

DRAFT Synthesis Review of FCPF R-PP of Suriname: re-submission
By the ad hoc FCPF Technical Advisory Panel

Lead Reviewer: Stephen Cobb, on the basis of eight independent TAP reviews

Date of review: March 4, 2010

Overview

Forests cover approximately 90% of Suriname's land area, of which a large tract is in intact condition. The majority of the national population is concentrated in coastal areas and to date there has been relatively little penetration of infrastructure, agricultural settlement and commercial extractive industry into the forests. Suriname is thus in a strong position to supply ecosystem services on a national and regional level, including clean, reliable water supplies and soil conservation, and to serve a global function of maintaining significant carbon stocks in its standing forests.

This strength places Suriname in the category of High Forest cover, Low Deforestation rate countries, which gives it the option either to convert its forests to other productive land uses, or to continue to conserve its existing forests while forgoing potential extraction-based income-generating opportunities by participating in forest carbon financing mechanisms. The Government of Suriname has stated its wish to realize legitimate national aspirations and move along a development path that would harness its potentially rich mineral resources, respond to international demand for tropical timber and develop transportation links in the Amazon basin with road-building. At the same time, it has committed itself to sustainable forest management and livelihoods and wishes to create and benefit from positive incentives, through an international REDD+ framework.

The Government of Suriname has established a cross-sectoral National REDD+ committee, led by the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management (known as RGB), which has taken a leading role in the national discussion on REDD, and in developing its Readiness Preparation Proposal. Thus, a process has begun that could ultimately lead to a comprehensive national program, based on sustainable, but low-impact, use of its forest areas. However, an effective, efficient and equitable program must integrate the economic activities that drive deforestation, such as mining and timber extraction, with the land tenure and livelihood interests of the indigenous and Maroon communities who occupy and use the forests over most of the country's interior. Such a national development program will require successful identification of the main deforestation drivers – historical, current and projected – and the economic trade-offs that will encourage forest conservation and REDD while ensuring the well-being of all its citizens, not least those who are the inhabitants and custodians of the forests.

Strengths of Suriname's revised R-PP

- Suriname has already contributed to significant national and international efforts to identify, harness and enhance the value of its intact forests. It hosted the Paramaribo Dialogue on forest conservation and was a major player at the 14th and 15th CoPs of the UNFCCC, where REDD and REDD+ became a key component of international climate negotiations. While recognizing its legitimate aspirations to develop and use its forest and mineral resources, it has affirmed its intention to consider participation in an international framework aimed at limiting carbon emissions through financial transfers.
- National consultation exercises have been initiated, with attempts to increase the awareness

and involvement of indigenous and Maroon groups, national NGOs and CBOs, the private sector and academia, although there remains much to do. The R-PP has brought this consultative process to national attention and further development is possible.

- A National REDD Working Group (NRWG) has been established and a governance framework for REDD planning and implementation has been proposed that includes a wide range of stakeholders within government and other sectors.
- The drivers of deforestation have been identified in a rapid analysis, and include the mining and forestry sectors, with agriculture and infrastructure development also identified as contributing.
- Early attempts have been made to develop an understanding of the requirements for monitoring, reporting and verification. Capacity development needs have been identified, both for governance and MRV.
- A framework of budgets and timetables has been developed for all the activities identified under the R-PP. These can serve as a basis for discussion and further elaboration.

Issues in the revised R-PP

- There is heavy dependence in the R-PP on government institutions, and not yet enough on other national groupings and communities, particularly those of the indigenous and Maroon groups who are the principal users of the forests.

Suriname still has significant internally unresolved issues between the largely urban/ peri-urban majority of its population, living in the narrow coastal strip, and the indigenous and Maroon communities living at much lower density in the forests that are nevertheless the key target area of REDD proposals. There is concern within Suriname, as well as internationally, that such groups have up to this point been largely marginalized in the process of developing REDD plans, most of which would take place in lands they occupy and depend on. Land tenure for forest communities remains an unresolved issue. Resolution of these issues is a high priority within the country, and raise questions over compliance with international agreements on the rights of indigenous people and World Bank guidelines. These issues were raised in the first TAP review, and seem still to need further attention. Strong consideration still needs to be given to an improved planning process, based on more direct and central involvement of forest dwellers in further evaluation and elaboration of the R-PP.

- In line with the above-noted preponderance of government institutions in the R-PP, there is residual unease amongst reviewers that the current National REDD Working Group or NRWG is predominantly a government body, particularly in the forestry/ environment sector, to the relative exclusion of other sectors and stakeholders. A key sector currently missing from the NRWG is the mining industry, which is surprising, given their clear position as a main driver of deforestation. The diverse communities of forest-dwelling rights-holders are currently represented by very few individuals, as are other CBOs and NGOs.
- The drivers of deforestation, particularly the underlying causes and cross-sectoral linkages, have been much better described in this revised submission. Improved understanding of social and economic trade-offs that would result under a development trajectory requiring reduced carbon emissions and modelling of the effects of alternative development pathways and their effects on livelihoods are key areas that are currently poorly represented in the R-PP. An intention and mechanism for mainstreaming of REDD activities through integration within the Multi-Annual Development Plan needs further consolidation.

