

**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) *FCPFREDD 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

(For formal consideration at PC 11 in March 2012)

Tomas Schlichter, Gisela Ulloa, and Jim Baker co-leading the TAP team of five reviewers

Date of review (fill in): March 9, 2012

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

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

Background:

Guatemala submitted a first draft R-PP in August, 2011 for informal consideration at PC 10 (October 2011). A TAP Team consisting of 6 members reviewed the draft R-PP, and Guatemala revised the draft R-PP based on comments from different sources including those from TAP, and submitted the revised R-PP in early October for informal consideration at PC 10. TAP updated the

synthesis review to reflect changes in the revised draft R-PP.

Then, Guatemala submitted a revised R-PP for formal consideration at PC 11 (March 2012). A TAP team consisting of 5 members reviewed the R-PP and a synthesized review was elaborated and communicated to the country.

Guatemala submitted a revised version on March 2 for revision. The document presents several and important improvements with respect to the last version. The following table summarizes the main conclusions of the TAP team:

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

Components	R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 10 (October 2011)		R-PP Submitted for assessment in PC 11(March 2012)	
	Draft R-PP August, 2011-Submission	Revised Draft R-PP October, 2011	R-PP January, 2012 Draft Submission	Revised R-PP March 2nd 2012
1a	Partially met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met
1b	Partially met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met
1c	Partially met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met
2a	Partially met	Largely Met	Met	Met
2b	Not met	Largely Met	Met	Met
2c	Partially met	Partially Met	Largely Met	Met
2d	Largely met	Largely Met	Met	Met
3	Not met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met
4a	Partially met	Largely Met	Largely Met	Met
4b	Not met	Not met	Partially Met	Met
5	Not met	Not met	Partially Met	Largely Met
6	Met	Met	Met	Met

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

- 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

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The new version of the R-PP, submitted on January 10, 2012 includes important improvements along all the components.

The institutional arrangement properly reflects the roles of involved institutions and organizations, and shows an effort to properly integrate indigenous people organizations.

The communication and dissemination program is already considering key issues. Also capacity building through communication and training of indigenous facilitators has begun, in order to promote the workshops and other events to be carried out in their own language.

The consultation plan is clear and comprehensive. Main stakeholders have been identified, and a new methodology for consultation and participations is in development. New themes have been included, among them are recognition and practice of indigenous rights and environmental and social safeguards for IPs and local communities, and the issue of mechanisms for conflict resolution.

A comprehensive plan to elucidate the processes of deforestation is now included. The plan describes activities and assigns institutional responsibilities for each of them.

New strategy options have been included, among them the need to strengthen the land zoning process with special attention to the rights of Indigenous Peoples. Also the enhancement of existing successful programs as PINFOR and PINPEP, and the creation of new ones to take into account environmental services have been proposed.

Following previous TAP recommendations the proposed implementation framework acknowledges the need to establish close links with parliamentary commissions related to environment and land use.

The new proposal presents a complete plan to develop SESA as well as an adequate budget.

Component 3 (Reference Level) and new work plan for capacity building was included acknowledging previous TAP recommendations.

For MRV (4a) a new work plan is presented, including objectives, and expected results along a long term temporal scale. A list of the main ecosystem goods and services provided by forests in Guatemala is now included (4b) and a preliminary workplan is also presented.

Recommendations

- It would be helpful to provide more information about the participation of the private sector in the institutional arrangement and overall in the whole process
- The document could benefit greatly with more consistency between components 1b and 1c, especially with respect to listing and roles of stakeholders involved. The two components currently refer to different sets of stakeholders. The information concerning the drivers of deforestation and possible activities that could be conducted to better understand the process conducting to develop more knowledge with respect to this process, could be presented better by organizing it by regions.
- It would be helpful to develop further the capacity building workplan for component 3, including issues each institution would perform and main activities.
- The workplan for MRV (4a) could be improved by adding a new column that includes institutional responsibilities for each proposed action.
- It seems important to further develop component 4b, which is less well developed than 4a. This section could be more comprehensive by reaching out to organizations such as Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza, OTECBIO, and WWF, to learn about the methods and relevant information for REDD+.
- The budget for each component needs to be carefully checked to ensure that all the activities mentioned in the body of the text are included and sources of funding in the budget.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

As occurred in with the last submission of January 2012, this version includes many of the TAP recommendations and the document presents considerable improvements.

