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| **Approved Mission Itinerary:**  New York –Washington, DC-New York | | **Documents/Resources**:   * FCPF website (with links to summary reports of Design Forums 1-2):   https://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/development-carbon-fund-methodological-framework-0 | | | |
| Inclusive Travel Dates: | | **Key counterpart(s):** | | | |
| 25 – 28 February 2013 |  | * FCPF FMT: Ken Andrasko, Kenn Rapp, Diana Movius, Bruno Guay * REDD+ SES: Joanna Durbin | | | |
| **Purpose/Objectives of Mission:** To participate in the Design Forum, representing UNDP as an FCPF Delivery Partner. In addition, the other key objective of UNDP/UN-REDD participation was to meet bilaterally with Joanna Durbin to discuss communication and collaboration between UN-REDD and REDD+ SES on safeguards.  **Main objective of the meeting:**   * To inform the development of the Methodological Framework (MF) of the FCPF Carbon Fund, specifically on the topics of safeguards, benefit-sharing and feedback and grievance redress mechanisms (GRM). Issue papers, drafted by the FMT with independent expert consultants, were presented and discussed. Participants were to provide reactions to the proposed options in these issue papers and additional inputs to feed into the further elaboration of the MF by the FCPF FMT. | | | | | |
| **Context**   * This was part of a series of expert workshops being held in Washington, D.C. in 2013. A third was held in April, with a focus on C rights, non-C benefits, registries and finance issues. A 4th design forum may be held in September, if needed. * The MF is intended to: (a) provide technical and programmatic guidance to countries for their design of Emission Reduction Programs (ERPs) for inclusion in the Carbon Fund and (b) assist C Fund participants and other stakeholders to assess the C Fund proposals received.   **Participants:** About 50 participants, including: FCPF FMT staff members and other World Bank staff, Carbon Fund Working Group members, UNFCCC, NGOs, IP organizations, country experts on REDD+ safeguards (gov’t and/or NGOs), Technical Advisory panel (TAP) experts  **Summary of Mission Activities/ Findings:**   1. **Safeguards/SIS (1.5 days of meeting time)**  * The need to identify and address differences between World Bank Operational Policies and Cancun safeguards, or other relevant UN provisions on REDD+ safeguards and non-carbon benefits was highlighted, with a view to streamline, reduce and simplify the reporting burden on REDD+ countries.   + Specific concerns about perceived shortcomings of the WB safeguards included: a narrower definition of stakeholders restricted to IPs versus broader UNFCCC characterization; lack of clarity on whether treatment of natural forests within the WB safeguards would be comparable to the relevant UNFCCC safeguard (i.e., would “natural forests” be protected in a comparable way under the WB operational policy definition of “critical natural habitat.” * World Bank responded to concerns about the comparability of WB safeguards to the Cancun safeguards, saying that, by fulfilling WB safeguard requirements, it’s expected that the Cancun safeguards will also be promoted/supported. The FMT also explained that a comparative matrix had been initiated but never released. An agreement was reached to finalize this mapping of WB safeguards to Cancun safeguards and distribute it to the C Fund Working Group. * There were also many comments that aside from this comparability issue that the Cancun safeguards be given more weight in the MF – should be the frame of reference rather than the WB safeguards; this will be more difficult within the Bank to get agreement on though the FMT will pursue –mainly a framing/optics issue, in addition, altering this would not be entirely consistent with the Participants’ committee agreed principle on this topic which frames Cancun as secondary. * The FMT will provide information on how World Bank Operational Policies relate to Cancun safeguards * There was also discussion about how the WB due diligence procedures could be built on/enhanced for the purposed of ERPs. A suggestion was made, for example, to increase the frequency of supervision missions for these C Fund ERPs. * In regards to safeguard information systems (SIS), a number of participants emphasized the importance of work on SIS within the context of the ERP linking up to the national SIS development, providing a starting point for the country to develop it’s more comprehensive national system. There were a number of concerns that there would be a high reporting burden on countries, with countries in a position to report different things to different donors. There were multiple calls for the MF to provide sufficient guidance on how the SESA/ESMF developed with the FCPF support could and should feed intotheir overall national processes. * Capacity concerns were raised citing a disconnect with what international safeguard frameworks are calling for and the actual country capacity to implement.  1. **Benefit-Sharing (< 1 day)**  * Overall, participants converged for the most part on the proposal that the guidance for benefit-sharing should provide a set of minimum standards, though with the caveat these systems need to be flexible and designed based on country circumstances. The proposed standards for benefit-sharing proposed in the issue paper and based primarily on REDD+ SES were viewed as a very good starting point. * There was also interest providing good practice guidance and case studies, as part of the benefit-sharing guidance in the MF.  1. **Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRM) (< 1 day)**  * Amar Inamdar, WB (working closely with Jen on the guidance for national-level grievance mechanisms) was the main speaker during this session. * Given that the Readiness Fund of the FCPF had allocated $200 K additional per country for GRM development, the discussion emphasized the importance of building upon this work, and participants called for the MF to provide guidance on how the GRM for the CF should improve upon the readiness work as well as how well-developed a GRM should be at various stages along the C Fund pipeline. * Grievance – several comments on courts versus informal procedures   FCPF FMT’s Next Steps:   * The FMT provided a rough timeframe for the further elaboration of the MF. A presentation of the MF will be made at the next C Fund meeting in Indonesia (preceding the PC meeting). * The current plan is that a public comment period will then run during the summer, with the FMT expecting to present the final draft of the MF for Carbon Fund partners’ consideration at the 8th CF meeting (Oct/Nov 2013).   Bilateral with Joanna Durbin:   * View that the UN-REDD policy brief was “UN-REDD-centric;” explained the initial thinking within the safeguards group to move forward with a of a safeguards web-based decision tree that would represent broader processes and tools beyond UN-REDD; Joanna’s view – this is already what REDD+ SES is aiming to do with their slides, so agree that showing where the different tools come in is very important. * Joanna agreed that the fact that our frameworks for a national approach to safeguards are not entirely harmonized (mainly because we don’t identify grievance as an explicit component of a safeguards approach) is not a major issue and there’s no need to strive for further harmonization. * Discussed participation in each other’s workshops as a priority | | | | | |
| Next steps/Follow-up actions:  * Follow-up with FMT on availability of a summary report from the Design Forum, upon request from safeguards group: done – FMT made available online early May (see link above) * Follow-up with FMT on status of information on how World Bank Operational Policies relate to Cancun safeguards (The summary report indicates release to the C Fund Working Group, but will follow up to see if this carried out, given UNDP is not on the C Fund WG) * Through the Safeguard Group, foster ongoing communication between UN-REDD and the FCPF FMT, both at global and country-levels (ongoing) | | | | **Distribution List:**   * UNDP/UN-REDD Global * UN-REDD Safeguards Group | |