In the actual presentation the R-PP presents in a very detailed way the strengthening necessities but a work plan would be very convenient to better understand how these activities will be carried out in the context of the R-PP. This work plan should be represented in the budget.

The leadership of the whole MRV process should be clearly identified.

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- Provide information about who is going to lead the MRV and the roles of the institutions involved in this component.
- Provide a work plan including chronogram and a list of institutions for each activity as well identifying clearly which one is going to lead each of them

Assessment October 4, 2011

**Standard largely met**

**Standard 4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts, and Governance:**

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

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

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

This section is somewhat generic. The proposal does identify the potential repercussions but it does not elaborate on the approach.

The wider concept of the ENRD (Estrategia Nacional para Reducir la Deforestación y el Deterioro) should be further introduced. Considerable experience exists in Guatemala on the valuation of ecosystem services, including water and biodiversity and the important role of forests for the livelihoods of forest-dependent people. Key governance factors should be described in this chapter and appropriate monitoring tools described. Some link should be established with the important role of forests to help to reduce vulnerability and resilience forest-dependent communities from climate change and climate variability. In particular, mountain forests and coastal/mangrove forests that fulfill important protective functions for local communities should be considered in a MRV system. Also reflect on how municipalities and other decentralized units dealing with territorial issues can be included in the monitoring of the multiple benefits and the governance of REDD+.

This component does not present a work plan. Activities are included in the budget but no description of them is provided in the document

It seems that the methodology needs to be developed from the beginning. Despite this, some hypothesis about impacts and indicators could be provided by the proponents.

**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Reflect on the multiple benefits that could be integrated in the R-PP, particularly taking into account the sub-national particularities and the broader ENDR concept
- Develop an appropriate approach to monitor multiple benefits derived from the REDD+ process
- Present a separate budget for Components 4a and 4b
- Provided a preliminary work plan in the main body of the text.
- Include in the budget only activities that have been explained in the body of the text

**Assessment:**

➔ Standard 4b has not been met.

**Tap Review October 4, 2011**

No significant additions are present in this new version. Apparently the authors argue that following the Cancun COP REDD text Agreement the monitoring of other benefits, different from

Carbon reductions may not be included in the MRV

This section of the R-PP is one of the weakest and little improvements have been made. The text now mentions that ideas on how to inform on safeguards will be discussed in the preparatory phase. In light of decision 1 of COP 16, countries should develop an information system on safeguards. In a biodiversity rich country like Guatemala this should in fact be beneficial. It would be interesting, for example, to know if the Government has biodiversity inventories and to which extent they could be used to inform on that particular safeguards. More thoughts appear desirable in that section.

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

- The same recommendations from the previous review are valid
- Clarify why non carbon benefits and variables would not be included in the MRV system design, when virtually all countries are including them.

**Assessment**

Standard not Met

**Component 5. Schedule and Budget**

**Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements**

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

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

While the R-PP has identified activities in every single section that perhaps conceptually cover every category necessary for readiness, the lack of detail in many of the different categories call into question how accurate the budget projections are and on what basis they have been made-

In respect to the scheduling of the R-PP implementation, the election in September 2011 and a possible government change in the beginning of 2012 might affect the launching of the R-PP and the further planning process. It is important that the R-PP will be backed also by a possible new government. Thus some provision should be made to make sure that the R-PP is submitted in a way that the proposed activities and scheduling can be respected.

The budget is presented in a form that is hard to read. It would be appropriate to shorten the table so that a good overview of the budget items and sources of funding is presented. What needs to be in at the level of the budget is to clearly identify the costs of the various components and the share of the budget that will come from national and other sources that FCPF.

As mentioned in other sections, some activities seem to require no funding and other are presented in the budget but not described or even mentioned in the text. The budget should reflect only activities described in the body of the text. On the other side relevant activities mentioned in the text are not reflected in the budget.



**Recommendations (for the August draft):**

- Prepare a realistic scheduling of activities that takes also into account the endorsement of the proposed R-PP by an eventual new government
- Present in a concise for the budget and include sources of funding, including budget provisions by source
- Budget should reflect activities described or proposed in the text.

**Assessment:**

→ Standard 5 has not been met.

**Tap Review October 4, 2011**

The component shows no changes with respect to the first draft

**Recommendations (October 4<sup>th</sup>):**

The TAP recommendations of September 13 are still valid

**Assessment:**

This standard has not been met.

**Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**

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

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

The draft R-PP presents an excellent list of indicators that will help to monitor the progress made in the R-PP. Some adaptation will need to be done based on the revised R-PP. It could be useful to use the monitoring of programme implementation as a tool not only at the level of direct implementation partners (MARN, INAB and CONAP) but also in the wider context with MAGA (in the GTI) and with the Grupo de Bosques-Biodiversidad y Cambio Climatico (GBByCC).

To be more effective the protocol must include questions that directly address shortfalls or problems in order to avoid over-reporting of success and under-reporting of failures

**Assessment:**

Standard largely met, but revision of the log frame will be necessary for the next version of the R-PP to reflect the changes made under each component

**Tap Review October 4, 2011**

This component shows no changes with respect to the previous version

**Assessment:**

Standard Met