- There seems to be a good awareness of the constraints to set up a MRV system, with Suriname admitting it needs capacity building in many aspects. Their proposed methods are not very detailed, but this is perhaps unsurprising given the lack of experience and knowledge with regards to this form of monitoring.

Recommendations for development of the R-PP

Our recommendation is as straightforward as we can make it. We have added no new recommendations since the first review, and base this whole review on assessing whether or not the previous set of recommendations has been, or could be, followed up.

We have indicated in the text which recommendations have, and which have not, received what is, in our judgment, adequate or appropriate attention.

- Thus, our single overriding recommendation is to attend to those previous recommendations, to the extent that it is feasible to do so.

When that is done, while there will be a substantial amount to attend to in any subsequent phase of this process, the TAP review panelists are predominantly of the view that a process is under way that will enable progress towards REDD readiness to be made. We are of the view that there are many problems still to be solved, notably around the issues of indigenous peoples' rights: but with goodwill and commitment, solved they can be.

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3:)

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;

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

Overall assessment

The summary TAP review of October 2009 made the following overall assessment for this standard:

- NRWG: a structure has been proposed, but does not yet delineate institutional responsibilities
- REDD implementation implies profound changes: does not yet show how RPP will integrate with MADP (5-yr Development Plan)
- NRWG comprehensive, but top-down. Full stakeholder representation, particularly forest-dependent communities, is not yet assured in the design
- Proposals for sharing responsibilities among agencies are rather light

The summary TAP review of October 2009 made five recommendations, and the text which follows shows how the present reviewers have assessed whether or not the resubmission has been able to

take account of each of these:

Recommendation 1: Place NRWG outside individual government departments, to ensure greater independence

There has been some editing in this component to delineate the different institutions into Government, government institutions, the private sector (including the mining industry), the community (including both forest-dependent communities and civil society) and academia and adding a couple of bodies.

It is newly proposed that the NRWG would be placed under the Ministry of RGB, which will tend to reduce the R-PP and REDD initiatives to department-specific activities (particularly forestry, yet REDD is about so much more than forestry). This proposal runs contrary to the earlier recommendation of opening up and making accessible the NRWG and REDD institutional arrangements.

The delegation of implementation to the National Forest Carbon Unit is source of concern if oversight is done by a single ministry. It is the NRWG who steers the NFCU but they both fall under the Ministry of RGB as mentioned above, so execution and control are within the same Ministry, which seems to be a missed opportunity.

Hence, the recommendation appears not to have been followed.

Recommendation 2: Define clearer roles and responsibilities

One role and responsibility that is defined is that of a monitoring function. Monitoring by an independent body is suggested and is a very good idea. However, to task the Planning Office with that should either be legally regulated and the present capacity of the Planning Office be strengthened to do so, or the monitoring body should be redefined to become a multi-stakeholder body that would be composed and functioning through a process independent from governmental decisions.

Recommendation 3: Ensure better civil society, indigenous peoples' and private sector representation

There is a new section of text on the development of operational guidelines, with the intention of more stakeholder involvement. There is a statement, including that "REDD+ will be integrated into the national development policies at an early stage", but without clear specification of how this would take place in practical terms of higher level policy making. There is also greater commitment to two-way consultation with stakeholders, but without clarification of how FPIC will be ensured so that meetings are not simply "open to all interested parties", but with stakeholder participation, especially those of the diverse forest communities, will be embedded in the decision-making system

In spite of earlier comments by the previous TAP, the proposed structures are predominantly government entities. The recommendation to significantly provide for more effective participation of indigenous peoples and maroons and other civil society groups in the various structures has not been taken up.

Recommendation 4: Define FPIC procedural rights of representatives

There is no participation of rights-holders and stakeholders in the NFCU, only in the oversight body. How exactly rights-holders and stakeholders would be able to participate effectively remains unclear; reason why the previous TAP recommendation of defining FPIC procedural rights are repeated here. Issues can and do arise from inappropriate implementation, and even if the oversight mechanism functions well, damage could have already been done by the implementation.

Recommendation 5: Ensure RPP implementation finds its place in national development priorities

There were no comments about this at this juncture by reviewers, nor apparently did the R-PP text address this recommendation.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

The R-PP still needs some more clarity on NRWG function, on mechanisms to ensure that REDD is mainstreamed in national planning and that stakeholders, especially at local level, are effectively represented in planning and decision-making.

Standard 1a is largely met, with some room for increased clarification.

Standard 1b: Stakeholder Consultation and Participation

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders: Inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, assessed in the following ways:

- i. the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³, the extent of ownership within government and REDD coordinating body, as well as in the broader national stakeholder community; and

the Consultation and Participation Plan included in the R-PP (which looks forward in time); and the inclusion of elements in the R-PP that adequately document the expressed concerns and recommendations of relevant stakeholders and propose a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

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

Overall assessment

The summary TAP review of October 2009 made the following overall assessment for this standard:

- Fairly well developed COP, with awareness of (but not solving) questions of representation
- Clear definition of NRWG's consultation rules is missing
- Past experience of stakeholder engagement in Suriname not fully exploited
- Definition of roles and responsibilities not clear
- Decision-making procedures not yet clear
- Describe criteria and protocol under which NRWG will operate,

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).