The participation of the private sector is described with more detail, in the development of the National REDD strategy as well as in consultation instances. The consultation process includes now a proposal to carry out continuous dialogue with different sectors as Energy, Mining and others.

The needs of capacity building for the development of a Reference Level is described in a comprehensive way, and a complete plan is presented for the MRV component (4a and 4b).

Although in many cases the budget was presented in a more detailed way, there is still a lack of matching between activities described in the text and the budget tables. Also sources of funding are still not specified.

Recommendations:

- Present with more detail feedback mechanisms that will allow to include results of consultation process into the main activities.
- Improve the budget

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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

- 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 other sources.

TAP Assessment October 4, 2011: Standard largely met

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The recommendations made in the previous two reviews are considered in this version. There is greater clarity on roles and responsibilities of REDD related entities, an established structure at different levels, also national, regional, departmental and local levels are taking into account, and issues have been identified for further discussion and for strengthening based on the stakeholders's consultation and participation process.

Efforts to consolidate the participation of indigenous peoples are included for the identification of new coordination mechanisms that will allow the major representation of local communities and/or entities related to natural resource management.

The document would benefit from additional detail on the conditions conducive to private sector participation in the REDD process.

Private sector actors are not included in 1.a.2. Furthermore, the table on page 38 (1c) only lists forest relevant stakeholders leaving many of the stakeholders mentioned earlier in the document out (as an example COPNAP). A more coherent and inclusive list of Stakeholders reflecting all actors mentioned throughout the document, non-forest stakeholders, forests stakeholders and so on, needs to be developed.

Budget is not detailed enough and is not always consistent with text (there are activities mentioned in the document that are not included in the budget, such as hiring the services of expert consultants). Different potential sources of funding for each component in the R-PP need to be included in the budget, such as bilateral support, request for FCPF funding, other programs and public funding.

Additional comment, probably a typo: On page 10, paragraph 2, line 7, it states that the documentation mechanism for the GCI meetings and decisions will be “not” via meeting minutes collected in “Actas”. Actas collecting meeting minutes are a standard mechanism for documentation of meetings discussions and agreements, it seems odd they would go on to establish that this would NOT be the mechanism for follow up but do not offer an alternative. Please review that “not” is intended or is a typo.

Recommendations:

- Detail better the private sector participation.
 - Include information on potential source of funding for each budget table in each R-PP components e.g. from the national government or other sources of funding.
 - Include in Table 1, all the relevant actors mentioned throughout the document and check for consistency with other parts of the document where stakeholders are mentioned.
-
- **Conclusion: Standard Largely Met**

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

The participation of the private sector and its specific role in the development and implementation of the National REDD Strategy is included in more detail.

The importance to include the private sector at early stages of the process is stated. A strategy for this inclusion is mentioned. Dialogue activities with certain sectors (mining, agriculture, livestock etc.) and different levels (technical, institutional, and private sector) to define roles and forms of participation are mentioned.

In table 1 the private sector is also incorporated and dialogue with the Private Sector (Forest Guild), Agribusiness, Livestock etc..) for the second quarter of 2012 is established as an activity of the REDD+ Strategy.

Regarding the budget for this sub component, it remains general therefore same recommendations apply.

Recommendations:

- Include Information on additional sources of funding if available.

Conclusions: Standard Met, but the budget should be presented with more detail.

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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

- Complete the information about the stakeholders involved in the process as asked by the TAP review of September 13, 2011.
- Improve the budget by reflecting with detail the main activities mentioned in the body of the text

Assessment: Standard Largely Met

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The process of communication and dissemination in the country in general has been quite successful, key issues have been considered and the actors are allowed to give their comments, insights and suggestions on REDD. Workshops have been attended by a large number of representatives from OFD Alliance, and workshops have been organized in different regions. Lessons learned have been identified.

