# Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF):
# Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) – <u>External</u> Review Form

May 28, 2008

*Guidelines for Reviewers:*

1) *This review form is a record of your review, which may be disclosed for transparency. Please bear that in mind when filling it out.*

2) *Please summarize your comments-- address whatever you feel is important.*

3) *Please evaluate and mark (score) each of the 5 Summary Assessment review criteria from the FCPF Information Memorandum, the Participants Committee Selection Criteria, and the numbered R-PIN major topics, as requested in the right-hand column. Select a mark from the following scale: NA: Not Addressed. 1: Inadequately addresses criterion. 2: Barely addresses criterion. 3: Average, or adequately addresses criterion. 4: Good job of addressing criterion. 5: Excellent job of addressing criterion.*

| | Mark (score): |
|---|---|
| **1) Country submitting the R-PIN:** [ GUATEMALA ]<br>**2) Date of Review:**<br>**3) Name and affiliation of R-PIN Reviewer:** | |
| **I. Summary Assessment of the Quality and Completeness of the R-PIN:**<br>*Note with value of 1 – 5* | |
| **Criterion (i): Ownership of the proposal by both the government and relevant stakeholders:** | |
| **Criterion (ii): Consistency between national and sectoral strategies and proposed REDD Strategy:** | |
| **Criterion (iii): Completeness of information and data provided:** | |
| **Criterion (iv): Clarity of responsibilities for the execution of REDD activities to be financed:** | |
| **Criterion (v): Feasibility of proposal and likelihood of success:** | |
| **SUMMARY SCORE:** *add scores above and enter sum into box on right* | **SUM:** |
| **Improvements the country could make to R-PIN, and any TA needs for it:** | |
| **II. Participants Committee Selection Criteria: Information** | |
| **Relevance of country in REDD context: Priority to countries with: (i) substantial forest area and forest carbon stocks; and (ii) relevance of forests in economy, including livelihoods of forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples:** | |

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

**Variety of approaches**: Proposed innovative approaches to tackling deforestation and degradation; methods; testing new mechanisms and distribution of REDD revenues; and/or regionally important leadership.

---

## III. Detailed Review of R-PIN Responses to Template Questions:

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

**1. Government focal point, and ownership and consultation in producing the R-PIN:**
RPIN ownership seems clear but what is the role or contribution given by the list of participants as governmental agencies and NGOs. No evidence of Municipalities participation in this initial process given the autonomy they have for instance, Petén holds the highest deforestation rate but consultations evidence has not been provided.

**2. Identification of institutions responsible for: forest monitoring, law enforcement, conservation, and coordination across forest, agriculture and rural development:**
No specific references on the role and responsibilities of each listed institutions.

**3. Current country situation:**

**Where do deforestation and forest degradation occur, main causes, estimates of greenhouse gas emissions, data available? Key issues in forest law enforcement and forest sector governance?**

No updated information provided on forest cover (1991 – 1993) and emissions (1990 and 2000). Excellent information on causes of deforestation but difficult to identify the major drivers. No data on specific land ownership conflict and how public policy on agriculture has been addressed lately to avoid deforestation. Weakness on Law enforcement and institutional capacities.

**4. Data available on indigenous peoples and forest dwellers?**

Petén is the targeted area and inhabited by Mayan communities and other local peoples. Should be excellent to have the limited information they have on IPs and local people.

**5. *Current* strategy in place to address deforestation and forest degradation. What stakeholder process was used to arrive at it?**

Would be great to get a sense of the importance of the five pillars of the current strategy. Incentives have had limited success to avoid the major trends of deforestation. There is a clear need of capacity building to implement the strategy on Protected Areas.

**6. What would be needed to reduce deforestation and forest degradation?**
**Has country considered the potential relationship between REDD strategies and country's broader development agenda?**
Indicates the need to strengthen the justice sector in Petén as well as to eliminate the policies that encourages deforestation and also the recognition to harmonize the programs. Weakness in the rational that REDD could make a significant difference. The poverty reduction strategy link to the use of natural resources has to be well organize otherwise could conduct to deforestation.
**Has any technical assistance been received, or is planned on REDD?**
No received yet.

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

Adequate information on stake holder consultation based on national, regional and thematic level. It's general for meaningful analysis of FCPF support. What is the process to invite delegates from indigenous and local organizations?

**8.   Implementing REDD strategies:  challenges to introducing effective REDD strategies, and how might they be overcome?   Would performance-based payments though REDD  be a major incentive for implementing a more coherent strategy to tackle deforestation?**
Four main challenges have been identified but supporting details are missing. The proposal is skeptical about the feasibility of implementing performance based payment due to the experience in the past.

**9.   REDD strategy monitoring and implementation:**
**How forest cover and land use change are monitored today, and any constraints in this approach?**
Clear need of capacity building and lack of basic information on land use change.  No mention of own remote sensing will be done. Need to give a better sense of monitoring and implementation. No specific information of constrains.

**10.   Additional benefits of potential REDD strategy, and how to monitor them:  biodiversity and rural livelihood?**
RPIN has good relevant information about biodiversity monitoring in Guatemala. No clear and specific elaborated ideas about benefits on governance and socio economics.

**11. What assistance is country likely to request from FCPF Readiness Mechanism?**
It's general and this section doesn't have specific and detailed information, for example, no idea is given about equipments they will require. Need to be elaborated.

**12.   Donors and international partners already cooperating with country on REDD.**
There are some NGOs willing to support the work in REDD in the future but specific donors are not identified.

**13.   Country's Potential Next Steps and Schedule:**

The timetable and associated activities presented in the proposal is insufficient to draw conclusions as per the stage of development of the REDD strategy concept for Guatemala. The potential next steps from the information presented, would be "Refine Draft Proposal for the Creation of the REDD unit", "Information and Outreach Activities", and "Workshops and follow up meetings". Need to clearly identify each activity meaning.

**14.  Attachments  and their usefulness:**

Information on socio economics was not provided.