

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF)
Fourth Meeting of the Participants Committee (PC4)
October 27-28, 2009 — Washington, DC
Informal Summary of Discussions of Suriname's Draft R-PP

The Government of Suriname presented a draft Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) to the FCPF Participants Committee at the PC4 meeting on October 27th, 2009, for informal discussion and feedback. The following is an informal summary of the discussions prepared by the Facility Management Team (FMT).

Guyana objected to the map of Suriname used in the draft R-PP, given that an area included in this map is in dispute between Guyana and Suriname, and said that the country expert on the TAP should have noted the problem. Guyana also suggested that the FMT should seek advice from the Country that a potential TAP member is from, prior to the selection of the member to the TAP.

Consultation and participation. The Indigenous Peoples and civil society observers expressed concern over the consultation process thus far, stating that meetings were held in the capital city and attended by a limited number of indigenous and other forest-dependent groups, and that the draft R-PP does not identify specific steps to adhere to the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Other Participants recognized this concern, meanwhile noting that these concerns go beyond what countries are being asked to do at this early stage, and pointing to the need to manage false expectations of what needs to be completed at this point, with regard to both consultation and policy development.

Participants noted that the R-PP acknowledges past critiques of consultations, but that greater efforts are needed in this regard, drawing on the lessons of those experiences. Participants requested more detail on how FPIC will be implemented, and suggested that the results of consultations be disclosed in real-time and that a mechanism be developed for feeding the results of consultations into revisions of the R-PP.

Drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. Several Participants recognized that the R-PP identifies key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, but requested that the R-PP provide further detail on how Suriname quantified these drivers and how Suriname intends to address the drivers, including addressing conflicts with other competing sectors (e.g., mining, agriculture, energy). Suriname clarified that the Government plans to establish a second hydro-lake and a road to Brazil, bearing the REDD agenda in mind.

Past deforestation experiences. Some Participants noted that the rate of deforestation in the country is already low, and asked for further detail on past experiences and efforts to address deforestation.

Suriname responded that low deforestation rates have been the result of political will, low population growth, and an avoidance of projects in Suriname's hinterland.

Costs of REDD. Participants recommended that Suriname identify the costs—both economic and social—of implementing REDD in the country, particularly in the context of the apparent challenges the country faces in garnering local support.