The summary TAP review of October 2009 made seven recommendations, and the text which follows shows how the present reviewers have assessed whether or not the resubmission has been able to take account of each of these:

Recommendation 1: Define clearer roles for existing programmes and expertise

There were no comments about this at this juncture by reviewers, nor apparently did the R-PP text evolve to address this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: Enshrine two-way communication to protect indigenous interests

While it is a good sign that this version of the R-PP states that the consultation method to be used will be the one expressed in the plan designed by the participants in a training workshop prior to the re-submission, in general the rest of the description of this component remains a rather top-down, unilateral information flow rather than the product of a participatory planning and decision-taking process.

The three (July 6, July 31, August 17) meetings held with Indigenous, Maroon and others (as part of the first submission) appear to have been for information sharing and not consultation. Such information sharing meetings don't explore the contribution of communities based on their knowledge. So there is a need to clarify between "information sharing" and "consultation"; the second one is a long and specific process. Reviewers do not yet feel comfortable that this has been adequately dealt with, though the authors of the R-PP show in the document that they are clearly aware of the issues, as well as related ones such as the need to operate in all local languages.

Recommendation 3: Explain consultative methods to be used to produce decisions and actions

The TAP review recommended greater detail on the participation in and content of the consultations already done and on formal arrangements for more extensive participation by all stakeholders, particularly of forest communities. The Re-Submission has acknowledged some of these concerns and has stated that:

"the Ministry of Regional Development will assist with the consultation and participation meetings through governmental and traditional structures. The consultation method that will be used is described in point 6 in the box beneath. FPIC principles will be reviewed and used as a basis for the development of the FPIC guidelines taking into account the national circumstances."

This is a signal of an intention to proceed but does not provide much detail beyond the earlier Consultation and Participation Plan on how it would actually be implemented. Some additions to the Consultation Plan include:

- point 5, which calls for an assessment of, and design of a programme to address, capacity building and institutional strengthening needs for villagers and their relevant organizations. This is expected to lead into the engagement of the local villagers for planning, executing and monitoring the implementation of the RPP and the national REDD+ strategies.
- point 6c, which provides for an independent body to monitor and report on all issues regarding consultation and participation meetings.

point 12, which proposes additional feedback mechanisms to be developed through stakeholders meetings. Feedback from the communities and relevant stakeholders for the adjustments or review and revision of objectives and REDD+ could be communicated, for example, through the representatives of the communities and/or the district commissioner (the representative of the Ministry of Regional Development). Feedback can also be given through the consultation meetings, meetings with subunits, the RPP Assembly and social assessments.

The budget for this component is necessarily high given the nature of the planned activities and cost

involved with bringing together groups dispersed throughout the country and where common modes of transport are lacking: the organizers will have to rely on aeroplanes and boats for the most part.

Recommendation 4: Develop procedural rights for stakeholders

In general the participation process puts extra focus on indigenous and maroon communities. Special mention is made of an agreement with tribal groups on the REDD+ and R-PP strategy. What about other stakeholders such as the agriculture sector, the mining sector, etc.? Are special agreements also foreseen with representatives of these drivers? Reviewers feel that these remain open questions.

Reviewers also feel that the notion of FPIC has been watered down in this second draft to become *'The principles of FPIC will be used as the basis for the development of FPIC guidelines taking into account the national circumstances'*, whereas the previous draft stated that FPIC will be used as the basis for the REDD+ process. It should also be noted that the full meaning of FPIC is not mentioned in the list of abbreviations and it is only assumed that FPIC stands for free, prior and informed consent under its internationally recognized meaning, and not the World Bank's 'free, prior and informed consultation'. The addition of 'taking into account national circumstances' is another source of concern, since this clause has been used in many countries to shape internationally agreed standards, particularly human rights' standards' into much lower 'nationally appropriate' standards.

Recommendation 5: Consider the use of CBD's Akwe: Kon guidelines for assessing social and environment impacts on forest communities.

There were no comments about this at this juncture by reviewers, nor apparently did the R-PP text evolve to address this recommendation.

Recommendation 6: Respect time and culturally appropriate ways needed for indigenous and local communities' opinions to be expressed

There were no comments about this at this juncture by reviewers, nor apparently did the R-PP text evolve to address this recommendation.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

Address more fully the previous TAP recommendations, with more detail on consultation thus far and on plans for fully participatory involvement of stakeholders, especially forest communities in future stages.

Standard 1b is still partially met.

Component 2. Prepare the REDD Strategy

Standard 2.a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Policy, and Governance: A completed assessment is presented that identifies major land use trends, direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD, and major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues. It documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD. The assessment 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:

Overall assessment

The summary TAP review of October 2009 made the following overall assessment:

- Good overall assessment of land-use, forest policy and governance
- Assessment does not show systemic causes of these drivers of deforestation
- Land tenure rights are not clearly described and assessed
- Emissions estimates from agriculture, mining & other land-uses are not clear
- No clarity on constitutional protection for the traditional ways of life of Indigenous and Maroon communities
- A welcome range of new studies is proposed, but the capacity constraints are not given enough attention.

