



Annual Report Indonesia Programme

31 December 2011

1. National Programme Status

1.1 National Programme Identification

Please identify the National Programme by completing the information requested below. The Government Counterpart and the designated National Programme focal points of the participating UN organisations will also provide their electronic signature below, prior to submission to the UN-REDD Secretariat.

Country: Indonesia

Title of programme: Indonesia UN-REDD National Joint

Programme.

Date of submission: March 2009

Start date¹: 23 November 2009

End date: May 2011

No-cost extension requested²: June 2012

Implementing partners³:

Ministry of Forestry, Republic of Indonesia

FAO UNDP

UNEP

The financial information reported should include overhead, M&E and other associated costs.

| | Financial Summary (USD) | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| UN Agency | Cummulative Expenditures up | | | | | | | | |
| | Budget⁴ | date | to 31 December 2011 ⁴ | | | | | | |
| FAO | US\$ 1,498,000 | US\$ 1,498,000 | US\$ 536,634 ⁵ | | | | | | |
| UNDP | US\$ 2,996,000 | US\$ 2,996,000 | US\$1,238,910 ⁶ | | | | | | |
| UNEP | US\$ 1,150,250 | US\$ 1,150,250 | US\$466,940 ⁷ | | | | | | |
| Total | US\$ 5,644,250 | US\$ 5,644,250 | US\$2,242,484 | | | | | | |

Approved National Programme budget⁸

(This information is available on the MDTF Office GATEWAY www.mdtf.undp.org)

| Electronic sign | Electronic signatures by the designated UN organization ⁹ | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| FAO | UNDP | UNEP | Government Counterpart | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Type the name of signatories in full: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

¹ Date of signature on the National Programme Document

² If yes, please provide new end date

³ Those organizations either sub-contracted by the Project Management Unite or those organizations officially identified in the National Programme Document as responsible for implementing a defined aspect of the project

⁴ Disbursement and commitments combined

⁵ As of 19 December 2011

⁶ As of 20 December 2011

⁷ As of 20 December 2011

⁸ Total budget for entire duration of the Programme, as specified in the signed Submission Form and National Programme Document

⁹ Each UN organisation is to nominate one or more focal points to sign the report. Please refer to the *UN-REDD Programme Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Framework* document for further guidance

1.2 Monitoring Framework

In the table below, please report on progress to date based on the Monitoring Framework included in the signed National Programme Document. Please input cumulative achievements and achievements gained in the reporting period. If indicators or other data was modified, please explain in the comments column. If there is no data to be reported in the reporting period, please mark N/A. Please add additional rows as needed.

| Expected Results (Output) Outcome 1: Streng | Indicators gthen multi-stake | Baseline eholder particip | Expected Target by the end of the reporting period (According to the annual work plan) ation and consensus | Achievement of Target to Date at national and provincial level | Means of Verification | Responsibilities | Risks and Assumpti ons | Comments |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|--------------------|--|--|
| | | | | Achievements this reporting period: | | | | |
| Output 1.1: Consensus on key issues for national REDD policy | 1.1.1 UN- REDD Programme operational 1.1.2 National and sub- national consultations on key-issues organized 1.1.3 Key issues analyzed 1.1.4 Inter- ministerial round table | • Indonesian National Climate Change Council (DNPI) and Ministry of Forestry (MoFor) have established REDD related working groups. • Mandates and responsibilit y of MoFor | December 2010 1.1.1 UN-REDD Programme operational 1.1.2 Two national consultation on 2 key-issues organized December 2011 1.1.2 Two national and 4 sub-national consultations on 2 key-issues | Cumulative achievements: Establishment of PMU secretariat and office (mid 2010) Recommendations to the Government based on 5 (five) key products (REDD+ national strategy, FPIC, Criteria to select REDD+ pilot province, Forest Industry based Forestry Development Road Map, National Park based Forestry Development Road Map were submitted based on 6 (six) national consultations involving cross ministries and 12 Sub-national consultations on REDD+ national Strategy (in Yogyakarta, Mataram, Jayapura, Aceh, Palu, Bali, Jakarta with | Progress reports MoM Workshop proceedings Publications Policy recommendations Some of the above publications are available at http://un-redd.or.id/resources-publications and http://www.u | UNDP; MoFor/Gol | Elections may change the political landscape on REDD Commitm ent from all partners Institution al relationshi ps strengthe ned | • The submission of national REDD+ strategy has been submitted one year ago to the TF but it has not significant any actions informed to public. An acceleratio n is |
| | discussions organized | and DNPI working | 1.1.3 Two key issues analyzed | 2,000 experts from about 200 organizations, September to | <u>n-</u> redd.org/UNR | | | needed to catch up |

| | groups have | | | November 2010); Criteria for | EDDProgram | | with the |
|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|------------|
| 1.1.5 Policy | not been | 1.1.4 At least 6 | | REDD+ pilot province selection (in | me/CountryA | | dynamic |
| recommend | | inter-ministerial | | Jambi, Palembang and Papua, July | ctions/Indone | | situation |
| ons on at le | | round table | | to August 2010); How to establish | sia/tabid/987 | | of REDD+ |
| 2 key-issues | | discussions on 2 | | REDD+ agency (July 2010); FPIC | /language/en | | in |
| prepared | IFCA analysis | | | national policy (400 participants | - | | Indonesia. |
| prepared | needs | key issues | | from more than 40 institutions, | US/Default.as | | maoriesia. |
| 1.1.6 | further | 1.1.5 Policy | | December 2010 to February | <u>px</u>) | | |
| Roadmap | | recommendations | | 2011) | <u>px</u> / | | |
| issuing | es. | on at least 2 key- | | More than 50 nationwide multi- | | | |
| policies or | | issues prepared | | stakeholder consultations in | | | |
| key-issues | - 1 | issues prepared | | developing the above key policy | | | |
| developed | | | | issues, including inter-ministerial | | | |
| developed | yet. | | | roundtable discussion, sub- | | | |
| | • Some demo | | | national and national | | | |
| | initiatives | | | consultations with | | | |
| | are ongoing. | | | representatives from | | | |
| | Status of | | | governments, private sector, | | | |
| | demonstrati | | | CSOs/NGOs, local communities | | | |
| | on projects | | | and Indigenous Peoples, | | | |
| | has not been | | | academic groups and experts | | | |
| | reported | | | Recommendation on REDD pilot | | | |
| | yet. | | | province criteria (in August 2010 | | | |
| | • REDDI | | | through two workshops at Papua | | | |
| | Strategy | | | and Jambi in collaboration with | | | |
| | Roadmap to | | | REDD+ Task Force and the | | | |
| | REDD | | | Ministry of Forestry) | | | |
| | implementati | | | REDD+ National Strategy | | | |
| | on has not | | | (submitted to UKP4/Satgas | | | |
| | been | | | REDD+ on 18 Nov 2010 in | | | |
| | developed. | | | collaboration with Bappenas) | | | |
| | uevelopeu. | | Δς | hievements this reporting period: | | | |
| | | | ^ | merements this reporting period. | | | |
| | | | • | Policy Recommendation on FPIC | | | |
| | | | | Principles at national and | | | |
| | | | | provincial levels (in collaboration | | | |
| | | | | with National Forestry | | | |

| 4.2. REDD I | | | | Council/DKN and the recommendation was submitted to UKP4/Satgas REDD+ in February 2011) Central Sulawesi Governor Decree on the establishment of Provincial REDD+ Working Group (February 2011) Forestry Development Road Map (Forest Industry-Based) through multi-stakeholder consultation process (January-June 2011, presented to the Ministry in June 2011 by the Senior Advisor) Forestry Development Road Map (National Park-based) through multi-stakeholder consultation process (January-June 2011, presented to the Ministry in June 2011 by the Senior Advisor) Three national consultations on FPIC policy, Forest Industry based Forestry Development Road Map, National Park based Forestry Development Road Map (in Yogyakarta, Samarinda, Jakarta with 200 experts, January to March 2011) | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1.2. REDD lessons learnt | 1.2.1 National knowledge & | Some NGOs have | December 2010 1.2.1 Framework | Cumulative achievements: | Website (http://un- | UNDP; MoFor/Gol | REDD+ implemen | Document ation and |
| Tourist . | learning network | developed REDD | for a national knowledge & | Joint workshops with FORDA, Center for Environment | redd.or.id) Workshop | | ters are unwilling | Lessons |
| | established | related | learning network | Standardization/ Pustanling | proceedings | | to share | Learned from the |
| | 1.2.2 | initiatives. | proposed | (December 2010), DNPI (December 2010 in Jakarta), | Progress reports | | experienc es/techno | processes |
| | 11 / / | Others are | 1 | i ibecellibel 2010 III Jakai lali | I PUNOTTS | | μς/τρςηηΛ | |

