Grading for ER-PIN Assessments:

Color	Qualification	Analysis
Green	The indicator is clearly addressed and supported by country stakeholders and other sources of evidence;	Reasons for attributed grade should be clearly stated and supported by evidence.
Yellow	The indicator is partially addressed, ER-PIN claims are contested, and/or supporting evidence is weak;	
Red	The indicator is not addressed or is mentioned but not defined/explained, nor supported by evidence and local stakeholder input.	

Section 1: ADVANCING INDIGENOUS AND COMMUNITY RIGHTS TO LAND AND FORESTS: To what extent does the proposed emission reduction program protect and advance the rights of Indigenous Peoples (IP) and local communities (LC) to land and forests within REDD+ systems and processes?

1) **Stakeholder participation in ER-PIN planning and ERP design**

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	1a) The ER-PIN design process shows evidence of full and effective engagement of locally affected populations and vulnerable groups, including women, Indigenous Peoples and local communities.	The ER-PIN does not show evidence of full and effective engagement. It identifies the engagement of generic stakeholders (ER-PIN, p. 9-10) and describes a few consultations (ER-PIN, p. 55). It mentions that a fuller stakeholder mapping will be carried out as part of the SESA (ER-PIN, p.56) and acknowledges that there is still a need to promote the full participation of civil society, particularly indigenous peoples and local communities (ER-PIN p. 35).
	1b) The ER-PIN presents a clear and realistic approach for ensuring IP/LC involvement in the design and implementation of the full ER Program.	According to the ER-PIN, the ER Initiative design will be aligned with the National REDD Strategy (ENAREDD), which will undergo a broad consultation process (ER-PIN, p. 37), including *ejidos*, indigenous peoples, etc., at state level in REDD+ Early Action areas (ER-PIN, p. 38). An update status on these consultations is presented in the R-Package from April 2016. It includes progress such as the establishment of a Roundtable for Indigenous and Rural Communities (R-Package, p. 15), and specific consultations for women (R-Package, p. 20) and indigenous peoples (R-Package, p. 22). In addition, the ENAREDD+ consultation plan was published and is available in the FCPF website.

2) Land and forest tenure

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	2a) Robust tenure assessments (i.e., assessment takes into account customary and legal land hold, disputed areas, challenges, etc) in the geographical area of the proposed ER Program were conducted as part of the SESA.	By the time of the analysis, there was no robust tenure analysis in the proposed ER Program area. While land tenure for Indigenous Peoples and local communities is generally secure, there are areas where this is not true, and outstanding issues where it is unclear how REDD may positively or negatively impact the situation. No work on land and resource tenure seems to be have been contemplated under SESA (ER-PIN, p. 55-56).
	2b) Land and resource tenure assessments were publically vetted and endorsed by all concerned stakeholders.	There is a mention to "land tenure issues" at a consultation on November 7, 2013 (ER-PIN p. 28). The R-Package assesses tenure related issues as a possible challenge to the successful implementation of the ENAREDD+ (R-Package p. 66). The ER-PIN does give an overall description of land tenure in Mexico (ER-PIN, p. 57-61), but it does explore how land tenure insecurity might affect stakeholders, nor presents any feedback.
	2c) The land use / land tenure context of the proposed ER Program, including implementation risks (conflicting claims) and available arbitration processes is well defined.	There is a description of land tenure context (ER-PIN, p. 57). Nevertheless, although threats to communal land in Mexico have been growing, and the potential role of REDD in exacerbating or ameliorating them are not addressed. Furthermore, the ER-PIN asserts there is little implementation risk around land conflicts (ER-PIN, p. 36), ignoring challenges to resolve conflicts through the Agrarian courts and issues of illegal encroachment and usurpation of indigenous lands, which reportedly continue to be a problem in some regions.
	2d) The process for addressing emerging land and forest tenure issues (e.g., conflicting claims, tenure insecurity for IP/LC and women) is clearly defined in the ER-PIN.	In descriptions of drivers at sub-national level, land/forest tenure and security is mentioned several times (ER-PIN, p. 26, 28 and 30), but these issues are not explored in the ER-PIN or followed through to proposed actions in the ER Initiative. Issues of women's tenure security as well as that of *avecindados* are not addressed in the ER-PIN.

3) Assignment of rights to forest carbon

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
🟩	3a) The legal framework for carbon rights is defined in the ER-PIN.	It is noted that the ENAREDD+ establishes that the owners and holders of forest lands have ownership of carbon and rights to increases in carbon stocks and avoided emissions (ER-PIN, p. 61), clearly a best practice that should be considered by other countries as it links potential financial incentives through REDD+ to actors at the local level and facilitates development of benefit sharing mechanisms.
🟨	3b) The process for dealing with contested and/or overlapping land, forest and carbon claims is defined.	The ER Initiative is based on arrangements worked out at the local and territorial level, through agreements with the various actors, rights- and stakeholders. The issues related to carbon rights of those communities and *ejidos* whose lands are not certified by PROCEDE, and the status of rights for women, widows, youth, day laborers and others within *ejidos* but without formal rights, is not discussed.
🟥	3c) The legal basis for the transfer of ER titles is defined.	The process of transferring title to emissions reductions from land owners to CONAFOR is not discussed.

