

**Draft Minutes**  
**Global Programme Coordination Teleconference**  
**12 June 2012, 14.30-16.00 CET**

**Attendance:**

FAO: Tiina Vahanen, Elisa Marzo-Perez  
UNDP: Tim Clairs, Dina Hajj, Estelle Fach  
UNEP: Julie Greenwalt, Florence Kahiro  
UN-REDD Secretariat: Thais Linhares-Juvenal, Helena Eriksson

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of last call minutes.
2. Final comments on the ToRs for the working groups.
3. Report of MG discussion of questions sent out last week.
4. Clarification regarding Targeted Support and Backstopping to National Programmes.
5. Budget for EC grant.
6. AOB.

**1. Approval of minutes from 5 June 2012.**

- The minutes were approved with the clarification regarding the interagency work plan: the group agreed on interagency annual work plan that includes clearly articulated outputs and well defined indicative activities to be undertaken under these outputs, and present the budget aggregated at the output level. The individual agency work plans are meant to serve as tools for internal management of the UN-REDD Programme.

**2. Final comments on the ToRs for the working groups.**

While the consultative process and involvement of the three agencies are reflected in the ToR and was appreciated, more clarity was sought on the work expected by the agencies. It was agreed that the Secretariat develops and shares material/templates, structures etc for the agencies' to build on and provide inputs and comments on.

- It was agreed to reformulate the work modality section in the ToR and the Secretariat will share an updated version. At the same time, it was suggested to move into practice and adjust working modality if necessary along the way since the Concept Note/ToRs are for internal use.
- The participants agreed that a time line for each task should be inserted.

**3. Report of MG discussion of questions sent out last week.**

- The Secretariat gave a summary of the discussion at the MG concall on 6 June regarding the questions that had been put forward by the Group. MG's responses are seen below next to each question.
  - *The work areas should be maintained or the GP should have another structure of presentation?* The MG advised the Group to maintain the work areas as the overarching framework emphasizing the three categories; International Support Function, Support to National REDD+ activities and Secretariat's Function.
  - *Guidance related to interagency collaboration within each outcome: What is the extent of flexibility that the working group can have when reviewing the current allocation of budget per agency/per outcome? Can changes be presented?* The MG commented that the discussion on the budget can only be initiated when the draft work plan incl. budget for the next year has been presented. They recommended a face-to-face meeting between the

GPCG and MG for presentation and joint review of the work plan. Overall budget guidance can at that stage be provided by MG.

- *The total amount of the budget presented to PB should/can be adjusted?* MG's comment above also refers to this question. I.e. the work plan should first be presented to have a view of the budget changes needed/intended. No level of next year's budget for the GP was indicated.
- *Does the MG envisage that any pre-established percentage of the GP should be allocated as targeted support? If positive, what should be the percentage?* It was no conclusion/advice from the MG on this question.

The Group empathized that it would be useful to pre-determinate a percentage, if possible. It refers to the overall GP support to countries including targeted support and backstopping.

- *It is also important to remind that the MG recommended the GP to be reported according to the categories of activities, i.e. international support functions, support to national REDD+ action and Secretariat. In this regard, the planning of the GP will involve elaboration of annual work plans that also takes into consideration those categories. Please advise whether the agencies are prepared to implement the reporting under these categories thoroughly or whether the need for some flexibility is envisaged.*

The MG recommended the Group to integrate the three categories (International Support Function, Support to National REDD+ activities and Secretariat's function) in the work plan and with its current structure of outcomes as per the approved GP document. The activities linked to the categories should be described in the work plan. The MG advised that the budget should be associated with the activities of the three categories.

Since it was agreed by the Group to keep budget details at output level while including indicative activities, it needs to be decided how to proceed with the MG's advice of including budget details on activity level for these three categories. It needs to be further discussed by the Group and brought up with MG.

UNDP suggested associating six GP outcomes to the *International Support function* and for the two other categories relate work components as outlined below;

*International support function:*

MRV and Monitoring; National REDD+ Governance, Transparent, Equitable and Accountable Management; Stakeholder Engagement, Multiple Benefits; Green Economy.

*Support to national REDD+ activities:*

Targeted support; Policy and Technical Support services.

*Secretariat's function:*

PB support; Knowledge Management and Communication; RBM; Resource Mobilisation, Interagency Coordination.

- UNDP has looked into the classification of their work and this could be a way to present the integrated approach of the three categories "as a package" to MG.
- UNEP suggested rewording 'International Support Function' since it involves a broader scope. No decision was taken, but to look further into.
- The process by the Secretariat to bring points to MG and feed back to the Group was acknowledged and it was noted that MG should be encouraged to take on their responsibility of providing advice to the Group when needed, for example with regard to the guidance requested for the likely proportion of support to national REDD+ activities.

#### **4. Clarification regarding Targeted Support and Backstopping to National Programmes.**

- The participants described the differences between targeted support and backstopping. Compared to backstopping, the targeted support is aimed for limited activities driven by the countries for initiating or building REDD+ activities, follows the application process through the agencies/secretariat and has a cash transfer involved. Both components are part of the category of GP support to National REDD+ activities. It has been difficult in the past to back-track these activities and related costs, thus the agreed aim of the exercise is to track the work and capture the work in the reporting.
- The Secretariat had shared a draft summary for targeted support using Access to give a view of what was intended. A new formatted version will be shared and it was suggested to review the comments received from the agencies at that point.

#### **5. Budget for EC grant.**

- The Secretariat gave an update on the status of the contract for the EC fund contribution to GP. Since GP is the first recipient of funds within the agreement that was signed with EC, some of the contract issues need to be worked out to conform to the requirements by EC, MPTF, UN, agencies etc. EC requires a longer time frame, thus the budget includes the period 2012-2015. A draft budget was sent to EC referring to 8 outcomes with an additional outcome for support to national programmes. In the budget itself a line has been added for national programmes and the first year's budget for national programmes has been extrapolated to the other years (2013-2015) on the basis of two programmes being approved per year. The Secretariat explained that EC did not want the budget for the national programmes and Secretariat's services separately but to have all components in one pot for PB's decision. (The budget has been compiled at inputs level based on the information from the three agencies).
- There will be a meeting in Brussels involving the EC, MPTF, UN Office and the Secretariat on 15 June. The aim of the meeting is to reach a consensus on the budget categories and level of details. I.e. the MPTF Office requires more details while EC wants to keep the budget on an outcome level. It was clarified that the UN Office represents the three agencies at this meeting.

#### **6. AOB.**

- The participants from the agencies to the CNA workshop in Colombia on 26 June will be Tim from UNDP and Alberto from FAO. Regrettable no attendance from UNEP.

The next Global Programme Coordination concall will be held on **Tuesday, 19 June, 14.30 CET.**