| established to | so but have | Reference for | | Demonstration Activities in | Lessons | to | valuable |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| cooperate | | mechanism to | | Indonesia (Pustanling), the | learned | commerci | for other |
| with local | | cooperate with | | Indonesia Carbon Update (DNPI), | disseminated | al or | |
| initiatives | _ | local initiatives | | the First Asia Carbon Update | at at COP15 | political | initiatives. |
| initiatives | | developed | | (DNPI) | Lessons | interests | • There is a |
| 1.2.3 Joint | intends to | acvelopea | | Lessons Learned materials: | learned | interests | room for |
| workshops | | December 2011 | | - How to develop criteria to | disseminated | | more |
| organized | ' ' | 1.2.1 National | | select Pilot Province with the | at at COP16 | | cooperatio |
| organized | | knowledge & | | REDD+ Task Force | Some of the | | n with |
| 1.2.4 A | | learning network | | - UN-REDD Indonesia | above | | |
| publication on | | established | | Programme video at the | publications | | private |
| lessons | REDD | established | | Cancun Conference side event | are available | | sectors. |
| learned | | 1.2.2 Mechanism | | - Presentation on how UN- | at http://un- | | • It is |
| prepared | | to cooperative | | REDD will conduct t FPIC at | redd.or.id/ | | important |
| | | with local | | Cancun Conference | ■ Letter of | | to improve |
| 1.2.4 A | Experience | initiatives | | - Results from the Cancun | Agreements | | capacities |
| publication | 4114 16550115 | operational | | Conference | with local | | of |
| on lessons | communities | • | | - The National REDD+ Strategy | initiatives | | Parliament |
| learned | | 1.2.2 Cooperation | | draft | | | |
| disseminated | | with 5 local | | - UN-REDD Programme | | | members |
| | | initiatives | | activities | | | on REDD+ |
| | | confirmed | • | Effective coordination of | | | issues. |
| | d | | | Indonesia's diplomats | | | |
| | [| 1.2.3 Six joint | | (Ambassadors, the Ministry of | | | |
| | N | workshops | | Foreign Affairs) about REDD+ in | | | |
| | | organized | | collaboration with Center for | | | |
| | | | | International Cooperation, | | | |
| | - | 1.2.4 One | | Ministry of Forestry (November | | | |
| | | publication on | | 2010) | | | |
| | ļ ļi | lessons learned | | • | | | |
| | | prepared | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | - | 1.2.4 One | | | | | |
| | | publication on | | | | | |
| | | lessons learned | | | | | |
| | (| disseminated | | | | | |

| Achievements this reporting period: |
|-------------------------------------|
| Achievements and reporting period. |
| Joint workshops with DNPI |
| (March 2011 in Bandung), DKN |
| (January to March 2011), Central |
| Sulawesi NGOs, Central Sulawesi |
| Costumary/Adat communities |
| (January 2011 to February 2011 |
| in Sigi and Donggala) on FPIC |
| policy recommendation (DKN), |
| socialization of REDD+ result |
| studies (FORDA, March 2011) |
| Draft framework for national |
| knowledge and learning network |
| (May 2011) |
| Dissemination of progress on |
| Demonstration Activities to |
| multi-stakeholders at national |
| level including the national |
| parliament |
| Supported the National Climate |
| Change Council (DNPI) in |
| organizing the Indonesia Carbon |
| Update, and the First Asia |
| Carbon Update |
| Lesson learned materials: |
| - UN-REDD multi-stakeholder |
| consultation process |
| - 10 'fast facts' (fact sheets) on |
| national REDD+ strategy |
| Effective coordination of high |
| rank decision makers in the |
| Ministry of Forestry and |
| members of the Climate Change |
| working group of the Ministry of |
| Forestry on the Cancun |
| Conference's results (March |

| | | | | 2011) | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| 1.3 | Communicati | Awareness | December 2010 | Cumulative achievements: | Awareness | UNEP; | Governme | Developmen |
| Communications | ons strategy | on REDD | 1.3.1 Agreement | | baseline | MoFor/Gol | nt | t of the |
| Programme | and impact | remains | on target | | study results | | supports | Communicat |
| | monitoring | limited to | messages reached | | Midterm | | targeting | ion Strategy |
| | system | few key | | | assessment | | controver | ideally |
| | developed to | agencies at | 1.3.1 Target | | End-of- | | sial | should be at |
| | include: | central | groups identified | | project | | forestry | the |
| | 1.3.1 | governmen | | | assessment | | issues, like | beginning of |
| | Agreement on | t level. | 1.3.2 Awareness | | Media | | oil palm | project. |
| | target | Various | impact | | reports | | expansion | |
| | messages | policies | monitoring | | IEC materials | | , mining | |
| | reached | endanger | system designed | | | | and illegal | |
| | | prospect | | | Communicatio | | logging | |
| | 1.3.1 Target | and | 1.3.2 Awareness | | n strategy | | | |
| | groups | sustainabili | baseline | | developed and | | Diverse | |
| | identified | ty of REDD, | established | | guiding | | approach | |
| | | like | | | communicatio | | es and | |
| | 1.3.2 | expansion | 1.3.3 Framework | | ns at the PMU | | products | |
| | Awareness | palm oil on | for social | | Monitoring | | can be | |
| | impact | peat and | marketing | | system | | developed | |
| | monitoring | allowing | campaign drafted | | developed and | | that | |
| | system | the use of | | | level of | | effectively | |
| | designed | timber | 1.3.4 Outline of | | awareness | | raise | |
| | | from | REDD | | assessed and | | awarenes | |
| | 1.3.2 Baseline | natural | information, | | reported | | s of a | |
| | established | forests for | education and | | Communicatio | | heterogen | |
| | | pulp and | communication | | n products | | eous | |
| | 1.3.2 Impact | paper | (IEC) materials | | | | audience | |
| | assessed (at | Training on | prepared | | | | | |
| | completion) | REDD | | | | | | |
| | | related to | 1.3.6 Training | | | | | |
| | National | sub- | needs on REDD | | | | | |
| | communicatio | national | for local level | | | | | |
| | n campaign | levels are | actors identified | | | | | |
| | and training | limited. | | | | | | |

| | Т | | T | 1 | T | 1 | |
|----------------|--------------|-------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| for local | • E-data at | December 2011 | | | | | |
| REDD+ actors | MoFor, | 1.3.2 Impact of | | | | | |
| developed, | DNPI, UN | communication | | | | | |
| including: | are not well | campaign | | | | | |
| 1.3.3 Social | updated. | assessed | | | | | |
| marketing | • No | | | | | | |
| campaign | strategic | 1.3.3 Social | | | | | |
| designed | approach in | marketing | | | | | |
| | communica | campaign | | | | | |
| 1.3.4 REDD | tions and | designed | | | | | |
| information, | no | | | | | | |
| education and | monitoring | 1.3.4 REDD | | | | | |
| communicatio | systems for | information, | | | | | |
| n materials | assessing | education and | | | | | |
| (IEC) | impact of | communication | | | | | |
| developed | awareness | materials | | | | | |
| | raising | developed | | | | | |
| 1.3.5 National | J | | | | | | |
| communicatio | | 1.3.5 National | | | | | |
| ns campaign | | communications | | | | | |
| conducted | | campaign | | | | | |
| | | conducted | | | | | |
| 1.3.5 high- | | | | | | | |
| level Gol - UN | | 1.3.5 One high- | | | | | |
| conference or | | level Gol - UN | | | | | |
| panel | | conference or | | | | | |
| discussion | | panel discussion | | | | | |
| organized | | organized | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 1.3.6 | | 1.3.6 Training on | | | | | |
| Training on | | REDD for local | | | | | |
| REDD for | | level actors | | | | | |
| local level | | conducted | | | | | |
| actors | | | | | | | |
| conducted | | | | | | | |
| | | | Achievements this reporting period: | | | | |
| | | | Identified target groups and | | | | |

