

## Users' Perspectives

### Group 1

Q: What steps should be taken to engage the intended users, to encourage use of the documents, and produce good results?

- 1) Dissemination: Who are the potential users? What can be done to reach them and to make docs more accessible to them?

*Potential Users*: Priv sector, Civ Soc, Academics, National Governments, IPs, Donor govts, FIP, FCPF, UN-REDD

#### *Accessibility*:

Priv sector – would it need to be in a different format for use as risk tool, eg published by rating agency like Moody's?

IPs – need to disseminate to IPs at Bonn

General - Language quite complex – not very accessible – maybe better if was framed as questions – ask questions, then provide answers – easy to understand

Danger of it being branded as being prescriptive views of WB/FAO – need to be clear about the very open and participatory process by which the framework was developed – better to present as questions for this reason (seems less prescriptive)

Lots of words and concepts referred to are not entirely clear – important to make it more easily accessible – examples would be very illustrative – just because certain indicators don't fit every circumstance, would still be useful to have examples

Accessible – could during piloting, develop annexed illustrations suitable to different user groups

National govt perspective - Need to agree that this framework will be used consistently across various ongoing processes, to reduce burden on countries

Someone has to adopt this – eg FCPF – as it stands, Nepal would report back based on what FCPF & WB want – national govts will follow the needs of individual donors

Need to differentiate between the framework and the associated manual – framework is fine, but need better 'how to' manual to accompany it – some of the content is in the UN-REDD paper, but is UNREDD-specific

- 2) Relevance: How are these documents relevant to current needs? How do they resonate with ongoing activities? How practical are they? How likely are they to facilitate constructive discs of controversial issues?

Q: will the same Qs actually be being asked by different users (eg civ soc, priv sec, nat govts)

Q: will all stakeholders be equally able to influence how it is used/implemented?

Would be helpful to CSOs – gives them international, official basis for raising certain issues – starting point

Donor govt – useful to start framing discussion, but a bit dense; for donors, needs to be able to measure change over time – is very flexible – any user can choose some indicators, choose some sub-components; but donors need to see progress in REDD readiness, and still need proxies and indicators; need broad baseline, and need some consistency between countries – flexibility could be a problem – do need some consistency in how the framework is used, not just consistency in the framework itself

Users – would be useful for investors (donor govts and priv sec) if nat govts have ongoing info which they can provide; also useful for measuring impacts of investments – need baselines against which change can be monitored

Would be v hard to measure indicators for every subcomponent – so many – onerous [but can choose a subset]

[Guillermo – thinks some things missing from framework; also no clear definition of governance – difficult to use this matrix for teaching or academic work –

- 3) Potential to bring about change: Can these docs catalyze change? What would help these docs better stimulate progress in governance?

The doc itself wont, BUT if is used as basis for country action – if start building analytical process in that country using it, then that in turn will help drive governance improvements by identifying shortcomings

Q: if you improve governance, might this actually increase deforestation? [should we start wars?]

Interediate goal is to catalyse change in how governance is being measured – standardize language, avoid duplication of effort, etc – important that ongoing processes involved in measuring governance (eg FCPF, WRI, CH policy inds, etc) are willing to adjust their existing processes to make them fit the new framework

Needs to be nationally “owned” – if give a ready made, prescriptive thing it wont gain ownership – is up to each country to develop indicators in their own country – is important it is not seen as prescriptive – the preface needs to stress this