4) Equitable benefit sharing and non-carbon benefits

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
🟩	4a) The ER-PIN presents a transparent and verifiable process to equitably share carbon-related benefits (e.g., REDD+ revenue streams).	While the complex set of issues and trade-offs around REDD+ benefit sharing in Mexico are not well captured or described by the ER-PIN, there is clearly a lively national debate on them underway, led in part by CONAFOR in the context of the ENAREDD+ design.
🟨	4b) The ER-PIN presents a transparent and verifiable process to prioritize and equitably share non-carbon benefits (e.g., alternative business models and revenue streams).	The issue of non-carbon benefits is dealt with superficially in the ER-PIN. Non-carbon benefits are identified (ER-PIN, p. 63-64). Under the ER Initiative, communities will develop investment plans and identify which non-carbon benefits are of highest priority to them, a best practice that should be disseminated; combining that with a menu of options based on what can be feasibly monitored and reported may be warranted.
🟩	4c) The benefit sharing mechanisms outlined in the ER-PIN are broadly supported by indigenous and forest dependent communities, including women.	The ER-PIN mentions multiple engagements on benefit sharing and mentions that a study has been commissioned with PROFOR to apply the Options Assessment Framework (ER-PIN, p. 62). Significant attention needs to be devoted to limited access to benefits by women.

5) Alignment of ERP strategies with main drivers of deforestation

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	5a) The drivers of deforestation and forest degradation identified in the ER-PIN are consistent with expert analyses and local stakeholder input.	The ER-PIN suggests that data on drivers in Mexico is generally good, but that data is missing for Jalisco; a plan for filling that gap is not identified. Civil society organizations in Mexico have also conducted analysis of drivers, but suggest that more detailed work is needed to inform state or landscape level REDD programming.
	5b) Challenges to overcoming identified drivers (i.e., technical, institutional, political or economic) are clearly defined.	The major barriers to the implementation of REDD+ in Mexico are identified in the ER-PIN (pp. 29-30). It is unclear however, how these issues can be dealt with effectively through actions exclusively at the state and local level, as no national level policy actions are described as part of the ER Initiative. The barriers identified around "lack of security in the holding of land and the use of its resources" are also not clearly addressed in the menu of options for the activities under the ER Initiative.
	5c) Proposed ER Program interventions specifically target the main drivers and their related challenges.	It is not entirely clear from the ER-PIN how well the proposed program aligns with the identified drivers, particularly those around policy incoherence and implementation capacity challenges.

6) Safeguards framework

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	6a) The country has completed its SESA and elaborated an ESMF (yes/no; if yes then consider b through e; if no, got to 6f)	Partial. The SESA is now completed through and extensive participatory process aligned with the consultations around the National REDD+ Strategy. The ESMF is underway and will be completed by the end of 2016.
	6b) The assessment of social and environmental considerations was conducted in a transparent and participatory manner.	Yes, the extensive SESA related activities conducted at the national level, through the National Forest Commission (CONAF), the state level Technical Advisory Committees (CTC), with indigenous groups, women, youth and the Indigenous and Farmer Roundtable constitute a best practice. Results are presented in Mexico's SESA Report (April 2016).[1]
	6c) FPIC is presented as a requirement of the ESMF.	The ESMF is not yet completed, but Mexican legislation has incorporated the principle of free, prior, informed consent for indigenous peoples and local communities.
	6d) The EMSF identifies key steps, including budget and timeline, to strengthen forest governance issues within the national legal framework.	The ESMF is not yet completed, it is reported in the R-Package that it will be available towards the end of 2016. Extensive analytical work on the Mexican legal framework has been carried out and made public, some reforms have been undertaken, the timeline for additional reforms is not clearly presented in the ER-PIN, SESA or R-Package.
	6e) The ER-PIN presence a credible grievance/dispute resolution mechanism, based on the FGRM assessment.	CONAFOR's Public Attention Mechanism (MAC) has been strengthened through the readiness process, additional dissemination is underway, and a specific REDD related mechanism is being piloted in the three states of the Yucatan Peninsula. (WB GRM April 14, 2016, p.6)[2]
	6f) The ER-PIN describes the design of the Safeguard Information System and its application in the context of the ER-P.	The ER-PIN notes that the ENAREDD+ requires the creation of a SIS, but does not describe efforts to create it. However fairly extensive materials are available on CONAFOR's website documenting efforts to date (ER-PIN, p.14)
	6g) Proposed safeguards adequately address the land and resource rights of indigenous peoples, forest communities and women.	The questions around safeguards in the REDD+ Early Action areas are not adequately answered by CONAFOR in the attached annex; in particular, providing more information about how safeguards are currently being applied in the REDD+ Early Action areas and under the FIP would be helpful in understanding how safeguards for the ER Initiative will build on those efforts.