Currently the capacity building program is in place and includes the training of indigenous facilitators and community representatives. There is a joint work with indigenous organizations involved in the process. The plan is well built and is expected that indigenous facilitators can conduct workshops in their local communities in their native language.

It is recommended again the inclusion in the dialogue process of other sectors not previously considered, such as the economic, mining, agriculture, cattle raising sectors and peasant movements, among others.

The 1b actions seem disconnected from the stakeholders, section 1b is not clearly linked to section 1c, Need to be clarify.

Information sharing and dialogue mechanisms need to include how conclusions from already held consultations are being integrated in the process.

Finally the funds are not identified by source and the budget needs to be developed further.

Recommendations:

- Clarify how other sectors will participate in the REDD dialogue process.
- The link between actions in this component with identified stakeholders in 1c needs to be clarified.
- The budget needs more detail.

Conclusion: Standard largely met

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

The establishment of a permanent dialogue throughout the design of the strategy with other key sectors such as energy, agriculture, local communities, etc. is included as well as the capacity building for other governmental institutions such as planning, finance, energy, mining, tourism and economy ministries. The private sector institutions are also mentioned, such as agribusiness, livestock and tourism, among others.

While participation and dialogue for the development of the strategy is well detailed and the actors are well defined, the mechanisms to be followed for feedback on the process of dialogue are not mentioned

Recommendations:

The budget needs more detail, and some specificity should be provided with respect to feedback mechanisms

Conclusions: Standard Met, with a more detail budget and feedback mechanisms included

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 far³ (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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

- 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

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

This new R-PP version includes a clear description of consultation and participation

³ 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).

process, describes an institutional organizational framework consisting of government agencies, units of indigenous peoples and civil society associations. Poses the basis for socialization and validation of the Consultation and Participation Plan, stakeholder groups to consult have been identified, for example the National Alliance of Community Forestry Organizations and Indian officers Climate Change, among others.

Specific mechanisms for information, participation, and cooperation and consultation process have been proposed. On page 33 references to a list of key players is made, the number of annex is missing, please check.

Within the consultation plan, new themes have been included among them, recognition and practice of indigenous rights and environmental and social safeguards for IPs and local communities, and the issue of mechanisms for conflict resolution.

Finally a conceptual transparency framework is developed, building from the country legislation also a Transparency, accountability and socialization strategy is attached the later for the design and implementation process. This framework was presented by indigenous organizations and local communities involved in the process, the strategy will be analyzed during the preparation process by the technical and political teams of the government.

The budget still does not make any reference to additional sources of funding.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended to include the methodology and / or mechanisms for consultation with IPs and other sectors, also anticipate fluent communication with the indigenous sector in relation to the methods considered or proposed.
- Table 1c. needs more detailed information; it is suggested to build another table to list all sub-activities identified in the budget and include a description of each explaining how the activity will be carried out, who will be responsible, and who will participate in that activity.
- Include in the budget additional sources of funding (if exist).

Conclusion: Standard largely met

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

According to the recommendations of the last review, the description of activities for participation and consultation with various stakeholders is included as well as a consultation plan.

Conclusions: Standard 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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

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

Assessment: Standard Largely Met

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

This component includes, in the January version, a complete workplan, summarized in a table, listing the main activities that are needed to understand dynamics of deforestation, its drivers and the importance of this process in each of the regions of the country. A tentative date for the beginning of each of the activities and the responsibilities of its coordination is also included in this table.

The table could be improved by organizing the proposed workplan presenting the activities by region or deforestation driver.

The budget now reflects each of the activities mentioned in the workplan although more information about the source of the funds is needed.

Recommendations:

- It is recommended to work in a classification of the main causes of deforestation by region and include sources of funding in the budget.

Conclusion: Standard 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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

- 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

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The present version of the R -PP adds new important strategy options. These options include: the need to improve the land zoning process with special attention to respect the rights of local communities and indigenous people, the importance to including negotiations with the private sector regarding its special agro industrial activities; strengthening of actual programs, such as PINFOR and PINPEP, end creating new ones that may include other activities such as tourism.

The budget has been improved reflecting the activities mentioned in the body of the text.

