



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Back to Office Report
Submitted by Celina Yong, UN-REDD
Title Regional Stakeholder Engagement Specialist
Date submitted 13 June 2016

1. Practice area: BPPS, Sustainable Development and Resilience Cluster	
2. Mission period (incl. of travel days) From: 5 – 8 June	
3. Type of mission: Technical backstopping	4. Clients UNDP/UN-REDD Vietnam CO and National PMU staff
5. Purpose of mission (a) Attend PRAP review workshop with objective to strengthen participatory approaches and safeguards/PaMs benefits and risks analysis. (b) Review progress with annual support to CSO and EM PEB representatives; and pilot GRM in relation to BDS	6. Documents, materials, resources
7. Mission member Celina Yong	8. Costs UNDP/UN-REDD Vietnam CO budget

9. Brief summary of the mission

All remaining 5 pilot provinces, with the exception of Lam Dong that has an approved Provincial REDD+ Action Plan (PRAP), have finalized their PRAPs. Ca Mau’s PRAP was approved by the Provincial Peoples’ Committee (PPC) mid-May 2016: Binh Thuan and Bac Kan will follow suit. Compounding an already complex process is the approach adopted by UNDP/UNEP and FAO, who divided and shared oversight for different provinces: Lao Cai and Binh Thuan for the former, and Bac Kan, Ha Tinh and Ca Mau for the latter. At the request of the provinces for official guidance to develop PRAP, MARD Decision 5414 “Approving the guidelines on development of provincial action plan on reducing greenhouse gases emissions through efforts to reduce deforestation and forest degradation, sustainable forest management, and conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+)”, was adopted 25 December 2015. Its development was led by UNDP CO, with input from all agencies. At the same time, FAO developed a PRAP facilitators’ manual, outlining processes and technical considerations, which were not fully synchronised with Decision 5414 and vice versa. This led to some confusion among PPMU, with Decision 5414 prevailing as it was an official document. However, to align with the government template, the Decision did not provide full details, nonetheless, these gaps were supplemented by the PRAP facilitators’ manual. Operational and technical challenges were frequently raised during the workshop. FAO intends to incorporate these challenges and remedial actions in a Sub-National REDD+ Action Plan (S-RAP) facilitators’ manual.

9.a Findings

PRAP Review Workshop, 6 – 7 June

- A common feedback from all 6 PPMUs is a request for more official technical guidance throughout the stages of the PRAP development process: preparation, analysis, planning, and monitoring. There was inconsistent interpretation of terminologies related to spatial analysis, direct vs indirect drivers, risks vs benefits. Participants indirectly attributed the varying quality of provincial intervention packages to the lack of detailed technical and legal guidance because Decision 5414 was adopted after the PRAP development process started. Linked to this is also the quality of facilitators, who may be familiar with general forestry issues, but not necessarily technically competent in relation to REDD+.
- Other challenges included inconsistent stakeholder representation and participation throughout the process, inconsistency between data sources among agencies, the sequence and lack of field verification to ensure suitability of Intervention Packages and their linkages to key drivers, lack of differentiation between activities for forest protection and development and reducing emissions.
- Risks and benefits assessments of the intervention packages were hampered by a lack of expert inputs, particularly environmental and social considerations, as well as weak intervention packages that do not provide coherent linkages to the drivers’ analysis.
- While there are minimal opportunities to strengthen the PRAPs for the pilot provinces, in spite of repeated interventions, these feedback will be incorporated into the S-RAP facilitators’ manual for other potential REDD+ provinces. However, the BDS piloting under Outcome

4 had developed a Site-based REDD+ Action Plan for both Forest Management Boards and Communes. Input from national colleagues working on Outcome 4, especially Mdm Thoa, is necessary to ensure the history of divergent PRAP guidance is not repeated.