| customized messages for each |
|-------------------------------------|
| group (July 2011) |
| Communication Strategy |
| (August 2011) |
| A draft of policy |
| recommendation on |
| communication strategy for |
| REDD+ implementation |
| (December 2011) |
| Published articles about REDD+ |
| and UN-REDD issues by national |
| and local newspapers as well as |
| broadcasting through a national |
| television (TVRI) and province |
| television (Palu TV). These were |
| achieved because UN-REDD |
| facilitated a Joint workshop with |
| RECOFTC on capacity building |
| for journalists (April 2011), |
| collaborated with the Central |
| Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group |
| on Media Gathering to raise |
| awareness (February 2011) |
| UN-REDD Website (December |
| 2011, http://un-redd.or.id/) |
| Facilitated a meeting and |
| conducted a panel discussion |
| with the head of the Indonesia's |
| delegation team and the high |
| level decision makers from the |
| Ministry of Forestry for COP 17 |
| in Durban |
| Early awareness-raising on |
| climate change and REDD+ issues |
| to the district forestry offices in |
| the Central Sulawesi province |

| | (Nov 2011 in Palu attended by all | |
|---|--|--|
| | representative of forestry offices | |
| | from all districts) | |
| | Published and distributed the | |
| | following: | |
| | - Results from the Cancun | |
| | Conference | |
| | - National REDD+ Strategy draft | |
| | - UN-REDD brochures and | |
| | leaflet | |
| | - UN-REDD quarterly | |
| | Newsletters | |
| | - 10 'fast facts' (fact sheets) | |
| | developed and distributed at | |
| | Forestry conference | |
| | - Lessons Learned from | |
| | National REDD+ Strategy | |
| | process (in Indonesian and | |
| | English) | |
| | - Promotional materials of UN- | |
| | REDD for national and | |
| | international exhibitions | |
| | Organized an event with | |
| | religious leaders in support of | |
| | issues related to climate change | |
| | mitigation and adaptation | |
| Outcome 2: Successful demonstration of establishing a F | EL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the national REDD architecture | |

| 2.1 Improved | 2.1.1 Existing | (1) NFI | December 2010 | Cumulative achievements: | • | Progress | FAO; | Sufficient | • The search |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------|
| capacity and | standards and | (1989-1997) | 2.1.1 Review of | | | reports | MoFor/Gol | staff, | for an |
| methodology | methodologie | are outdated | existing standards | | • | Regulation | | equipmen | internatio |
| design for forest | s in MRV | and need to | and | | • | Training | | t and | nal |
| carbon inventory | reviewed | be further | methodologies in | | | materials | | other | consultant |
| within a | | developed | MRV published | | • | Workshop | | resources | to develop |
| Monitoring, | 2.1.2 | (2) Base | | | | proceeding | | are | NFI design |
| Assessment, | Measurement | line for | 2.1.2 Outline for | | • | Publication | | dedicated | took very |
| Reporting and | protocols and | socioecono | measurement | | | S | | to the | long and |
| Verification | sampling | mic data in | protocols and | | | | | task | was |
| System (MRV), | design for a | NFI does not | sampling design | | | | | | eventually |
| including sub- | national forest | exists | for a national | | | | | Adequate | abandone |
| national pilot | carbon | | forest carbon | | | | | methodol | d and a |
| implementation | inventory | | inventory | | | | | ogy | national |
| | developed | | prepared | | | | | selected | consultant |
| | | | | | | | | for | was |
| | 2.1.3 Forest | | 2.1.3 Terms of | | | | | demonstr | selected. |
| | carbon | | Reference for | | | | | ation of | Clear time |
| | inventory in | | forest carbon | | | | | MRV | line on the |
| | pilot provinces | | inventory in pilot | | | | | | NFI related |
| | implemented | | provinces | | | | | There is a | activities |
| | | | prepared | | | | | need for a | should be |
| | 2.1.4 Methods | | | | | | | clear data | developed |
| | for Reporting | | 2.1.4 Outline for | | | | | managem | to ensure |
| | and | | methods for | | | | | ent and | that the |
| | Verification | | Reporting and | | | | | data | activities |
| | developed | | Verification | | | | | sharing | will be in |
| | | | prepared | | | | | policy | accordanc |
| | 2.1.5 | | | | | | | among | e with the |
| | Reporting and | | 2.1.6 Workshop | | | | | informatio | project |
| | Verification in | | on MRV Training | | | | | n | period. |
| | pilot provinces | | methodology | | | | | providers | There are |
| | implemented | | organized | | | | | and users | many DAs |
| | | | | | | | | | developing |
| | 2.1.6 | | December 2011 | | | | | | MRV |
| | Workshop on | | | | | | | | methodolo |

| la a | IDV/Training | 2.4.2 | | | T | and the Alexander |
|------|--------------|---------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | | 2.1.2 | | | | gy in their |
| | ethodology | Measurement | | | | area. A |
| or | • | protocols and | | | | lead |
| | | sampling design | | | | agency is |
| | | for a national | | | | needed to |
| | | forest carbon | | | | coordinate |
| | | inventory | | | | and decide |
| | | developed | | | | what MRV |
| | | | | | | methodolo |
| | | 2.1.3 forest | | | | gy should |
| | | carbon inventory | | | | be |
| | | in pilot provinces | | | | implement |
| | | implemented | | | | ed for |
| | | | | | | Indonesia |
| | | 2.1.4 Methods for | | | | Lack of |
| | | Reporting and | | | | clarity |
| | | Verification | | | | about |
| | | released | | | | responsibil |
| | | | | | | ities for |
| | | 2.1.5 Reporting | | | | MRV in |
| | | and Verification in | | | | Indonesia |
| | | pilot provinces | | | | due the |
| | | implemented | | | | planned |
| | | Implemented | | | | establishm |
| | | | | | | ent of an |
| | | | | | | MRV |
| | | | | | | Institution. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | The details |
| | | | | | | of Who |
| | | | | | | and What |
| | | | | | | this MRV |
| | | | | | | institution |
| | | | | | | is, are still |
| | | | | | | unknown. |
| | | | Achievements this reporting period: | | | |
| | | | Decommondation on National | | | |
| | | | Recommendation on National | | | |

| REDD+ Information, Monitoring & MRV Action Plan to the REDD+ Task Force and other government institutions • Draft of Forestry MRV Roadmap through collaboration with the Ministry of Forestry (since April 2011) • Trained 33 participants from provincial government, forestry province, NGOs, CSOs, Universities on Basic Remote Sensing in Central Sulawesi (June to July 2011) • Published and disseminated publication about MRV principles (Nov 2010) • Study on land use classification based on Spot 4 image for |
|--|
| Sensing in Central Sulawesi |
| |
| |
| · |
| |
| |
| based on Spot 4 image for |
| Central Sulawesi (October 2010) |
| Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) |
| on redesigning the NFI's |
| sampling method |
| NFI study trip to FAO |
| headquarters with staff from |
| Ministry of Forestry to discuss the options for re-designing the |
| NFI (since March 2011) |
| Enhanced REDD+ understanding |
| and collaboration through a |
| MRV workshop for universities, |
| focused on universities from |
| eastern Indonesia (September |
| 2011 in Palu) |

