

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

**BDP/EEG - MISSION REPORT SUMMARY**

Date: 29 October 2013



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

**Name:**

Claudia Segesser, UN-REDD/UNDP

**Tel. No.:**

+41 22 917 8527

**Approved Mission Itinerary:**

Geneva- Lima- Geneva

**Documents/Resources:**

The following background documents and presentations are available on the workspace at this link:

[http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=3343&Itemid=53](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=3343&Itemid=53)

- Agenda
- Presentation slides: UN-REDD Global, UN-REDD NP Ecuador, REDD+SES, LAC countries.
- List of participants (*latest version to be uploaded*)
- Final workshop report (*to be uploaded once its available*)

**Inclusive Travel Dates:**

22-27 October 2013

**Key counterpart(s) in each location:**

Location: Lima, Peru

- Interagency Safeguards Coordination Group: Emelyne Cheney (FAO, Rome), Clea Paz (UN-REDD Secretariat, via skype)
- Organizing team:
  - UN-REDD NP Ecuador: Saraswati Rodríguez
  - ICAA: Marco Chiu
  - CCBA: Joanna Durbin, Aurelie Lhumeau
- USAID: Beatriz Torres
- Workshop participants: Brasil (Acre), Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru
- UNDP CO: Rebeca Arias, RC

**Purpose/Objectives of Mission**

- Participate in a pre-meeting (23-Oct) as well as in 2-day workshop on SIS (24-25-Oct):
  - Presenting the UN-REDD framework for supporting the development of country approaches to safeguards;
  - Facilitating a session to test the decision-support-tool and to gather feedback from participants.

**Summary of Mission Activities/ Findings**

**Pre-meeting on 23 October:**

- Objectives: (a) Plan the testing session; (b) Ensure consistency regarding the terminology used through the agenda and objectives.

**Workshop on “Development of Safeguards Information Systems for REDD+” on 24-25 October:**

- Organized and funded by: RA-Perú (NZDZ), CI-Perú (FCMC), REDD+ SES, la UA-ICAA, CI (Peru y Ecuador), UN-REDD Ecuador, UN-REDD Global, FAO
- Objectives: (a) Share conceptual approaches to design, evaluate and implement SIS for REDD+; (b) Analyze approaches and perspectives on safeguards to respond to the UNFCCC; (c) Identify synergies among the participants to strengthen the national positions for negotiations at COP19 and COP20 regarding the methodological guidelines on SIS.
- Workshop gathered 35 participants of which 21 represented 10 countries.
- The workshop was organized in plenary and group sessions:
  - a) Presentation on UNFCCC requirements on safeguards and SIS (by UN-REDD Secretariat);
  - b) Presentations on approaches and international tools for SIS (by REDD+SES and UN-REDD; WB cancelled: FCPF/FIP, Jaime Fernández);
  - c) Panel on Country approaches to apply safeguards for REDD+ (by participants from Mexico, Peru, Costa Rica, Honduras, Chile, NP Ecuador, Acre-Brazil, Colombia and Guatemala)
  - d) Testing session of the Decision-support tool (by UN-REDD)
  - e) Group sessions on analyzing the design and implementation of SIS (challenges, opportunities, objectives, users, articulation, etc.)
  - f) Panel on lessons learned on the design and implementation of SIS (by participants from Mexico, Ecuador, Costa Rica and Acre-Brazil)
  - g) Group sessions on identifying recommendations for the methodological guidelines on SIS for submissions to the UNFCCC.

- **Findings:**
  - a) There was confusion between UNFCCC and WB safeguards. Countries wanted to understand the linkages between the CBD and UNFCCC.
  - b) (i) REDD+ SES approach is aligned with the UN-REDD Conceptual Framework on Safeguards, with the exception that the “Review and Grievance Mechanism” is a mandatory component of the country approach to safeguards (for REDD+ SES); (ii) Countries were under the impression that UN-REDD has a set of safeguards and processes that countries must follow.
  - c) Participants (i) identified the importance of defining the objectives of the system from the beginning based in what is already in place, defining a clear approach to participation in order to manage expectations; (ii) agreed there is a challenge of linking SIS to existing information systems.
  - d) Detailed feedback on the decision-support tool bellow.
  - e) Although Ecuador made a disclaimer at the beginning of their first presentation that the NP goes “beyond” of the UNFCCC requirements; in the group sessions that they were participating the terms “monitoring” and “reporting” were always coming out and taking over the discussions and presentations; whereas the other group kept using SIS and not monitoring system.
  - f) Most countries are only starting to develop their SIS. Participants were very satisfied (a) with the knowledge exchange on SIS, especially with the experiences of Mexico (establishment of three different frameworks) and Costa Rica (rules for indicators - “hojas metodologicas”), as well as (b) with the clarification provided regarding the UNFCCC requirements and (c) the utility of the UN-REDD decision-support tool.
    - Participants pointed out the need for more opportunities to exchange experiences at regional level.
    - Organizers had agreed on the participant countries; SCG recommended extending invitation to Argentina and Paraguay; however invitation was sent out less than one week before and only Paraguay ended up attending.
    - UNDSS was closely following up the workshop; participants did not have security clearance.

