

Comment Horoshi

Dear vathana,

Congratulations on a successful pen session! Please find summary of my comments as an observer just in case it will help your documentation:

1) Indicators and Priorities

I have no objection for PEB to approve new indicators. One of the issues that we may need to be aware of is that fact that the Cambodia national REDD+ Taskforce does not have its multi-year work plan with indicators. What may happen is that the taskforce may need to initially borrow these indicators of the UN-REDD Cambodia program. If i understood correctly, Thomas's desk assessment based on the existing indicators, outcome 2 needs to be more emphasized. This itself is true that the Cambodia is supposed to have its "strategy" in the end of its readiness phase. At the same time, I see the senior management of FA and FiA (presumably GDANCP as well) as well as the international NGOs such as WCS facing big challenges in materializing reducing emission from deforestation and forest degradation in the field (equivalent to outcome 3). Tim's comment response was great in terms of the financial allocation under FCPF. My point was that one needs to be careful just in case the taskforce work plan or some kind of monitoring/evaluation of the implementation of the roadmap will borrow these indicators for UN-REDD program as they are reflecting the priorities of the program and may not fully address those of the country as a whole. Again, UN-REDD programs have no obligations to address all the priorities of the countries they support.

2) Priorities for 2013

I am a bit concerned about not seeing relevant activities to kick-off sub-national consideration under outcome 3 was not listed in your presentation. I have the feeling we need to go over the options what we mean by "sub-national". There is at least one technical paper already available under Mr. Chivin. There should be some form of evolution from project-based to a sub-national approach. That's what i see in the roadmap documents. Once again, what were approved was the priority activities to be supported by UN-REDD Cambodia program in rest of 2013. This itself is not a problem as the program has no obligation to support everything.

3) ToR for Technical Teams

I have some reservation that madam co-chair concluded in her closing remarks that they are approved. As Mr. Peter explained to the floor, they need to be approved by the taskforce. I would consider that the comments from the PEB members were compiled to request Cambodia national REDD+ Taskforce secretariat to revise them before they will be tabled the taskforce meeting. Nonetheless virtual technical teams could start operating based on the amended drafts. I still see a few areas to be reconsidered:

- The NGOs (e.g. WCS in Seima) that have been supporting FA, GDANCP and FiA are one of the most valuable potential members for the "demonstration" and "MRV/REL" technical teams. The draft membership for the "demonstration" may not end up in having them. There should be another membership criteria to make sure that there will be at least one of them; and
- Who are the secretariat members (e.g. Moeko, the office if technical advisor to DG-FA as the extended part of the secretariat?); Have these drafts been widely consulted with those who have been involved? I had not seen the drafts for the exception of that of MRV/REL. I am sorry that i may have simply missed them.

I hope my points are now clear with you.

Regards,
Hiroshi Nakata