United Nations Environment Programme
World Conservation Monitoring Centre

MISSION REPORT

Distribution: UN-REDD: Safeguards Coordination Group UNEP-WCMC: SMT, CCB	**Name of person(s) that undertook mission:** Lera Miles
	Period (including travel days): 6-7 November 2013
	Projects: 2650.06 UN-REDD Global Programme
	Institution(s) or Meeting(s) and Venue(s): REDD+ SES International Steering Committee (1st 2 days of a 3 day meeting)
	Main Person(s) contacted: **REDD+SES**: Joanna Durbin (CCBA), Phil Franks (CARE International), Aurélie Lhumeau (CCBA), Ruth Nussbaum & Dawn Robinson (Proforest) Steering Committee: • **Countries**: Tamrini Said (Ministry of Agriculture & Natural Resources (Dept Forestry), Zanzibar-Tanzania); Ben Karmorh, Environmental Protection Agency, Liberia; • **Indigenous representatives**: Jen Rubis, IPMN, Malaysia; Estebancio Castro Díaz, LAC • **Community organizations**: Arturo Urena, ACICAFOC, Costa Rica, Brikha Shahi, FECOFUN, Nepal • **Social NGOs**: Samuel Nnah Ndobe, Accra Caucus, Alaya de Leon, Ateneo School of Government, Philippines • **Environmental organizations:** Marina Piatto, IMAFLORA, Brazil; George Akwah Neba, IUCN; Minnie Degawan, WWF; Belinda (Beechie) de la Paz, Haribon Foundation, Philippines. • **Private sector**: Rezal Kusumaatmadja, Mazars Starling Resources, Indonesia
File(s): Agenda of the meeting; supporting documents (all at http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=3351&Itemid=53	**Objective(s):** Bring UN-REDD views to the REDD+ SES steering committee; making constructive input and sharing our experience. (ToR on representation: With the exception of governmental representatives, committee membership is as individuals rather than organisations: members represent a viewpoint of a constituency based on their individual experience. However, Members should currently be actively involved in the constituency they represent. Members must have formal approval of the organisation for which they work to be a Member of the ISC, but do not necessarily represent them.)

Brief summary:

The REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards are being used by countries in different ways – from seeking full adoption and compliance with the standard, through partially using the approaches and content, to simply drawing upon the materials to inform their own independent approaches. This diversity of uses is welcomed, and there's an acceptance that some countries are looking for guidance rather than a full standard.

The meeting covered the ways that countries use REDD+ SES, their objectives for SIS, and ways forward for a REDD+ SES international review mechanism (IRM). The meeting looked at the experience of Ecuador and Acre in applying SES and their aims for next steps. Some materials from these countries are included in the supporting documents.

REDD+ SES had discussed with 10 countries their objectives for SIS and for use of REDD+ SES. I found it striking that countries saw an internal communication and REDD+ programme management role for both to be more important than an international role. (See attached 'Motivation for SES & SES' Excel sheet). Acre had a very specific additional objective to use REDD+ SES as part of its VCS-JNR (Jurisdictional and Nested REDD+) process. Its the first piloting of the JNR, and although VCS focuses on carbon, the JNR includes a safeguard requirement which Acre is using REDD+ SES implementation to meet.

In its June meeting in Oxford, which Cordula Epple attended, REDD+ SES had explored different ways in which a country might implement an SIS, relating it to different steps of their process but working hard to generalise so that it might be useful to countries not engaged in REDD+ SES. A model table based on this was presented (not yet shared electronically). I felt that this was a very useful start, and that UN-REDD might like to discuss whether there's room for developing joint approaches and messaging here as we did in the conceptual framework development.

There was a discussion on whether REDD+ SES should submit a synthesis of experience on SIS to SBSTTA in Sept 2014. There was a strong preference from the Secretariat to leave this to participating countries.

As well as contributing to debate, I acted as rapporteur for a group on day 2 that looked at the options for the involvement of the International Steering Committee in an IRM - review of country implementation of REDD+ SES (process and content).

Joanna Durbin was particularly interested in meeting up again with the UN-REDD SCG to discuss common approaches and complementarities, preferably also including the FCPF, and had already brought this up with Thais and Emelyne. We thought a dedicated meeting early next year would make more sense than attempting to do this on the side at the planned safeguards information session at Policy Board in December. Joanna proposed asking the FCPF to host in Washington as a way of ensuring participation.

Recommendation(s)/Action(s) to be taken:

Follow up action:	Responsible	Time-frame (by)
Ensure country contacts are in touch with UNEP-WCMC focal points and have access to relevant mapping work	LM/CCB	15 Nov
Discuss with SCG options for meeting and further collaboration with REDD+ SES, especially on delineating options for a Safeguard Information System	LM	15 Nov
Share with SCG the collated country views on motivations for REDD+SES **and SIS** (see 'Motivation for SES & SES' Excel sheet - http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=11698&Itemid=53)	LM	10 Nov

Detailed report [ ] encl. [X] N/A.	**Documents** [X] encl. [ ] list [ ] none [ ]	**Date 7 November 2013**
Classification [X] restr. [] unrestr.	**Signature(s) staff member(s)**	**Signature(s) supervisor**