#### **Decision-support-tool testing session on 24 October 2013:**

- After having tested the decision-support tool in Nairobi, Kenya (17 September 2013), this tool was adjusted to include four parts: Mapping (two-pages survey to map progress), Analyzing (auto-generated analysis, including tools and resources available), Prioritization (where countries define timeframe for priority options, afterward an option is given to each of the activities) and Planning (auto-generated 1-page plan based on countries’ priorities).
- During the testing session, one group per country was formed; one laptop per country was available to test the tool.
- Participants found the tool very useful, concrete and right-to-the-point as it does support planning and decision-making in an effective manner.
- Participants provided some feedback and the following suggestions:
  - a) Adding an option to show progress of activities undertaken;
  - b) Including reference to tools and resources developed by countries;
  - c) Including a way to associate risks with the activities, these helping prioritization and planning;
  - d) Allowing a way to continue the decision-making exercise by contextualizing the tool: giving a space to tailor/further develop the plan framed in the national context.

#### **Meeting with CCBA on 25 October 2013:**

- J. Durbin commented that the tool was quick and easy to use; also that the exercise is useful and can be repeated and that it follows the conceptual framework that REDD+SES uses too.
  - Going through each question, commented that from their point of view, the tool was very useful for countries starting, not so much for the more advanced; therefore there could be an opportunity to add “tick off” options to show progress.
  - Commented it was clear how useful the tool was for starting countries, however not so sure for advanced countries.
  - Also suggested including tools and resources from countries and national experiences (e.g. case studies); additionally that there is a need to include some context on each tool on the different activities including hyperlinks.
  - REDD+ SES process and activities included in “Mapping” were revised and agreed with CCBA.
- There was a strong suggestion to have a joint meeting with the WB, CCBA and UN-REDD safeguards coordination group in order to develop a commitment to support countries. CCBA to lobby with the WB so they host the meeting in DC.

#### **Informal meeting with NP Ecuador on 26 October 2013:**

- NP Ecuador commented that their objectives for the workshop were not achieved. These were: to obtain feedback on their SIS and to position the NP.
- Additionally commented that the day before “Unidad de Monitoreo” (monitoring unit - government) sent an email declining to host the SIS.
- Also commented that UNDP Peru didn’t actively participate maybe because they weren’t satisfied with the approach of the workshop; they wanted IPs to participate.

**Bilateral meeting with UNDP Resident Coordinator in Peru on 25 October 2013:**

- Mrs. Arias was not familiar with the workshop and questioned why UN-REDD NP Ecuador organized a LAC workshop in Lima.

**Follow-up actions:**

Specifically regarding the decision-support tool:

- Claudia to add all feedback into the one-single document already developed (*done*).
- Decision-support-tool working group (Emelyne Cheney, FAO; Kimberly Todd and Claudia, UNDP,) to analyze received feedback and to plan next steps (*Tue 5 Nov 2013*).
- Working group to send CCBA a word version of the tool for comments on auto-generated analysis and resources.
- Safeguards Coordination Group to discuss/address feedback and decide next steps (*Mon 11 Nov 2013*).
- Claudia to revise the tool based on feedback from the workshop and the SCG's agreed next steps.
- Presentation of the tool at the PB11 Information Session (*Sun 8 Dec 2013*).
- Follow-up with Peru as they expressed an interest in using the tool to plan its national process.

For the SCG:

- To follow-up with J. Durbin on a possible joint meeting hosted by the WB.
- To discuss about the UN-REDD NP Ecuador and other related issues. (*Partially done on Thu 31 Oct 2013, further discussions to take place during a SCG back-to-back meeting tbc*).

**Distribution List:**

Tim Clairs, UN-REDD UNDP PTA  
Safeguards Coordination Group (SCG)  
UNDP UN-REDD team

*Note that the BTOR will be placed on the UN-REDD workspace, access restricted to UN staff.*