| 2.2 Reference | 2.2.1 REL | Some data | December 2010 | Cumulative achievements: | • | Progress | FAO; | Basic | Public has |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--|---|------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| emissions level | methodologie | analysis | 2.2.1 Review of | | | reports | MoFor/Gol | informatio | waited for |
| (REL) proposed at | s reviewed | exist within | REL | Initial historical emission levels | • | Technical | | n is | the clear |
| the provincial | | DGPLAN | methodologies | for LULUCF for Central Sulawesi | | reports | | available | status of |
| level | 2.2.2 | but | published | developed (October 2010) | • | Publicatio | | (satellite | REL/RL |
| | Methodologic | incomplete | | Initiated discussions on Reference | | ns | | images, | from |
| | al options to | • No | 2.2.2 Outline for | Emissions Levels/Reference | • | Workshop | | reference | national/c |
| | establish REL | Baseline for | methodological | Levels through a Focus Groups | | proceedin | | data) | entral |
| | at national | Carbon | options to | Discussion (September 2010) | | gs | | | governme |
| | and sub- | Emission at | establish REL at | Options of method to calculate | | 8- | | Authoritie | nt. UN- |
| | national scale | the | national and sub- | REL/RL at national level are under | | | | s are | REDD |
| | developed | national | national scale | development | | | | willing to | should |
| | | and sub- | prepared | | | | | co- | take this |
| | 2.2.3 Data to | national | | | | | | operate | moment |
| | support | level exists | 2.2.3 Data to | | | | | | to provide |
| | development | Existing NFI | support | | | | | Implemen | policy |
| | of REL | data not | development of | | | | | ting | recommen |
| | compiled | calculated | REL compiled | | | | | partners | dation on |
| | | for REDD | | | | | | are | this issue |
| | 2.2.4 | No scenario | December 2011 | | | | | capable to | as soon as |
| | Provisional | exists | 2.2.2 | | | | | allocate | possible to |
| | REL in the | | Methodological | | | | | skillful | accelerate |
| | pilot province | | options to | | | | | staff | the REDD+ |
| | assessed | | establish REL at | | | | | | readiness |
| | | | national and sub- | | | | | | in |
| | 2.2.5 | | national scale | | | | | | Indonesia. |
| | Provisional | | released | | | | | | • Internatio |
| | REL | | 2.2.4.0 | | | | | | nal |
| | scientifically | | 2.2.4 Provisional | | | | | | guidance |
| | peer reviewed | | REL in the pilot | | | | | | on |
| | 2.2.6 | | province released | | | | | | Reference |
| | 2.2.6 Stakeholder | | 2.2.5 Peer review | | | | | | Emission |
| | consultations | | of Provisional REL | | | | | | Levels |
| | on REL | | completed | | | | | | were |
| | methodologic | | completed | | | | | | lacking for |
| | methodologic | | | | | | | | a long |

| and provents and provents and provents and provents and provents are peer peer peer peer peer peer peer | provincial visional organized 7 REL hodologic oproach provincial visional ntifically r reviewed 1 Existing • No REDD | 2.2.6 At least 4 stakeholder consultations on REL methodological approach and provincial provisional REL organized 2.2.7 Peer review of REL methodological approach and provincial provisional REL completed | Achievements this reporting period: Initiated discussions on Reference Emissions Levels/Reference Levels through a Focus Groups Discussion Options of method to calculate REL/RL at national level are under development (Sep 2011) Cumulative achievements: | ■ Progress | UNDP; | No | time. At COP17 in Durban it was decided that countries can develop their own methodolo gy. FAO recommen ds to follow UNFCCC decisions, thus the work on REL started with a delay. |
|---|---|--|---|---|-----------|--|---|
| fair and equitable payr payment system | ment payment distributio ns systems | 2.3.1 Information about existing payment systems compiled | Compiled information on existing funding systems, payment mechanisms and benefit | reports Publications Workshop proceedings | MoFor/Gol | national legislation enabling the | government has recently issued a Presidential |

| 2 | .3.2 Benefits | types of | | distribution systems, and payments | ■ MoM | payment | Decree |
|-----|---------------|----------|---------------------|--|--------|-----------|--------------|
| ar | | | 2.3.2 Outline for a | for environmental services (PES) in | ■ ToRs | system(s) | about fund |
| | | | review on | Indonesia and abroad (Dec 2010 – | | .,(., | that might |
| | xisting | | benefits and | March 2011) | | Lack up- | be used as a |
| | /stems | | constraints of | Mapping of funding mechanisms in | | front | legal base |
| | nalyzed and | U | existing systems | Indonesia from national to sub- | | payments | for the |
| | eviewed | | prepared | national level | | impacting | developmen |
| | | | | | | local | t of trust |
| 2.: | .3.3 Options | | 2.3.3 Terms of | | | commitm | fund like |
| fo | • | | Reference for | | | ents | institution. |
| m | odifications | | developing | | | | |
| to | meet | | options for | | | | UN-REDD |
| re | equirements | | modifications to | | | | need to |
| of | f a REDD | | meet | | | | focus on |
| pa | ayment | | requirements of a | | | | sub-national |
| sy | /stem | | REDD payment | | | | payment |
| de | eveloped | | system prepared | | | | mechanism |
| | | | | | | | and use the |
| 2. | .3.4 | | 2.3.4 One | | | | result to |
| St | takeholder | | stakeholder | | | | generate a |
| | onsultations | | consultations | | | | policy |
| or | rganized | | organized | | | | recommend |
| | | | | | | | ation to the |
| | .3.5 A REDD | | December 2011 | | | | Task Force. |
| l F | ayment | | 2.3.2 Analytical | | | | |
| | /stem | | report on benefits | | | | |
| cr | reated | | and constraints of | | | | |
| | | | existing systems | | | | |
| | .3.6 Local | | published | | | | |
| | stitutions | | | | | | |
| tra | ained | | 2.3.3 Options for | | | | |
| | | | modifications to | | | | |
| | | | meet | | | | |
| | | | requirements of a | | | | |
| | | | REDD payment | | | | |
| | | | system developed | | | | |

| | 1 | T | 1 | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2.3.4 Three stakeholder | | | | |
| consultations | | | | |
| organized | | | | |
| 2.3.5 A REDD | | | | |
| payment system | | | | |
| created | | | | |
| 2.3.6 Local | | | | |
| institutions | | | | |
| trained | | | | |
| | Achievements this reporting period: | | | |
| | Preparation for analysis of the | | | |
| | compiled information showing | | | |
| | benefits and constraints of existing | | | |
| | PES projects and the implications | | | |
| | for REDD+ (Feb – March 2011) | | | |
| | Compiled funding and fiscal transfer | | | |
| | systems that currently exist in | | | |
| | Indonesia (March – July 2011) | | | |
| | Lessons learned from mapping | | | |
| | existing funding systems, payment | | | |
| | mechanisms and benefit | | | |
| | distribution systems in Indonesia | | | |
| | and internationally (April – June | | | |
| | 2011) | | | |
| | Coordination meeting on potential | | | |
| | collaboration in developing a road | | | |
| | map of payment mechanism with | | | |
| | UN-REDD, REDD+ Task Force, and | | | |
| | WB/FCPF (December 2011) | | | |

| 2.4 Toolkit for | 2.4.1 | (3) No | December 2010 | Cumulative achievements: | ■ Project reports | UNEP; | Relevant | Progress of |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|
| priority setting | Agreement on | national nor | 2.4.1 Agreement | | ■ Manual of | MoFor/Gol | data are | the output |
| towards | agencies, data | provincial | on agencies, data | | Toolkit | (UNEP-WCMC, | available | was delayed |
| maximizing | sources, GIS | site | sources, GIS | | translated in | leading the | for | due to a |
| potential Carbon- | development | selection | development and | | Bahasa | development of | producing | lengthy |
| benefits and | and site | process, | site selection | | Indonesia | the output) | map | selection of |
| incorporating co- | selection | IFCA | criteria reached | | Maps | | overlays | participants |
| benefits, at the | criteria | provides | | | ■ MoM | | | for the |
| provincial level | reached | guidelines | 2.4.2 Outline for | | Work plan | | Remote | training on |
| 1 | | only | the Priority | | developed in | | sensing | priority- |
| I | 2.4.2 The | (4) No | Setting Toolkit | | collaboration | | coverage | setting |
| 1 | Priority | DSS to make | developed | | with partners | | pilot | toolkit. |
| 1 | Setting Toolkit | feasible | | | | | province | |
| | (including | investment | 2.4.3 Terms of | | Series of map | | not | |
| | short manual) | decisions | reference for | | overlays | | available | |
| | developed | Draft criteria | mapping below- & | | | | or not in | |
| | | for site | above-ground | | Priority-setting | | time for | |
| | 2.4.3 Below- & | selection | carbon, inside and | | toolkit | | analysis | |
| | above-ground | indicated in | outside the Forest | | | | | |
| | carbon, inside | IFCA (2007) | Estate prepared | | Skills in using | | MoFor | |
| I | and outside | | | | toolkit | | departme | |
| | the Forest | | 2.4.4 Outline for | | developed | | nts | |
| | Estate | | mapping co- | | during training | | unwilling | |
| 1 | mapped | | benefits | | session | | to | |
| | | | (minimally: | | | | exchange | |
| | 2.4.4 Co- | | biodiversity, | | Some of the | | data sets, | |
| | benefits | | water resources, | | publications | | and share | |
| | (minimally: | | pockets of | | are available | | with | |
| | biodiversity, | | poverty, others) | | at | | FORDA | |
| | water | | prepared | | http://un- | | | |
| | resources, | | | | redd.or.id/pub | | Climate | |
| | pockets of | | December 2011 | | lications | | Change | |
| | poverty, | | | | | | impacts | |
| | others) | | 2.4.2 The Priority | | | | lead to | |
| | mapped | | Setting Toolkit | | | | significant | |
| | | | (including short | | | | changes in | |