Conclusion: Standard 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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

- 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

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

Budget activities in the table and activities included in text do not match up fully, a thorough review both ways is needed. The inclusion of Parliamentary commissions is now considered; however, it seems that not enough thought has gone into defining how this relationship can work effectively. Given how difficult Guatemala's legislature can be, it is still more relevant that a proper strategy to ensure that adequate legislative support for REDD is achieved.

Conclusion: Standard Largely Met

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

In this version the budget was improved reflecting all activities and sub-activities mentioned in the body of the text. Also the need to improve legal aspects is acknowledged and coordination mechanisms to develop and proposed new policy instruments are

mentioned.

Conclusion: Standard 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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10, October 2011 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

The author should reflect about the possibility of accomplishing the work plan with the proposed budget
 Assessment: Standard Largely Met

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

This version already includes the cultural impact assessment, safeguards and indigenous rights, that are raised properly. The work plan to develop SESA is complete and provides a budget according to the plan

Conclusion: Standard 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.)

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The TAP Review of 4 October 2011 noted the need for a description of human resources and capacity building, and an improvement of the budget assigning funds to all the activities.

In order to address the TAP Review, a new section has been added on page 97 relating to the analysis of the causes of deforestation, discussing in more detail the use of socio-economic indicators (such as data on production growth, exports, and urbanization) to

help estimate future deforestation. There is a new note in 3.4b on page 98 about a preliminary proposal to advance the process for sub-national monitoring, and there are two new notes in 3.4d at the bottom of page 101 about consulting to help speed up the process. Finally, there is a new section 3.5 on "Current national capabilities and requirements for development of reference scenarios in Guatemala." This new section emphasizes the need for additional human resources and technical capacity. Although the need of capacity building is acknowledged, the document could be improved by providing more details about this activity. A good example is provided in the table 5 of section 4 (MRV), and some of the items mentioned in that section could be also valid for component 3.

Some further details about the expenditures involved in the acquisition of satellite images could be provided, considering the high cost of this item (U\$S 200,000). Some specification about the kind of images to be bought would be welcomed.

Recommendations:

- Provide more detail in regards to capacity building needs.
- Improve the budgets by identifying sources and providing details of some of the mentioned costs (satellite images).

Conclusions: Standard Largely Met

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

In the last review, TAP asked for more detail with regard to capacity building needs and improvement in the budgets by identifying sources and providing details of some of the mentioned costs (including satellite images).

The latest revision includes a very useful table on page 107 that shows proposed actions, approaches, optimum results and proposed activities, and this is followed by an overall timeline that shows how these activities fit within the phases of strategy, preparation, and implementation.

Few specifications are provided for regions different to the "Tierras Bajas del Norte" which is considered a pilot area to develop the reference level. Probably this is based on the lack of solid information about deforestation processes and characteristics of forest types (including carbon storage) in these regions.

A new budget chart is presented that follows the outline of the actions and approaches.

Conclusions: Standard 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.

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The document takes into account reviewers' comments by including a detailed long-term work plan, establishing the definition of leadership and working structure. It would be helpful to provide details with respect to the responsibilities of each activity proposed in the work plan.

Recommendations:

- The budget should include all main activities identified in the text that are needed for this component.

Conclusion:

Standard Largely Met

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

The R-PP provides a detailed plan for development of the MRV system, with objectives, key results, institutional strengthening, research, data, methodological development, and training requirements.

Also a table is presented in which specific responsibilities are assigned to different institutions.

This arrangement is the same as the one proposed to develop the reference level. This is a very useful addition to the previous RPP.

The budget has not been changed.

Conclusions: Standard 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.)

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The new R-PP version acknowledges the comments and recommendations of the TAP on October 2011. Despite the important improvement in the document there are still some aspects that should be improved:

The TAP Review noted the need for (1) a work plan, (2) reflection on multiple benefits and an approach to monitoring them, (3) a separate budget for 4a and 4b, and (4) an explanation of why non-carbon benefits would not be included in the MRV plan.