The summary TAP review of October 2009 made six recommendations, and the text which follows shows how the present reviewers have assessed whether or not the resubmission has been able to take account of these:

Recommendation 1: Identify legal or policy measures to demonstrate how indigenous & Maroon communities' rights will be protected

There seems to be no reference to the issue of land rights of indigenous and maroon peoples, particularly in the sections dealing with spatial planning and land use research, which is explicitly required according to the standard described above ('...major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues'). The recognition of land rights of indigenous and maroon peoples remains unattended, even in spite of a ruling of the Inter-American Court on Human Rights. The situation of domestically unrecognized land rights while the state's purported ownership over traditional indigenous and maroon lands and territories continues to be asserted, worries a number of the reviewers, who feel it should be dealt with more openly at this stage, as a means of preparing to resolve issues that seem likely to arise, both on the ground and in the courts, during a next phase of REDD preparation.

Recommendation 2: Show how compliance could be reached with relevant WB safeguard policies and other appropriate international agreements

There were no comments about this at this juncture by reviewers, nor apparently did the R-PP text evolve to address this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: Need to show how institutional capacity constraints might be tackled

There were no comments about this at this juncture by reviewers, nor apparently did the R-PP text evolve to address this recommendation.

Recommendation 4: Clearer statement needed about approach to mitigation of future land-use impacts

There were no comments about this at this juncture by reviewers, nor apparently did the R-PP text evolve to address this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: Improve the detail on overall systemic drivers of deforestation and forest degradation

The TAP review asked for more accurate estimates of the drivers of carbon emissions from land use activities. The Re-Submission proposed that improved estimation of emission rates from different land uses will be included as an additional activity for Component 2a.

The R-PP has identified all major drivers and general trends in the major causes of D&D. No concrete policy vision is mentioned with regard to the largest drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in Suriname, namely the fast expanding mining sector (both for bauxite and other minerals) and plans for infrastructure (incl. the proposed road to Brazil and hydroelectric projects in East and West Suriname) and conversion of forests for agriculture. These drivers have not been studied in further detail yet and there is no quantification of their relative importance, which makes it difficult to make informed statements on a potential REDD strategy. That may be expected to evolve during the next phase.

One driver of deforestation that is cited, is the 'slash and burn' activities of indigenous and maroon peoples. No evidence has been presented to support the perceived negative impact of this practice, yet international studies have shown that traditional rotational agriculture (as this type of agricultural practice is correctly termed), can actually improve forest quality and biodiversity, especially at the scale that it is practiced in Suriname.

As requested, some more detail has been provided in the box entitled "Assessment" on the outputs expected from land use planning, including maps, baseline studies, environmental planning and a range of research and policy development proposals. Additional points have been added in several places, including in the time framework, to address the effects of drivers on carbon emissions, and to include an independent monitoring capacity.

Recommendation 6: Clarify regulatory framework needed for effective R-PP implementation

Forest governance is another unaddressed issue in the Suriname R-PP. While the various governmental institutes have been mentioned, the in-situ guardians and managers of the forests, namely the traditional authorities and communities, have not been brought into the picture. They are the ones that practically assert management functions over the forests in Suriname, and again, because of the non-recognition of the rights of indigenous and maroon peoples, including their traditional governance systems in relation to the State, are causing substantial governance and regulatory issues. Frequent conflicts between indigenous and maroon traditional land-users and logging, mining, agriculture and other concession-holders, are regularly reported. Reviewers feel that if these issues are not confronted now, in the text of the R-PP, they will only raise their profile even higher during forthcoming phases of REDD preparation.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

This component is good, and has greatly improved, but it would still be advisable to attend to the previous recommendations that appear not yet to have received any attention since the October review. The issues about indigenous rights and the regulatory framework are particularly important.

Standard 2a is still partially met

Standard 2.b: REDD strategy Options: Alignment of the proposed REDD strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies: the R-PP includes a summary of the emerging REDD strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD strategy options. This summary states:

- i. how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD strategy;
- ii. early estimates of cost and benefits of the emerging REDD strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental benefits;
- iii. socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD strategy;
- iv. major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD strategy; and
- v. 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 strategy over time.

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

Overall assessment

The TAP review summary presentation of late October 2009 made six recommendations, which we take now in turn:

Recommendation 1: Place the RPP in a more visionary context

The opening paragraph was expanded to discuss the status of forest development in Suriname, as requested by the TAP review, but it still doesn't fully describe interventions to address the major systemic issues. There is not really an outline strategy (with goals and how to reach them) in this component. A major aspect of developing the strategy should therefore be an effort to formulate targets for REDD+ compatible with the economic growth targets as formulated in the MADP.

Questions posed by reviewers include whether there is a strategy to address shifting cultivation by the indigenous and maroon communities? Or about mangrove forest destruction? The majority of the activities proposed are related to developing REL and MRV methodologies. These surely are one part of an overall strategy but what is proposed concerning the drivers of D&D

It seems to the reviewers that, due to the limited consultative process so far, the various assessments needed and policy directions that the REDD strategy should take, have been defined by the (few) writers of the R-PP instead of through an inclusive participatory process to identify priorities and strategies. Such a process would have ensured a human rights-based approach that is an operating principle of the Multi-Annual Development Plan of Suriname.

Recommendation 2: Show how integrated land use planning will be introduced and implemented

Although briefly mentioned on page 46, the issue of land rights seems underestimated by comparison with the Standard expected, in the analytical framework that is presented, as are the institutional and legal arrangements that will need to be in place to meet internationally recognized standards of FPIC and full and effective participation of indigenous and tribal peoples, as an integral part of land-use planning.

