

## **Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**

(interim, January 10, 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 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 this in mind when commenting.*
- 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 (fill in): Carmenza Robledo, Mike Speirs

Date of review (fill in): March 21<sup>st</sup> 2012

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

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

#### **General comments**

There has been a process of continuous improvement in the R-PP of Guatemala. The GoG has made great efforts in clarifying and addressing the comments sent by the reviewers over time. In the present version there are still some issues that could be improved. The corresponding recommendations are included in the following sections.

At this stage, it is difficult to be sure about the best strategy to follow either investing more time improving

the proposal or to facilitate implementation and then focus on some improvements directly. Similarly to the TAP the PC review concludes that all standards are either met or largely met. We would however recommend to take care of following aspects when implementing the R-PP:

- Further improvement is needed regarding the enhancing participation of the private sector. The private sector is now mentioned in different sections. However clarification is needed on participation mechanisms, representativeness and feed-back loops with the private sector
- given the recent formation of a new government in Guatemala, it will be important to ensure continuity in the design of the REDD+ strategy, in the responsible ministries and with continued involvement of civil society organizations;
- Clarify potential funding sources for the proposed activities. This should be considered for all standards
- Clarify participation, roles and responsibilities of sub-national and local authorities
- Continue using the link with the Climate change law that was proposed during the last administration. A key topic in this law is the allocation of the ownership of the emission reductions. The proper clarification is basic for ensuring a fair distribution of benefits of REDD+ and thus a central element not only for the implementation of the R-PP but for the future use of a REDD+ mechanism in Guatemala
- Update the tables of activities considering that we are now very close to the second quarter of 2012. Activities for 2011 don't make much sense
- Clarify responsibilities and functions for implementing the activities in the R-PP: What institution is responsible for leading each activity, what
- it will be important to ensure the development of one joint program in which the FCPF and the UN-REDD combine forces and resources.

**Recommendation:** Either these aspects are addressed in a next round of R-PP formulation or these aspects will carefully monitored during the implementation of the proposal

## **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:**

Recommendations to further improvement of this section are:

- Characterize the private sector and define a mechanism for its participation at different levels (planning, implementation and possible monitoring of REDD+ programs/activities)
- Clarify who is responsible or leading the implementation of the activities included in this standard
- Correct the time table (no activities in 2011)
- Clarify the role and responsibilities of sub-national and local authorities
- Clarify ownership of the proposal in the new government
- Clarify Connection of the REDD planning process to broader economic and development

processes to improve connection of the REDD+ planning with other sectors impacting drivers of deforestation.

- **Conclusion: Standard 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:**

This section now includes important issues in a more consistent manner. For the reviewers the treatment of the following aspects is especially positive:

- Creation of a mechanism for a multi-stakeholder participation, both for the formulation of the R-PP as well as for its future implementation. Use of this mechanism should be closely monitored in future.
- Awareness of the importance of improving capacities at different levels and the need for a capacity building program for IPs
- Stakeholder dialogue and promotion of facilitators in the indigenous people
- The clarification of needs for strengthening institutional capacity

One area for possible improvement would be the development of a clear plan clear plan or mechanism for incorporating feedback from stakeholders

Further improvement could be done in the budget. First for improving the dates and second for providing a more accurate budget

**Conclusion: Standard 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

<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

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:**

This section is well structured. It has consistently linked with the standard 1a. Wide consultation with IPs and local communities has taken place. However less consultation or dialogue has taken place with the private sector.

The idea of creating a mechanism for solving conflicts is highly appreciated by the reviewers

Recommendations regarding this standard are:

- Promote a dialogue with the private sector in order to understand its rational and future plans for land use in Guatemala
- Consider include consultation/dialogue about potential incentives or incentives schemes that would be attractive to the different social groups (i.e. IPs, local communities or private sector)
- The reviewers recognize the importance of keeping a consultation/dialogue platform in the future and linking this with other consultation platforms in the country. Special relevant in this case seems to be the platforms dealing with the rights of local communities and IPs (e.g. the comité de unidad campesina -CUC-)
- Improve the time table (no activities in 2011)

**Conclusion: 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.

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

This section has been improved since the last review. The action plan is very well structured

Recommendations:

Consider to include a differentiation of drivers per region. This should help provide information on what are the principle sources of deforestation or forest degradation, where and why. One can expect different drivers and actors in the different regions. Such a differentiated analysis of the drivers will help in future for the design of incentives that are appropriate to the situation in the different regions. A more detailed analysis of the potential role that other non forest related sectors of the economy play as drivers of deforestation would also be useful.

