

January 26, 2012

Comments from Red Mocaf on Mexico Forests and Climate Change Project under the FIP Investment Plan

Dear Members of the CTC
Sergio Madrid, President of the CTC
Sergio Graf, Technical Secretary of the CTC

In relation to the support that has been requested from the members of CTC REDD+ for the review of 5 documents related to the specific investment loan SIL, I would like to comment, in a constructive spirit, on certain aspects that worry me and then propose some suggestions, which I put forth for consideration by all members of this Committee.

The current period of the year is for many, perhaps the majority, one of intense workloads. Similarly, our organization, despite our interest in the topic, finds it very challenging to invest the coming week in reviewing ENA-REDD+ and the 5 SIL documents, attend the two workshops which we have been invited to, and above that, tend to the responsibilities of our regular work.

It is not clear to me why the deadline is the 10th of November, but I suppose that the reason is related to the discussion and approval of the federal budget and authorization of a counterpart for SIL by the Mexican government. Regardless, I would call it a paradox that the principal and guiding document of the REDD+ process, the REDD+ National Strategy or ENA-REDD+, is at the phase of “draft zero” whereas components such as the SIL are advancing at a very high level of specificity and their direction might not correspond with the final contents of ENAREDD+.

Considering the above, allow me to make the following proposals:

First. For those who can provide opinions of the 5 SIL documents, that they go ahead and that CONAFOR attends to these observations, but that the invitation to review the documents is not taken as a validation on the part of CTC REDD+ for the arguments described previously.

Second. The CTC can endorse or give a vote of confidence for the Mexican government regarding the SIL documents, for the purpose to the end of budget management; however the right of civil society to provide opinions on these documents under appropriate conditions of time and form should be reserved. This adequate time would be having ENA-REDD+ as an official document, probably during the first or second trimester of 2012.

In this sense, ***the contract, agreement or document for the formalization of the SIL should include a clause or provision specifying that once the approval process of ENA-REDD+ has concluded, an analysis for coherence and consistency will be conducted to align the direction of SIL with the content of ENAREDD+. This principle should be applied to all agreements and commitments of the Mexican***

government with relation to REDD+, since they should all ideally be coherent and consistent with ENAREDD+.

Third. The priority of analysis and opinion of the CTC should be around the review of the ENAREDD+ since in theory “draft one”, which will be generated after contributions from CTC REDD+ to “draft zero”, will be the foundational document on which to base a wide process of consultations with the population in general, particularly the rural and indigenous populations, and the document that results from this broad validation process should be the guiding axis for all agreements on REDD+ that had been made earlier and that would be made later.

With regards,

Gustavo Sánchez

p.s. I have heard excellent comments on the participation of CONAFOR in the FIP Sub-Committee meeting last Monday in Washington, DC, particularly the presentation of José Carlos Fernández. Congratulations.