Recommendation 3: Carry out cost-benefit analyses of various livelihood alternatives and indicate how the results will be used to guide the implementation of the REDD program

and

Be clearer about how future opportunity costs will be analysed and treated

Reference was made to preparation of cost-benefit analyses for different livelihood alternatives, but no details were added about how such studies might be carried out or their results used. This should be further explored, to include the costs that indigenous and tribal peoples may have to bear in case the R-PP and eventually REDD initiatives would come on stream without legal protection of their rights. Mechanisms for just benefit-sharing need more emphasis, as do the aspects of governance over any REDD initiative and possible financial flows arising from it. The fact that financial flows by themselves do not solve development problems is widely known, yet the R-PP does not appear to have offered any potential remedies for this potentially difficult issue.

Recommendation 4: Be clearer about gaps to be filled with new data, new studies incl. methods to be used to estimate and interpret carbon stocks

The need for a table summarizing existing data and research studies was acknowledged, but it was explained that there was currently no database for such studies; an assessment of these studies was proposed.

There was no explanation of methods to estimate and interpret carbon stocks.

Recommendation 5: Chart out a pathway for resolving policy conflicts

While it may be too early to take a definite standpoint on this matter, the intrinsic conflict and inconsistency between the current development vision that places high priority on exploitation of natural resources and large infrastructural projects, and a future REDD strategy, is not addressed very convincingly. To the contrary there seems to be a certain unwillingness to depart away from an exploitative path.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

Address the recommendations on this component mentioned by the previous TAP.

Standard 2b is still only partially met.

Standard 2.c: REDD implementation framework: Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD in the country setting that identifies key issues, explores potential arrangements to address them, and offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package.

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

Overall assessment

The previous TAP review summarized its findings at the October PC meeting as follows:

- The implementation arrangements were described in too little detail
- The framework of activities was limited to government agencies
- Implementation constraints (including conflicting and unenforced policies) were listed, but the proposed programme did not explicitly deal with them
- But at this juncture, prior to REDD architecture being defined, some gaps were quite

understandable

The recommendations were as listed below, and in the text which follows, we will summarise the views of the reviewers, taking all three recommendations at once, as to how well they were dealt with:

Recommendation 1: R-PP needs to show how its work programme will ensure REDD makes its way into the new MADP (Suriname's 2011-2015 Development Plan)

Recommendation 2: Show how activities will attempt to remove the 7 listed negative influences on forest carbon finance

Recommendation 3: Arrange multi-sectoral engagement to tackle implementation of these policy-related issues

This section only lists some issues related to an effective REDD implementation framework but would need much more elaboration, as acknowledged in the section itself on the institutional, economic, legal and governance arrangements to have in place. Apart from the addition of an independent monitoring assessment, none of the recommendations of the TAP review seem to have been acted upon. This component reinforces the focus on government as central and only player in REDD, and on REDD as a largely forestry issue.

In the Rationale of this chapter REDD+ is linked to 'poverty reduction'. This is a strong commitment especially for the forest dwelling communities. But poverty reduction is not visibly incorporated in the "Schedule and Sequencing of activities" or in "Table 2c: Summary of Implementation Framework Budget "

A very important factor to be thoroughly analyzed is the institutional capacity of Suriname to be able to effectively manage any large-scale future REDD program. This would require a fuller analysis and description in this section.

The further studies to be undertaken during the R-PP implementation phase seem insufficiently identified and described and would need to be further elaborated, taking into account different perspectives but particularly the non-forestry aspects of any REDD strategy, particularly those related to institutional capacity, legal and governance arrangements.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

Consider, make reference to and act upon the recommendations of the previous TAP review, or explain why this action is not taken.

Standard 2c is still only partially met.

Standard 2.d: Assessment of social and environmental impacts: The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the Bank'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.

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

Overall assessment

The TAP review summary of October 2009 made the following assessment:

- Not clear whether proposed SESAs would be single-sectoral, or a cumulative assessment of impact of REDD+
- Not clear how these assessments would be designed to meet WB safeguard policies
- There was an appropriate call for capacity-building, which did not clarify who would be targeted
- A proposed roster of NGOs and experts able to assist technically, was not related to an analysis of needs

This summary assessment was followed by four Recommendations, each of which is presented in turn, with the synthesis of the present reviewers comments as to whether or not the recommendations have been followed up.

Recommendation 1: Indicate how a social and environmental management framework would operate in the absence of an Environment Act

NIMOS, the National Institute for Environment and Development, already has guidelines for ESIA studies in place that comply with the requirements of the World Bank. These guidelines are already implemented when international finance institutions request an ESIA study for a project and in cases of other large projects from the private sector.

NIMOS is also entrusted with assessing ESIA studies for third parties (approving the ToR's, assessing the studies and approving the final drafts). NIMOS is furthermore entrusted with monitoring compliance of actors with what was agreed upon in the ESIA studies. As such NIMOS is an experienced monitor.

The only constraint for NIMOS is that the Environmental Law is not yet approved by Parliament and its actions thus do not have the force of law. . The absence of environmental legislation is thus acknowledged but no indication is given if and how this crucial gap will be dealt with. Past experience with ESIA's related to large scale investments has not always been positive. The reviewers felt that all this needs to be better explained in the R-PP.