-

---

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).

**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.

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

Again the proposal has been improved and the proponent have addressed the comments and recommendations provided in other reviews. We would like to list some additional recommendations including:

- There are some REDD+ options that although considered important, seem to have a low feasibility (e.g. option (i) Harmonization of policies). It is understandable that the political process for such an harmonization is a big challenge. We also recognize that this process can go beyond the mandate of the ministries already involved in the R-PP. However, we also recognize the importance of such options. We recommend (again) to have a dialogue with these other Ministries before starting the implementation of the R-PP and to propose alternative options in case an harmonization become not fully achievable.

**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.

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

*[add space as needed]*

The section has been improved. The budget has been improved.

One area that could be further elaborated is clarifying the relationship between national, regional and local governments and how capacity building and implementation of the REDD+ strategy will address this

The section also mentions the importance of legal aspects. Further the section consider demonstration

activities as part of the learning process

**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.

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

- The proposal is complete. As it is based on a wide consultation process, especially with local communities and IPs we assume a large level of ownership in this actors and the corresponding willingness to further collaborate in the process.
- This version includes cultural impact assessment as well as the other key elements of the SESA (sigla as in Spanish)
- The list of activities is clear and a timetable showing a logical flow for the implementation of the activities has been included

**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.)

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

The proposal considers the existing capacities in the country and analyses the new capacities that need to be build up. It also presents a very useful table explaining the proposed actions. The conclusions regarding the needs for improving capacities for setting the RL are a very good basis for monitoring the improvement of these capacities over time.

The proposal also recognizes the interim status and learning process of the sub-national approach

Main challenges for the implementation of this section are:

- The available experience is mainly in one region the “tierras bajas”. Data, drivers and actors in other regions are less known
- Coordination among the forest administration, especially INAB (responsible for the forest outside the protected areas) and CONAP (responsible for the administration of the protected areas).

- Securing the necessary funding for all the activities planned

**Conclusion: 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.)

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

The section has been improved and previous comments have been addressed.

The table on institutional arrangements is very useful for clarifying expected roles of different institutions in for the MRV. Similarly the table on page 137 showing the plan for developing a national MRV system is clear and well structured.

The plan presented is very ambitious. Some flexibility in the implementation is recommended

The budget should include all activities

**Conclusion: 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.)

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

The proposal now includes a logically structured set of objectives, corresponding activities and expected results. It follows a logical framework. It also includes a time table including the major activities. We recommend keeping some flexibility for the implementation of the time table as some delays are to be expected.

Additional information on how the proposed system would connect and coordinate with other national information and planning systems would be useful for understanding how the system will effectively identify additional benefits and address safeguards.

The proposal also includes the recent improvements and future challenges for some key issues in Guatemala including transparency and access to information. It is good to recognize the improvements and it is also good to keep an eye on these challenging issues.

The inclusion of Fundación defensores de la Naturaleza as funding partner shows the commitment of other sectors in the R-PP

**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.

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

As expressed in other sections and at the beginning of this review the budget should be completed/updated. Especially with regard to the activities in the standard 1. It has also said before that we recommend to provide information about potential additional funding sources

**Conclusion: Standard 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:**

Overall the program monitoring framework identifies key indicators / goals for accomplishment, but does not provide guidance for monitoring progress towards reaching the goals.

In many cases the plan identifies key documents needed for assessment, but does not provide information or specific indicators on how progress should be measured or confirmed.

An update of this section should be done in order to include all activities as presented in the sections before.



**Conclusion: Standard met, but an update is needed**