---

[1] Mexico SESA Report, pp.9-26
[2] World Bank Grant Monitoring Report on Mexico FCPF Grant, April 14, 2016

Section 2: BROADER GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES FOR ADDRESSING DEFORESTATION DRIVERS: To what extent does the proposed emission reduction program consider other key forest governance challenges for achieving REDD+?

7) **Government capacity and coordination in ERP planning and implementation**

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
	7a) The ER-PIN shows evidence of coordination across sectors, line ministries, and levels of government (local, sub-national, national).	Section 7.3 of the ER-PIN (p. 41) discusses all of the agencies and organizations involved in a generic way, without further specification. The capacity of these institutions, and their ability to foment effective coordination on the ground, is a risk for REDD and the ER Initiative. There is evidence of functionality at highest level (ER-PIN, p. 18). The implementation of ERP activities is less clear. Recent civil society analysis of implementation of activities in the REDD+ Early Action areas question whether inter-institutional policy harmonization and collaboration is really happening on the ground.
	7b) The ER-PIN identifies opportunities for community-based interventions, including natural resource management, tenure recognition, and other dedicated REDD+ investments.	Section 7.3 of the ER-PIN discusses all of the agencies and organizations involved in a generic way (including IPs, communities and CSOs). The ERP is predicated on community based natural resource management and an attempt to scale that up towards territorial management at the river basin/eco-region/state level, actions to be implemented by communities and *ejidos*. Participation in monitoring (calibration/validation of activity data, estimates for emission factors, information on degradation) is mentioned specifically in the context of the MRV system (ER-PIN, p.52).
	7c) The ER-PIN discusses efforts to combat corruption and the measures that will be used in the ER Program.	Despite the fact that "impunity, collusion and corruption existing in some sectors" is identified as a driver of deforestation and degradation (ER-PIN, p. 26), there is no discussion of broader corruption issues. The anti-corruption element of the MAC is mentioned, which can be utilized by stakeholders and beneficiaries of CONAFOR programming for allegations of corruption relating to CONAFOR officials, including relating to the Special Program in REDD+ Early Action Areas, and presumably, the design and implementation of the ER Initiative.

8) Transparent monitoring and oversight of REDD+

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
(yellow)	8a) The ER-PIN shows evidence of an open-access information management systems for REDD+	The ER-PIN describes Mexico's Access to Information system – outreach/consultation activities with CTC's, CONAF – and that Article 87 of the Climate Change law mandates an MRV registry with public access (ER-PIN, p. 64). The information management system for REDD+ or the Early Action areas is not discussed, however, nor is the extensive information on current REDD+ programming that is publically available on the CONAFOR website.
	The ER-PIN proposes mechanisms to independently and transparently:	
(red)	- 8b) Monitor the social and environmental impacts of REDD+ investments;	There is no discussion of how monitoring of social and environmental aspects will be handled.
- (yellow)	- 8c) Monitor the application of safeguards via the Safeguard information system;	By the time of the analysis, there was no discussion of how monitoring of social and environmental aspects will be handled, although this issue is addressed in the national safeguard system and SIS discussions and design efforts underway and would also be dealt with through the ESMF.
- (yellow)	- 8d) Monitor the effectiveness of governance-related interventions;	The ER-PIN states that INECC and INEGI will produce an annual report on results of evaluations of national climate change policy and that CONAFOR programs are evaluated annually, but no further information is presented.
- (green)	- 8e) Track and coordinate international finance flows;	A national registry will be set up, which includes tracking sources of finance, and private citizens can check the inventory on the registry website being designed, as per Article 107 of the Climate Change law (ER-PIN, p. 64).
- (red)	- 8f) Monitor the distribution of carbon and non-carbon benefits.	While there is no discussion of monitoring in the non-carbon benefit section, in section 9.5 there is a brief mention of using the monitoring system to detect deforestation of natural forests (hence linkage to biodiversity), and mention of efforts to assess and monitor ecosystem integrity (ER-PIN, p. 53).

Section 3: OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Grade	Indicators	ER-PIN Assessment
■	9a) The proposed emission reduction program protects and advances the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to land and forests within REDD+ systems and processes.	Although there could be more transparency in the ER Program design, stronger discussion on program implementation risks to IP and local communities, the Mexican ER-Program can be considered best practice in the issues such as definition of carbon rights and carbon benefits.
■	9b) The proposed emission reduction program presents a credible plan for addressing governance issues at national and sub-national levels, and establishes clear processes for monitoring progress on critical risk factors.	The issue of governance is described in a generic way and capacity for program implementation, especially at the local level, is considered to be a risk. Monitoring processes need to be further developed.