Recommendation 2: Explain how SESA protocols that are compliant with WB safeguard policies will be defined

The Re-Submission correctly identifies that there is a need for an assessment of environmental, social and economic issues, capacities and cost-benefit implications, and compliance with World Bank safeguards for the application of SESA to a national REDD programme before there can be implementation of SESA. It also states that this will be done according to national standards, which could be interpreted to mean a dilution of the force of some of the safeguards. It provides no clear policy direction about the principles on which these assessments would operate. Commitment to full and effective participation of all rights-holders particularly indigenous peoples and maroons as well as commitment to adhere to (rather than just 'consider') the World Bank's safeguards and preferably even higher international standards, such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, is not present in the RPP document.

Recommendation 3: Include cost/benefit analyses as part of the SESA process

Apart from the recognition referred to just above, reviewers did not find a detailed response to this recommendation.

Recommendation 4: Tabulate capacity building needs and constraints

This recommendation does not seem to have been taken up. Opinions about capacity amongst reviewers within Suriname differs, one saying that capacity within Suriname to undertake extensive ESIA's is very limited, the other saying the contrary.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

Address the recommendations on this component mentioned by the previous TAP.

Standard 2d is currently not met.

Component 3. Develop a Reference Scenario

Standard 3 Reference scenario: Present work plan for how the reference scenario for deforestation, and for forest degradation (if desired), will be developed, including early ideas on feasibility of which methods to use (e.g., scenario of forest cover change and emissions based on historical trends in emissions and/or based on projections into the future of historical trend data), major data requirements and capacity needs, and linkages to the monitoring system design.

(The FCPF recognizes 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-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Overall assessment

The TAP review summary of October 2009 made the following assessment:

- Most of the necessary elements are mentioned but there is a lack of framework, series of steps and expected outcomes
- Available information requires more effective and detailed analysis to get to appropriate reference scenario
- Unclear which target development scenario, uncertainty analysis and modelling approach will be used
- Timeline and budget do not match

This summary assessment was followed by three recommendations, which are listed together below, followed by the general synthesis of the present reviewers comments as to whether or not the recommendations have been followed up:

Recommendation 1: Clarify key points incl. definition of forests; methods for estimating emissions from different DD activities incl. forestry, mining and agriculture

Recommendation 2: Identify and describe institutions to provide data, make analyses and how it is proposed to build reference scenario(s)

Recommendation 3: Clarify unclear points(a long list is provided)

The approach was radically restructured and addressed a number of the recommendations in the previous TAP review. A staged approach is now proposed, with Phase I focusing on estimating historic trends in deforestation and degradation and Phase II looking at future projections. A first step toward establishing a reference scenario will be to update the definition of forest that is currently incompatible with REDD+. The IPCC 2003 guidelines will be used as a basis to take measurements. The R-PP presents an inventory of existing data (p. 60-61) while identifying the new data that will be needed. The data currently available in Suriname would allow the country to establish a reference level at the Tier 1 or Tier 2 level only. Personnel at several institutions have been capacitated with CO2 fix and Suriname plans to develop a model of future emissions.

The R-PP presents clearly the data that are available as well as the need for new data. Partners are well identified and expected to provide support during the R-PP implementation phase. The R-PP mentions that the reference scenario and data collection will involve stakeholders (p. 60) but it is not clear which stakeholders will discuss which kind of data, etc. In principle the idea is good, but more information on this point is needed. Likewise in p. 63, the R-PP indicates that future emissions will be modeled. With the historically low deforestation, Suriname is a country for which historical emissions might not be a good predictor of land use change in the future. Suriname is a country where the “+” of REDD is the key element and IPCC does not provide appropriate methodological guidance for conservation of forest carbon stocks. Suriname should not be penalized for that, but the R-PP should acknowledge the challenges ahead. Finally, it is not clear who will be responsible for developing the reference level.

A few concerns which remain are outlined below:

- Propose to use definition of forest according to FAO – though understandable, there can be technical problems when using remote sensing imagery to detect change accurately – this canopy cover is less than the minimum recommended by remote sensing experts to obtain accurate change detection. Instead they might want to propose what canopy cover level would suit Suriname’s forests – they could add this as a task to investigate as part of the work to be done under the R-PP
- They provide a comprehensive list of data on forest C stocks but it would have been good to see an assessment of their value – some of sources mentioned are quite old and may not be too useful for estimating historic emissions. Need to make a case as to why they could or could not be useful.
- It is not clear if there is an understanding of which forests are the “population of interest”? A national inventory is fine to understand perhaps the growing stock of timber for future exploitation, but for carbon the only forests of interest are those at risk of being deforested or degraded. It would be good to show some understanding of this concept as this will make doing historic emissions and future monitoring more cost-effective as not all forests may need to be monitored for carbon stocks .
- As Suriname is planning to collect new data as well as use useful existing data, there is no need to compare uncertainty with respect to IPCC default values – Suriname should recognize that its collection of new data will enable it to use high level Tier 2 data. They need to assess the uncertainty of the data they gather for their country specifically.
- Under new data – it is not necessary to collect new data in areas that are difficult to access – if difficult to access they are probably not under threat for D&D. Doing this kind of work would not be cost –effective in the near to mid term. If threats to these forests are seen to occur in the

future then at that time their stocks could be assessed.