| <u> </u> | | 1 | ı | |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| 2.4.4 Co- | manual) | | | forest |
| benefits maps | developed and | | | ecology. |
| analyzed | published | | | |
| | | | | Relevant |
| 2.4.5 | 2.4.3 Below- & | | | data are |
| Provincial staff | above-ground | | | available |
| trained in the | carbon, inside and | | | for |
| use of Priority | outside the Forest | | | producing |
| Setting Tool | Estate mapped | | | map |
| | | | | overlays |
| 2.4.6 | 2.4.4 Co-benefits | | | • |
| Workshop | (minimally: | | | |
| organized on | biodiversity, | | | |
| co-benefits, | water resources, | | | |
| local spatial | pockets of | | | |
| planning, and | poverty, others) | | | |
| national REDD | mapped | | | |
| policy | 1112 | | | |
| ροογ | 2.4.4 Co-benefits | | | |
| | maps analyzed | | | |
| | and published | | | |
| | aria pasiisrica | | | |
| | 2.4.5 Provincial | | | |
| | staff trained in | | | |
| | the use of Priority | | | |
| | Setting Tool | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 2.4.6 Workshop | | | |
| | organized on co- | | | |
| | benefits, local | | | |
| | spatial planning, | | | |
| | and national | | | |
| | REDD policy | | | |
| | | Achievements this reporting period: | | |
| | | | | |
| | | UNEP-WCMC scooping mission and | | |
| | | preliminary action plan agreed | | |

| Outcome 3: Capac | city established to | o implement REI | DD at decentralized | upon (March 2011)—>target 2.4.1. • UNEP-WCMC four trained Indonesian colleagues from MoFor, BPKH Palu, Central Sulawesi Forest Service and Tadulako University (July 2011)→ target 2.4.2. • Produced map layers to estimate carbon stock in the province (July 2011 in Cambridge, UK)→ target 2.4.4. • Identified additional data for further analysis (December 2011 in Palu) → target 2.4.4. • Identified tool-kit package that can be developed, given the limited time period and budget (December 2011 in Bogor) → target 2.4.2. Ievels | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---|--|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 3.1 Capacity for spatial socio- | 3.1.1 a comprehensiv | (5) Ong | December 2010 3.1.1 a | Cumulative achievements: | ReportsMinutes of | UNDP; MoFor/Gol | Forestry authoritie | A number of |
| economic | e baseline | conflicts | comprehensive | | consultatio | Wioi oi/doi | s willing | activities |
| planning | dataset | TGHK with | baseline dataset | | ns | | to | for pilot |
| incorporating | developed | process | developed | | Maps | | participat | district |
| REDD at the | | RTRD | | | draft | | e and go | selection |
| district level | | , , | 3.1.1 Areas of | | spatial plan | | for | are |
| | REDD-eligible | district | REDD-eligible | | Some of | | consensus | planned by |
| | forest | spatial plans | forest identified | | the | | | Q4/2011 . |
| | identified | endorsed at | | | publication | | Priority | |
| | 2.4.2 | national | December 2011 | | s are | | setting | |
| | 3.1.2 | level | 3.1.2 Opportunity costs of | | available at | | tool ready | |
| | Opportunity costs of | | costs of alternative land | | http://un- | | and | |
| | alternative | | uses analyzed and | | redd.or.id/ publication | | applied | |
| | land uses | | published | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| | analyzed | | publisheu | | <u>\$</u> | | | |
| | unaryzeu | | 3.1.3 Potential | | | | | |

| | 3.1.3 Potential | | socio-economic | | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| | socio- | | impacts of REDD | | | | | |
| | economic | | on communities | | | | | |
| | impacts of | | analyzed and | | | | | |
| | REDD on | | published | | | | | |
| | communities | | | | | | | |
| | analyzed | | 3.1.4 REDD | | | | | |
| | | | integrated in | | | | | |
| | 3.1.4 REDD | | existing spatial | | | | | |
| | integrated in | | planning and | | | | | |
| | existing spatial | | forest utilization | | | | | |
| | planning and | | planning | | | | | |
| | forest | | _ | | | | | |
| | utilization | | 3.1.5 District | | | | | |
| | planning | | based consensus | | | | | |
| | | | on land – and | | | | | |
| | 3.1.5 District | | forest use | | | | | |
| | based | | allocation reached | | | | | |
| | consensus on | | | | | | | |
| | land – and | | 3.1.6 The REDD | | | | | |
| | forest use | | mainstreamed | | | | | |
| | allocation | | spatial plan | | | | | |
| | reached | | approved | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 3.1.6 The | | | | | | | |
| | REDD | | | | | | | |
| | mainstreamed | | | | | | | |
| | spatial plan | | | | | | | |
| | approved | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Achievements this reporting period: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 Empowered | 3.2.1 Capacity | • Low | December 2010 | Cumulative achievements: | Progress | UNDP; | Baseline | • Media |
| local | needs | awareness | 3.2.1 Capacity | | reports | MoFor/Gol | establishe | needs |
| stakeholders are | assessment | and high | needs assessment | | Publications | | d at | informatio |
| able to benefit | made | level of | made | | Awareness & | | inception | n and |
| from REDD | | misconcept | | | capacity | | | updates |

| 3. | .2.2 Capacity | ion RFDD at | 3.2.2 Outline for | | impact | on CC and |
|----|----------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| | uilding & | village and | capacity building | | studies at | REDD+ |
| | raining | • | & training | | mid- and end- | issues in |
| | nodules | level | modules prepared | | term | order to |
| | eveloped | All REDD | | | | play a |
| | | proposals | December 2011 | | | more |
| 3. | .2.3 Trainers | driven by | 3.2.2 Capacity | | | strategic |
| | ave been | foreign | building & | | | role for |
| tr | rained | agencies | training modules | | | successful |
| | | J | developed | | | REDD+ |
| 3. | .2.4 Training | | , | | | readiness |
| aı | nd other | | 3.2.3 Trainers | | | and |
| ca | apacity | | have been trained | | | implement |
| b | uilding | | | | | ation. |
| a | ctivities have | | 3.2.4 Training and | | | • Asia- |
| b | een | | other capacity | | | Pacific |
| In | mplemented | | building activities | | | countries |
| | | | have been | | | need to |
| 3. | .2.5 Follow- | | implemented | | | consolidat |
| u | p activities | | | | | e to have a |
| re | equired to | | 3.2.5 Follow-up | | | strong |
| in | mprove and | | activities required | | | voice in |
| sı | ustain | | to improve and | | | upcoming |
| ca | apacity have | | sustain capacity | | | UNFCCC |
| b | een assessed | | have been | | | COPs. |
| | | | assessed | | | |
| | | | | Achievements this reporting period: | | |
| | | | | Establishment of the Working | | |
| | | | | Group in Central Sulawesi and their | | |
| | | | | increased level of understanding on | | |
| | | | | REDD+ issues (February 2011) | | |
| | | | | Dissemination of information on | | |
| | | | | climate change and REDD+ issues to | | |
| | | | | Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working | | |
| | | | | Group (February 2011 to-date) | | |
| | | | | Central Sulawesi Media Gathering | | |
| | | | | Central Sulawesi Media Gathering | | |