The response on (1) has been to provide an activity schedule for one year consisting of a list of action items and times - for a one year period. This is a good start on a work plan, but will need to be developed in more detail, with actors and specific deliverables, before it can be viewed to be a true work plan.

On (2), there is a list of multiple benefits, biodiversity, soil conservation, etc. on p. 133, but mountain forests and coastal mangrove forests are not mentioned as the TAP review proposed. There is no discussion of the approach to monitoring these, only the statement that specific methodologies will be required.

On (3) there are now separate budgets for 4a and 4b as requested.

On (4) they continue to maintain that non-carbon benefits will be handled separately from the forest carbon MRV system. The work plan presented in 1 seems to be in contradiction with the proposal to follow a decision of the Cancun Agreement, and it appears that these issues could not be considered in a MRV system. This apparent contradiction should be clarified by the authors.

In summary, Guatemala has identified the issues, it is developing a transparent system, and they have presented a schedule of actions as a start on a work plan and a budget to address the gaps. But overall, compared to sections 3 and 4a, even with the new information, section 4b is much less well developed.

Some NGOs have made considerable improvements in quantifying other benefits related with forest conservation, economic importance of environmental services, and other aspects related to this section. The authors could get pertinent information by contacting organizations as Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza, OTEC BIO, and WWF, in order to develop a more detailed work plan for the Readiness period.

Recommendations:

- Develop a more comprehensive workplan taking into account all the forest ecosystems that could benefit of a REDD+ strategy implementation.

Conclusion:

Standard Partially Met

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

The latest revision sets out new objectives, activities, and results, with a more specific timeline, showing what would be done at each stage (these are identified as "Months" but should be viewed more generically as yet to be defined time periods, depending on the relative difficulty of the task to be done).

Also some particularities from the Guatemalan administrative system, in terms of transparency of acquisition processes, transparency and public access to information are described.

For this component the budget includes contribution of a Guatemalan NGO: Fundación Defensores de la Naturaleza.

Conclusion: Standard 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.

TAP Key Recommendations on the R-PP version submitted for assessment in PC 10 (For full synthesis review, see FCPF website)

The TAP recommendations of September 13 are still valid Assessment: This standard has not been met.

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

The document has addressed some of the recommendations of Sept 13th including in the budget some of the newly identified activities in various components. However, the budget should still be reviewed since not all components had a clear match between proposed actions and budget lines.

Budget is not detailed enough and is not always consistent with text (there are activities mentioned in the document that are not included in the budget, such as hiring the services of expert consultants). Different potential sources of funding for each component in the R-PP need to be included in the budget, such as bilateral support, request for FCPF funding, other programs and public funding.

Recommendations:

- Recommendations on the realistic timeframe taking into account R-PP endorsement by the new government and the request for a concise budget that shows funding distribution by sources are still missing. Recommend that each component budget and component 5 summary budget estimate source of funding for major activities e.g. request to FCPF,

bilateral funder, government contribution etc.

Conclusion:

Standard Partially Met

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

In this new version, the budget has improved including for some components the main activities mentioned in the body of the text. In particular for component 3 the budget was completely reformulated.

Despite this improvement, for many components the budget did not present changes with respect to previous versions.

The document would benefit if it could reflect with more detail the activities proposed in the text.

Also additional sources of funding are not specified.

Recommendations: Complete the budget, in special for Component 1. If possible, provide some information about additional funding sources, if available.

Conclusion: Standard Largely 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.*

TAP review of the R-PP draft version submitted in January, 2012 (not final TAP comments)

Despite the fact that the document already accomplished the required standards, the improvements made in this version suggest the need to actualize the monitoring systems. The indicators should be reviewed so that the changes made to every component are taken into account.

Recommendations:

- Include new indicators to take into account the improvements of this new version of the R.PP.

Conclusion:

Standard Met but should be adapted to take in account the new activities proposed in the last R-PP submission.

TAP review of the revised R-PP version March 2nd, 2012, submitted for assessment in PC 11

No changes with respect to the last version were included for this component in the present version. It would be helpful to further elaborate this component since a lot of new activities were included in this last version.

Conclusion: Standard met, but it should be adapted to reflect the new activities proposed in the last versions of the R-PP