- Suggest that when planning future work on measuring forest C stocks, Suriname convene a workshop of experts from key institutions/organizations that do this type of work to investigate a variety of options that could make their collection of new data more cost-effective. Not sure RAINFOR design would meet their needs. Also might want to consider use of temporary plots rather than permanent ones – permanent ones are useful in areas where degradation is major issue but not necessarily where deforestation is the major threat.
- Mention of a benchmark map is good – need to perhaps discuss for which year this will be done
- One big section that is lacking is an assessment of current capacity to do all steps described under this section.
- Given apparent lack of sufficient capacity, might want to make one step in this section to hold a workshops of experts (national and international) to investigate what methods are available, what other countries are doing to accomplish same task, and what Suriname could use for their national circumstances. The budget item for capacity building is quite small relative to the overall budget for this component
- There are opportunities to engage forest communities to help collect new ground data to contribute to reference level efforts. A discussion of this is lacking.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

Suriname might find it helpful to follow the detailed advice laid out above.

Standard 3 is largely met, with some further detail required.

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System

Standard 4: Design a monitoring system: The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation. The system design should include early ideas on including capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor other benefits and impacts, for example rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD implementation in the country, and to assess the impacts of the REDD 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 implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD monitoring system with this full set of capabilities.

(The FCPF recognizes 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:

Overall assessment

The TAP review summary of October 2009 made the following assessment:

- RPP has a good but incomplete analysis of drivers of DD resulting in incomplete basis for an MRV system
- Ambitious monitoring framework exceeding anything previously produced in Suriname; apparent bias in favor of international consultants at expense of building local capacity
- Little discussion on inclusion of rural and indigenous communities in monitoring regime
- Little mentioned on reporting and verification systems

This summary assessment was followed by four recommendations which are each listed below, followed in each case by the synthesis of the present reviewers comments as to whether or not the recommendations have been followed up

Recommendation 1: Consult or refer to existing guidance and experiences, incl. standardized FCPF monitoring system

The two steps approach proposed by Suriname is an excellent way forward for a country with limited capacities. It should serve the country well to take the time to develop its monitoring system after building the understanding of the rules of REDD+ and of the available guidance. The preliminary ideas proposed for establishment of the monitoring system are sound. One missing piece of information pertains to the monitoring of safeguards. Given that countries are waiting for guidance from UNFCCC on this issue, Suriname should not be penalized for this omission..

Recommendation 2: Identify key drivers of deforestation in participatory evaluation process to identify monitoring measures

The R-PP describes the steps needed to design the monitoring system –most of these steps are on target except for concerns about some of them given below:

- Under Design – it would be good to outline some ideas about who will do what and when – who will be lead for what steps: forestry department, role of forest communities, etc.
- Step 3 – need to tie in the remote sensing standards to make sure they can monitor the results of activities that reduce D&D of forests – if the strategy is to do something about shifting cultivation then the remote sensing component must be at the scale to monitor these changes; the same for mangroves . Area of forests will need to be monitored for the whole country to ensure that activities prevented in one area are not displaced elsewhere in country
- Step 4 – monitoring carbon stocks of all forests may not be needed – the key stocks are those in areas where forests are under medium to high threat of D&D. Thus one needs to think how cost effectively to collect the data needed for monitoring – this is where input for the planned training workshops will be very useful .
- A continuous systematic national inventory is probably not needed – once again targeted inventory of forest carbon stocks is likely the most cost effective way to go. Also whether soil carbon stocks are needed depends on the cause of deforestation – if the strategy is to focus on reducing extent of shifting cultivation then collecting measures of soil carbon is probably a good idea especially if amount of charcoal produced and left in soil is included. Bit if focus of REDD

strategy is reduce emissions from forest degradation by over-logging then soil carbon stocks are not expected to change and thus measuring the soil C may not be cost effective. Such examples illustrate why it is important to link details of the monitoring system to the proposed REDD+ strategies in the design phase

- The proposed work on biomass burning from slash and burn agriculture looks like a pet project of a researcher rather than significantly contributing to emissions reduction estimates. In the proposed budget, the amount allocated to this step is as much as for monitoring C stocks of all the rest of the forests. Monitoring fires by remote sensing is an excellent idea but the plan to measure continuous in-situ emissions needs further thought. Most of the emissions will be CO₂ from the destruction of the biomass. Emissions of other non-CO₂ gases is complex and given the present area burned annually the quantity is likely to be very small relative to CO₂. A lot of insight would be gathered by doing pre and post burn measures of the stocks of live and dead wood and charcoal
- The fact that 'slash-and-burn' (a wrong terminology) is singled out for assessment of biomass burning indicates a certain bias against traditionally sustainable forest use and also distracts attention away from the major drivers of deforestation in Suriname (mining, infrastructure and commercial agriculture). Another important biomass burning that occurs on a large scale in Suriname is that of rice chaff burning, which is not mentioned.
- No mention was made of monitoring other environmental and social benefits, such as rotational agriculture (including carbon capture thanks to new forest growth but also the many social and cultural benefits, food security, maintenance of ecosystems and improvement of biodiversity). . Do monitoring systems exist for other benefits – e.g timber, biodiversity, social factors? How could these be linked with the planned MRV system for REDD+?
- No attention is given to the monitoring and reporting of government policies such as the promotion of extractive industries and other natural resource exploitation and the impacts of such policies on carbon emissions.