| | | | | to promote the understanding of REDD+, climate change issues and the UN-REDD Programme (February 2011) | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------|---|---------------|-----------|----------|--------------|
| | | | | Local participation in regional discussion on post-Cancun | | | | |
| | | | | organized by RECOFTC and FAO at | | | | |
| | | | | Bangkok (February 2011) | | | | |
| | | | | Participation of Central Sulawesi | | | | |
| | | | | REDD+ Working Group members at | | | | |
| | | | | Training of Trainers event organized by Conservation International and | | | | |
| | | | | University of Indonesia on Climate | | | | |
| | | | | Change and REDD+ (May 2011) | | | | |
| | | | | Supported the participation of | | | | |
| | | | | Central Sulawesi journalists in the | | | | |
| | | | | training on the issues of climate | | | | |
| | | | | change, REDD+ and FPIC at Jakarta | | | | |
| | | | | (April 2011) • Supported the participation of | | | | |
| | | | | Central Sulawesi Government in the | | | | |
| | | | | Durban COP 17 side event | | | | |
| | | | | Initial scoping mission for capacity | | | | |
| | | | | need assessment for Central | | | | |
| | | | | Sulawesi (November 2011) | | | | |
| | | | | Promoted the understanding on the | | | | |
| | | | | issues of climate change, REDD+, | | | | |
| | | | | and UN-REDD for the District forestry office | | | | |
| 3.3 Multi- | 3.3.1 Five | Few district | December 2010 | · | December 2009 | UNDP; | DPRD | Selection |
| stakeholder- | districts in | | 3.3.1 Five districts | | 3.3.1 Five | MoFor/Goi | approves | of districts |
| endorsed District | which REDD is | endorsed at | in which REDD is | | districts in | | district | have been |
| plans for REDD | most feasible | national | most feasible | | which REDD is | | based | delayed |
| implementation | identified | level | identified | | most feasible | | spatial | due to |
| | 2 2 2 0500 | | D 2011 | | identified | | plans, | long |
| | 3.3.2 REDD | | December 2011 | | | | | selection |

| socialized to | 3.3.2 REDD | | December 2010 | process. |
|-----------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------|
| these districts | socialized to 5 | | 3.3.2 REDD | • Represent |
| inese districts | districts | | socialized to 5 | atives |
| 3.3.3 Districts | 415011005 | | districts | from |
| developed | 3.3.3 Five districts | | | NGOs/CSO |
| proposals to | have developed | | 3.3.3 Five | and IPs are |
| implement | proposals to | | districts have | represente |
| REDD | implement REDD | | developed | d in the |
| | • | | proposals to | Working |
| 3.3.3 Districts | 3.3.3 Districts | | implement | Group. |
| show political | show political | | REDD | • Each sub- |
| commitment | commitment to | | | Working |
| to implement | implement REDD | | 3.3.3 Districts | Group has |
| REDD | | | show political | specific |
| | 3.3.4 For at least | | commitment to | tasks and |
| 3.3.4 For at | one district, | | implement | functions |
| least one | agreement on an | | REDD | • Need a |
| district, | implementation | | | synergy |
| agreement on | framework for | | 3.3.4 For at | among |
| an | REDD reached | | least one | sub- |
| implementatio | | | district, | Working |
| n framework | | | agreement on | Groups. |
| for REDD | | | an | |
| reached | | | implementatio | |
| | | | n framework | |
| | | | for REDD | |
| | | | reached | |
| | | Achievements this reporting period: | Progress | |
| | | A set of suitouis to colore wilet | reports | |
| | | A set of criteria to select pilot districts | Publications | |
| | | | Awareness & | |
| | | Selected five UN-REDD pilot districts (Sigi Donggala Parigi | capacity | |
| | | districts (Sigi, Donggala, Parigi Moutong, Toli-Toli, and Tojo Una- | impact | |
| | | Una) | studies at | |
| | | 1 | mid- and end- | |
| | | A set of guidelines on FPIC | term | |

| implementation Selected locations for FPIC Pilot activities (KPH Dampelas Tinombo and Lore Lindu National Park which are located at Donggala, Sigi and Parigi districts) The subject of FPIC pilot was agreed (not on REDD+) Materials for FPIC pilot activities in selected districts. Involvement of stakeholders in the consultation of the establishment of the Central Sulawesi Working Group (in February 2011) and inauguration (in March 2011) Trained MoFor staff on opportunity cost analyses for REDD+ (June 2011, Bangkok) Collected data of every district to be used as district baseline (November 2011) | |
|---|--|
| Template for district baseline information for spatial planning activity (November 2011) | |

Cross-cutting issues:

Gender:

- Training on gender issues conducted to mainstream gender into the National Programme (training facilitated by UN Women)
- Gender specific indicators and relevant activities developed and have been integrated in the work plan.

Governance:

- UN-REDD Indonesia collaboration to develop the Participatory Governance Assessment supported by the Global UN-REDD Programme. UN-REDD Indonesia provides in kind contribution technical support to the development of the Assessment Criteria. Central Sulawesi is one of the assessment locations, and UN-REDD Programme Indonesia is providing extra support in this province.

1.3 Financial Information

In the table below, please provide up-to-date information on activities completed based on the Results Framework included in the signed National Programme Document; as well as financial data on planned, committed and disbursed funds. The table requests information on the cumulative financial progress of the National Programme implementation at the end of the reporting period (including all cumulative yearly disbursements). Please add additional rows as needed. <u>Definitions of financial categories:</u>

- Budget: Amount transferred from the MDTF to date for the programme
- Commitments: Includes all amount committed 10 to date
- Disbursement: Amount paid to a vendor or entity for goods received, work completed, and/or services rendered (does not include un-liquidated obligations)
- Expenditures: Total of commitments plus disbursements
- Percentage delivery: Cumulative expenditure over funds transferred to date

| PROGRAMME OUTPUTS | UN | IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---|
| | ORGANISATION | BUDGET | UDGET CUMULATI | | ATIVE EXPENDITURES | |
| | | | Commitments | Disbursements | Total Expenditures | Expenditure as percentage of the budget |
| Outcome 1: Strengthen multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national and provincial level. | FAO | N/A | N/A | | | |
| | UNEP | 700,000 | 700,000 | | | |
| | UNDP | 900,000 | 0 | 453,250 | 455,148 | 120.5 |
| Outcome 2: Successful demonstration of establishing a REL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the | FAO | 1,498,000 | 103,970 | | | |
| national REDD architecture. | UNEP | 375,000 | 210,000 | | | |
| | UNDP | 400,000 | | 44,764 | 44,764 | 74.9 |
| Outcome 3: Capacity established to implement REDD at decentralized levels. | FAO | N/A | N/A | | | |
| | UNEP | N/A | N/A | | | |
| | UNDP | 1,500,000 | 0 | 216,926 | 217,150 | 54.7 |
| | TOTAL: | 5,275,000 | | | | |

¹⁰ Commitment is the amount for which legally binding contracts have been signed, including multi-year commitments which may be disbursed in future years

2. National Programme Progress

The questions in section two are intended to capture advancements and challenges that the National Programme has faced during the reporting period. It also aims to collect information on inter-agency coordination, ownership and development effectiveness, and communication. Please provide your answers after each question.

2.1 Narrative on Progress, Difficulties and Contingency Measures

The questions below ask for a brief narrative describing progress on the implementation of activities, generation of outputs and attainment of outcomes. It also asks for a description of internal and external challenges to National Programme implementation, as well as the contingency actions planned to overcome them.

2.1.1 Please provide a brief overall assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs. Please provide examples if relevant (600 words).

The UN-REDD Programme in Indonesia showed good overall progress although some activities took longer than expected. This has some impact on other activities that were scheduled in sequence. However, it does not have to affect the overall targets.

The Programme gained support from the Government of Indonesia through the UN-REDD activities as well as the process that was taken in implementing the activities by including all the relevant entities and stakeholders. At national level, the government policy on REDD+ has been taken into account. Several decrees have been issued at the national level, including Presidential Instruction on REDD+ Task Force (Presidential Decree No. 19/2010 and No. 25/2011 in May 2010 and September 2011, respectively), Ministry of Forestry Decrees on REDD+ issues (P68/2008 on REDD+ Demonstration Activity initiative in December 2008, P30/2009 on Procedures to reduce emission from REDD, and P36/2009 on Procedures to license carbon sink utilization from production and protected forest in May 2009), moratorium of new license issuance for timber extraction from natural forest (President Instruction No. 10/2011, May 2011), Ministry of Finance Decree on Regional Incentive Transfer, and Presidential Decree on Trust Fund (Presidential Decree 80/2011 on Trust Fund, Nov 2011). UN-REDD facilitated the Directorate General of planology by conducting Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) to provide inputs for the issuance of the moratorium decree. High-level decision makers have taken actions to implement the decrees. At the province level, the governor of Central Sulawesi has established a REDD+ working group to support the REDD+ readiness. The provincial government, represented by the Central Sulawesi Governor, the Head of Forestry Office and the Head of Planning Board also participated in the COP 17's side event and informed the international community on their willingness to implement successful REDD+ mechanisms in the province.