- Efforts are underway to identify priority provincial PaMs, which will then be used to negotiate PPMU budget allocation for the Q3 and Q4. However, PPMUs shared that the key challenge of mobilising non-Programme funds for PRAP activities not supported by the Programme is the fact the PPCs meet to work on annual budgets at the end of each year, prior to approval by the relevant Ministries. Therefore, this can only be done for 2017. This places the PPMUs in a difficult position as they have conducted the due process and now have to manage expectations.

BDS piloting

- SiRAPs and RiAs in 17 selected areas are currently under review. There were concerns that these activities are not linked to the provincial drivers' analysis, and much less to the current revision of the NRAP. It was clear that the dominant activities would be forest protection and development, but the conditions for financial support and payments are contested internally.
- The GRM component in the BDS piloting, includes training for Technical Support Group members. DEPOCEN, the consulting firm, is developing a training manual. What is yet unclear are how the principles GRM will be applied in this piloting, in particular how and what kind of steps will be introduced, and how certain structural and/or political grievances can be escalated upwards to the national level. A decision on the formation of the TSG has been adopted, without any prior consultation or feedback from the regional colleagues. A translated copy of this decision will be shared with regional colleagues.
- A UNV with CO has offered to review this manual, as well as map detailed issues based on the upcoming national Justice Index against the 6 pilot provinces.
- PMU has requested for regional support and participation during the first training in Lao Cai from 13 – 14 July.

EM PEB Member's 2016 Work Plan

- In preparation for a proposed dialogue in Bac Kan between EM PEB member, the Bac Kan EM network members, and PPC/PRSC/PPMU, the following was recommended:
 - Day 1 – Preparatory meeting
 - Selection of commune members – priority should be given to those members who are or have been directly involved in the SiRAP process, or any of the PRAP field verification activities, not just the commune members from the Bac Kan EM network's communes (unless they overlap to a large degree). Without this right group of participants, it is doubtful that Ms Truong will be able to receive in-depth and useful feedback – in fact, it may end up as a "wish list", which is not helpful. We need to work closely with Ms Truong, the Bac Kan EM network members, and Bac Kan PPMU to identify the best participants for this meeting.
 - Ensure the best commune representatives are selected by the meeting to present their views/inputs/feedback during the provincial dialogue. They may (or may not) need some coaching from Ms Truong and yourself. You may want to work with Ms Truong and structure the meeting along these themes: Quality of participation; access to participation; consideration for the substantive issues; operational difficulties and challenges; recommendations to address challenges faced. Please add/amend as you see fit.
 - Ensure that Ms Truong and the participants have the latest update regarding activities in Bac Kan for their internal discussion – for this, I look to you and Bac Kan PPMU colleagues.
 - Day 2 – Bac Kan Provincial Dialogue
 - Recommend that representatives from the PPC, PRSC and PPMU attend the dialogue. Our role is to help make that connection to decision-making bodies, and give some weight to the dialogue. It will be less effective if the dialogue is just with PPMUs, as they may just border on operational issues.
 - Coach/prepare the PPC, PRSC representatives in terms of providing a response to the points raised by the Bac Kan commune representatives/EM members.

9.b Results achieved (key outputs)

- Input for S-RAP facilitators' manual
- Revised GRM training manual and materials

9.c Expected outcomes and impacts

- Cohesive participatory approaches and safeguards considerations are strengthened in sub-national REDD+ planning processes.

- Proposed GRM are adequately placed to receive and address grievances related to SiRAPs, including clear and feasible options for redress at sub-national and national levels.

10. Key counterparts

- UNDP CO – Ngo Thi Loan, Vu Thai Truong
- National PMU – Fabien Monteils (CTA), Thuy Nguyen, Huu Dzung

11. Follow up action matrix

Action to be taken	By whom	Expected completion date
Provide input to S-RAP facilitators' manual	Celina	21 June
Review GRM training manual and materials	Celina	30 June, upon availability

12. Distribution list

UNDP UN-REDD