Recommendation 3: Identify type of capacity building needed, proposed recipients and expected outputs

It is recognized that substantial capacity will be needed to accomplish the monitoring activities and a good discussion is presented in R-PP on how to attain this capacity – what specific areas are needed and how to accomplish this.

Recommendation 4: Clarify scope for incorporation of local and indigenous communities in monitoring system

The re-submission of the R-PP includes the additions of text on the assessment and capacity building of local, Indigenous and Maroon people to be incorporated and be part of the monitoring system, and on provision for an independent audit of the system during the first three year but, curiously, not the final year (2013).

There is little mentioning of reporting systems, nor on verification systems to be set up.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

The authors of Suriname's R-PP might find it helpful to follow the detailed advice laid out above, with particular reference to the assessment of the 7 steps proposed in the revised R-PP.

Standard 4 is largely met, but is still not complete.

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, as well as from other international sources (e.g., UN-REDD or 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 readiness activities identified in the R-PP, or gaps in funding are clearly noted.

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

Overall assessment

The budget that was presented in the first submission was thought (by TAP reviewers in their October summary) to be reasonably costed, thorough and comprehensive. Nonetheless, the summary review made the following Recommendations, and in the text which follows each of them, the views of the present review team are summarised:

Recommendation 1: Revise budget to show sequencing

The recommendations of the previous TAP review were not acted upon. The Re-Submission has removed the detailed budget tables for each component, replacing them with a single summary table, so it is not possible to assess, in one place, the sequence of payments against activities and against outputs.

Recommendation 2: Give specific outputs from each activity and link those to objectives

This has not been done, but perhaps the earlier TAP summary was asking too much at this stage (though it is normal project preparation practice to do exactly this).

Recommendation 3: Identify possible, likely sources of funding and indicate existing versus new funding

There is no analysis of funding sources for different activities, whether from FCPF or other sources, nor of whether there can be synergies with existing sources. Funding requirements are not linked to the financing source: national budget, multilateral funds, REDD+ funds, bi-lateral assistance or other donors. Part of the REDD+ activities are, as can be expected, funded from the regular national budget. Making this visible would give an idea of the national efforts and financial commitment to REDD+ as well as the expected input from other donors.

Recommendation 4: Establish synergies and complementarities

Taking into account the actual budget figures also gives an idea of the extra financial efforts that will be needed to enter the REDD+ track successfully and the degree to which different funding sources might be complementary to one another. So far, this has not been done.

Recommendation 5: Reflect how gaps in funding will affect delivery of program objectives

There is no indication of how gaps in funding would affect the delivery of the overall programme.

An additional point made by some of the reviewers is that it would be reassuring to have early ideas on how the eventual funds (post 2013) would be governed and managed.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

The same remarks made by the previous TAP are still applicable, and need to be addressed, among others the need to further clarify sequencing of activities and inter-linkage between activities to meet standards, the need for differentiation between existing and newly required funding and where such funding may come from, and mentioning of how potential gaps in funding will affect delivery of the program

Standard 5 is still partially met.

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6: 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 assessment

The TAP summary assessment of October 2009 made the following comments:

- This section seems incomplete
- No information on indicators, baselines and frameworks for feedback needed to ensure compliance with all RPP standards
- Lack of identification of institution(s) to implement M&E
- Lack of means to ensure independent verification
- No identification of risks, obstacles and conflicts that can impede monitoring

The recommendations which followed are presented once more here, with a synthesis of the appropriate comments on the changes in the re-submission:

Recommendation 1: Clarify institutional framework for independent monitoring and feedback

This component has remained unchanged from the previous R-PP, with no action taken on the previous TAP recommendations. The justification for this approach appears to be provided in the opening statement in the Rationale section: "According to the RPP guidelines, component 6 is optional. Therefore, Suriname presents within this component the basis for the development of a "sustainable monitoring, evaluation and reporting framework for the REDD+ readiness strategy" within the framework of the National Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Program." Thus an outline plan is provided.

This approach seems to be at odds with the intention that an M&E system should be operational at the program outset and provide the basis for reporting on program implementation and budget

expenditure against agreed indicators. Since the FCPF FMT had earlier described this component as optional, the TAP reviewers cannot take exception to this: they can only say that it will need to be done before a readiness grant is made.

Recommendation 2: Make assessment of risks and obstacles to effective monitoring and how to address those

Clear principles that will govern the design and implementation of the monitoring and evaluation framework must be adopted in advance. Failure to involve all rights-holders and stakeholders effectively in all steps of program monitoring and evaluation must be seen as a real risk. The measurement of actual results and benefits, of the implementation of the R-PP itself as well of potential future REDD+ activities is an important part of this. These issues (and other risk factors) do not seem to have been taken into account in this re-submission.

Recommendation 3: Show need for SMART performance indicators and baselines

None of the reviewers commented on this.

Recommendations for the R-PP draft

The earlier recommendations of the TAP should be taken into consideration and acted upon. This sort of issue is a normal part of contract procedures and may therefore be assumed to be dealt with at that future stage.

Standard 6 is still not met, but its optional status makes this an equivocal issue.