The Programme's multi-stakeholder consensus-based approach has been well implemented and recognized by REDD+ stakeholders in Indonesia, including national and sub-national governments, CSOs, NGOs, the private sector, universities and individual experts. The following report by the Indonesia-Norway partnership (http://www.norway.or.id/PageFiles/454212/Final_Report_4_May_2011.pdf) is one example of public recognition of our efforts. Moreover, under the outcome 1, the Programme has achieved more than the expected and targeted outputs (See Output 1.1). Also, the communications programme has made use of a variety of media for awareness-raising purposes since the finalization of the communications strategy in the middle of the year.

In some cases, progress has been slower than expected, particularly for some activities in outcome 2 and outcome 3. This was because of the consultation process that was required to reach a recommendation on re-designing Indonesia's NFI (output 2.1), and because of necessary lengthy stakeholder consultations to select the five pilot districts (outcome 3). Progress of the output 2.4 was delayed due to a lengthy selection of participants for the training on priority-setting toolkit.

The Programme has focused on strengthening the capacity of provincial multi-stakeholders forums through the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group before implementing its activities at province, district, and community levels. This approach was taken in order to make the REDD+ Working Group the driving force of

REDD+ implementation in the province. We believe that the resulting strong sense of ownership will ensure the sustainability of the REDD+ work in the province.

2.1.2 Please provide a brief overall assessment of any measures taken to ensure the sustainability of the National Programme results during the reporting period. Please provide examples if relevant. (250 words)

The UN-REDD Programme has applied two approaches to ensure sustainability: (1) increasing the sense of ownership by stakeholders through the process of building multi-stakeholder consensus; and (2) collaborating with relevant institutions that are officially leading the implementation of REDD+. The development of the National REDD+ Strategy, the FPIC Policy Recommendation, the National REDD+ Framework, the National Forest Inventory Re-design and the Forestry MRV Roadmap are the examples where the outputs will continue to have an effect beyond the UN-REDD National Programme. A similar approach has also been applied at the province level.

Other measures to ensure the sustainability include facilitating the link between the activities at the provincial level and the national level, such as the Provincial REDD+ Strategy with the National REDD+ Strategy, and Province Action Plan for Greenhouse Gases (GHG) Reduction draft with the National Action Plan of the GHG reduction.

In addition, the Programme is working closely with the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group. The close collaboration with the Working Group will ensure the sustainability, and the UN-REDD Programme will continue to make sure that the Working Group is well informed on REDD+ dynamics at national and international levels. Capacity development on REDD+ related issues in the province continues.

The Programme also involved universities from other provinces in eastern Indonesia for a sharing on REDD+ and MRV. This facilitates a common understanding of REDD+ and MRV and establishes an informal network through which the universities can learn from each other.

2.1.3 If there are difficulties in the implementation of the National Programme, what are the main causes of these difficulties? Please check the most suitable option. N/A.

| UN agency Coordination |
|--|
| Coordination with Government |
| Coordination within the Government |
| Administrative (Procurement, etc) /Financial (management of funds, availability, budget revision |
| etc) |
| Management: 1. Activity and output management |
| Management: 2. Governance/Decision making (PMC/NSC) |
| Accountability |
| Transparency |
| ☐ National Programme design |
| External to the National Programme (risks and assumptions, elections, natural disaster, socia |
| unrest) |

2.1.4 If boxes are checked under 2.1.3, please briefly describe any current *internal* difficulties¹¹ the National Programme is facing in relation to the implementation of the activities outlined in the National Programme Document. (200 words)

It is not a difficulty but rather a challenge. The challenge is due to dynamic REDD+ negotiations at international level and debates related with REDD+ issues in Indonesia as well as the disparity in the level of understanding on REDD+ issues across the ministry. Implementing UN-REDD activities by strengthening stakeholders' capacity in REDD+ issues required various approaches to assist them reaching consensus, including the pilot district selection and other REDD+ issues in Indonesia.

-

 $^{^{11}}$ Difficulties confronted by the team directly involved in the implementation of the National Programme

Other challenges include how to increase ownership or ensure the sustainability of the program. Implementing the Programme in the way that the process ensures its sustainability has been more difficult than simply achieving the targets without considering the sustainability of the Programme.

2.1.5 If boxes are checked under 2.1.3, please briefly describe any current *external* difficulties¹² (not caused by the National Programme) that delay or impede the quality of implementation. (200 words)

External difficulties faced by the UN-REDD Programme were uncertainty of the REDD+ negotiation at international level and also various interpretations and varying levels of understanding on REDD+ issues by national stakeholders whom we have been working with.

2.1.6 Please, briefly explain the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or manage the difficulties (internal and external referred to in question 2.1.3 and 2.1.4) described in the previous sections. (250 words)

UN-REDD is implementing the following:

- Involving various key stakeholders at national and sub-national levels in developing various policy recommendations related to REDD+ in the country.
- Ensuring the sustainability of the program by implementing a process-based approach rather than target/output-based (process versus output).
- Collaborating with key institutions that are responsible on actions related to REDD+ implementation such as BAPPENAS, UKP4, DNPI, DKN, FCPF and Climate Change working group of the Ministry of Forestry.

2.2 Inter-Agency Coordination

The aim of the questions below is to collect relevant information on how the National Programme is contributing to inter-agency work and "Delivering as One".

| 2.2.1 | Is the National Programme in coherence with the UN Country Programme or other donor assistance framework approved by the Government? Yes No If not, does the National Programme fit into the national strategies? Yes No If not, please explain: | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|
| 2.2.2 | What types of coordination mechanisms and decisions have been taken to ensure joint delivery? Please reflect on the questions above and add any other relevant comments and examples if you consider it necessary: | | | |
| | Quarterly Progress Report is developed by PMU using the UNDP's QWR template and distributed to all UN participating agencies. Regular coordination meetings of PMU, FAO, UNDP, and UNEP. | | | |
| 2.2.3 | Is HACT being applied in the implementation of the National Programme by the three participating UN organisation? ☑Yes ☐No If not, please explain: | | | |

 $^{^{12}}$ Difficulties confronted by the team caused by factors outside of the National Programme

2.3 Ownership¹³ and Development Effectiveness

The questions below seeks to gather relevant information on how the National Programme is putting into practice the principles of aid effectiveness through strong national ownership, alignment and harmonization of procedures and mutual accountability.

| 2.3.1 | Do government and other national implementation partners have ownership of the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs? No Some Yes | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Please explain: The UN-REDD Programme applies a multi-stakeholder based approach for policy-related activities a national and sub-national levels. Various stakeholders related to REDD+ issues at national and subnational levels have been actively involved since the beginning of the Programme. By applying the approach, all stakeholders have the ownership of the policy outputs. Main government institutions a national and provincial that have formal authority to implement the policy, including Bappenas, UKF (REDD+ Task Force), Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Forestry, National Climate Change Council (DNP and National Forestry Council (DKN) are partners of the UN-REDD in implementing its activitie Although the UN-REDD Programme is a small program in Indonesia but has an important role driving REDD+ Readiness development in the country. | | | | | |
| 2.3.2 | Are the UN-REDD Programme's Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement and Operational Guidance Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest Dependent Communities been applied in the National Programme process? No Partially Fully | | | | | |
| | Please explain, including if level of consultation varies between non-government stakeholders: | | | | | |
| UN-REDD Indonesia has developed a consultation process concept for all stakehol Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Since the Programme works at national, pro and community levels, it has developed the following consultation framework: (a) Multi-stakeholder (public) consultations are applied at national, province, and Consensus by all stakeholders (government, NGOs, CSOs/local communities, Indige representatives, private sector, universities, and experts) is an approach for propolicy related outputs. (b) A consultation process to the community located at selected districts implementation of FPIC. | | | | | | |
| | These consultation concepts are disseminated to all stakeholders at various UN-REDD events to let the public fully understand how UN-REDD Indonesia works. | | | | | |
| 2.3.3 | What kind of decisions and activities are non-government stakeholders involved in? ☐ Policy/decision making ☐ Management: ☐ Budget ☐ Procurement ☒ Service provision ☐ Other, please specify Please explain, including if level of involvement varies between non-government stakeholders: | | | | | |
| | Non-government stakeholders such as NGOs/CSOs (including groups working on gender issues) and the private sector as well as universities and professionals have been involved since the development of the National Programme Document. Non-government stakeholders were involved in the following activities: | | | | | |
| | - At the early development of the Programme by identifying activities that are needed for REDD+ | | | | | |

¹³ Ownership refers to countries exercising effective leadership over their REDD+ policies and strategies, and co-ordination of actions.

Readiness in Indonesia. Some well known national NGOs were involved in identifying outcomes and outputs. The meeting was conducted during the UN-REDD scoping mission (FAO-HQ, UNDP-

RAP & New York, and UNEP-Bangkok) in Fenruary 2009 at UNDP-Jakarta office. The second involvement of NGOs and CSOs was a consultation workshop for UN-REDD Indonesia National Programme Document was conducted in May 2009 as recommended by the UN-REDD Policy Board. The workshop was participated by 16 well known national NGOs and CSOs. The private sector was not involved in these events.

- UN-REDD facilitated workshops at national and sub-national levels. All non-government stakeholders (NGOs, CSOs, privates, universities, individual experts) were invited.
- A meeting to develop the first annual work plan for the Programme was conducted in March 2009; stakeholders/participants identified detailed activities for the UN-REDD Programme. All non-government stakeholders (NGOs, CSOs, the private sector, universities, and individual experts) were invited.
- Implementing the UN-REDD Programme activities in cooperation with the Government; such as through developing the National REDD+ Strategy (as a member of the writing team and as participants in FGDs and workshops), a resource person during (a) inputs collection for preparation to establish a REDD+ Agency by UKP4 which was facilitated by UN-REDD, development of national FPIC Policy Recommendations at national level, a resource person in (b) developing Roadmap of Forestry Development, (c) developing criteria for selecting the pilot province and districts, (d) developing the process of FPIC implementation at province level, and (e) establishing the REDD+ Working Group at sub-national level. All non-government stakeholders (NGOs, CSOs, the private sector, universities, and individual experts) were involved.
- Organizing workshops/seminars such as (a) the national FPIC workshop in February 2009, (b) workshop on capacity building on REDD+ issue for journalists (April 2009), (c) conference on climate change justice (June 2011), (d) Adat (Indigenous Peoples) community consolidation in Central Sulawesi (January February 2011), and (e) NGOs coordination for selecting representatives in the REDD+ Working Group (January February 2011). National and local NGOs and CSOs were involved.
- Involvement of IP representative (AMAN) in the UN-REDD Programme Executive Board Meetings
- Organizing a MRV workshop specifically for universities from eastern Indonesia with the aim to facilitate a common understanding, sharing and collaboration between universities (organized by University of Tadulako).

2.3.4 Based on your previous answers, briefly describe the current situation of the government and nongovernment stakeholders in relation to ownership and accountability¹⁴ of the National Programme. Please provide some examples.

The UN-REDD Programme in Indonesia is fully aware of the criticism and skepticism on REDD+ activities amongst some NGOs, and has reached out to these groups to ensure that the Programme's objectives are well understood and to contribute to an increased understanding of REDD+. Some criticism, partly based on inaccurate information, was raised by a national NGO named HUMA on UN-REDD FPIC activities in Central Sulawesi and an online publication by the Forest and People Programme. We reached out to the NGO communities and explained UN-REDD's FPIC approach, which resulted in a general increase in awareness about UN-REDD's sub-national activities and FPIC methodology. Communications among governments and NGOs, CSOs, and the private sector in relation with the UN-REDD Programme have been established since the early stage of the Programme, such as:

- 1. Government and NGOs were actively involved in reviewing the planned activities of UN-REDD and gave positive inputs for revision of the National Programme Document.
- 2. Public consultations of REDD+ National Strategy had brought the government and NGOs, CSOs, the private sector, universities, and individual experts to come together to identify drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in the country. The established fish bone scheme of deforestation and forest degradation from the consultations is often referred by the government as well as NGOs and CSOs in various presentations related to deforestation and forest degradation issues.
- 3. The establishment of REDD+ Working Group of Central Sulawesi has brought the various entities

-

¹⁴ Accountability: Acknowledgment and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies and encompassing the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences.

together, including the government. NGOs, CSOs, the private sector, and universities. There are 4 (four) sub working groups focused on policy, methodology, pilot sites and community empowerment and FPIC. Members of each sub-working group also represent different organizations (government, NGOs, CSOs, and university as well as the private sector).

In conclusion, the government and the non-government institutions are currently supporting each other to make the REDD+ program successful in the country.

Comments and responses from the public on the UN-REDD program have been collected by the PMU as part of project accountability. These show that UN-REDD has been contributing to build a better relationship between the government and non-government actors at national and sub-national levels.

3. General Programme Indicators

| 3.1.1 | Number of MRV and monitoring related focal personnel with increased capacities: | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | ✓ Women Total No 5(five) | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | |
| | These focal personnel sit at the MoFor | | | | |
| 3.1.2 | Does the country have a functional MRV and monitoring system in place? ☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No ☐ Not applicable at this stage | | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | |
| | MRV and monitoring system are currently being developed. | | | | |
| 3.1.3 | Does the country have nationally owned governance indicators, developed through a participatory | | | | |
| | governance assessment? ☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No ☐ Not applicable at this stage | | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | |
| | The PGA has been initiated, and we anticipate that it will contribute to nationally-owned governance indicators in the future. | | | | |
| 3.1.4 | Was a participatory governance assessment supported by the UN-REDD Programme and | | | | |
| | incorporated into the National REDD+ Strategy? | | | | |
| | Yes Partially No Not applicable at this stage | | | | |
| | Comments, including if the assessment was supported by another initiative: The REDD+ National Strategy draft, which was previously facilitated by the UN-REDD Programme and | | | | |
| | then further processed by the REDD+ Task Force, has been enriched by incorporating the issue of a | | | | |
| | participatory governance assessment as one of the tools to implement REDD+ good governance as | | | | |
| | suggested by the UN-REDD Programme in the early September 2011. | | | | |
| 3.1.5 | Does the National REDD+ Strategy include anti-corruption measures, such as a code of conduct, | | | | |
| | conflict of interest prohibitions, links to existing anti-corruption frameworks, protection for | | | | |
| | whistleblowers or application of social standards? Yes Partially No Not applicable at this stage | | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | |
| | In collaboration with Indonesian Center for Environmental Law (ICEL), a national NGO, in June 2011, | | | | |
| | UN-REDD conducted a workshop to discuss REDD+ and governance. One of the results from the | | | | |
| | workshop was that the National REDD+ Strategy has not answered the issues of anti-corruption | | | | |
| | measures, yet. The UN-REDD Programme has sent inputs to the REDD+ Task Force to consider this | | | | |
| | issue during the public comment period for submitting comments on the National REDD+ Strategy. | | | | |
| 3.1.6 | Number of Indigenous Peoples/civil society stakeholders represented in REDD+ decision making, | | | | |
| | strategy development and implementation of REDD+ at the national level: | | | | |
| | Women Total No. 1270 | | | | |
| | Men Total No. 1906 | | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | |

This information is based on the attendance list of national consultations for National REDD+ strategy, MRV Forestry Roadmap, FPIC national policy, Industry based Forestry Roadmap, and National Park Forestry Roadmap.

| | Forestry Roadma | ap. | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 3.1.7 | Number of consultation processes (Meetings, workshops etc.) underway for national readiness and | | | | | |
| | REDD+ activities: | | | | | |
| | Total No. 54 | • | | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | | |
| | This information | is based on the | attendance list of | national consultations for National REDD+ strategy, | | |
| | MRV Forestry Ro | oadmap, FPIC nat | ional policy, Indus | try based Forestry Roadmap, and National Park | | |
| | Forestry Roadma | ap. It excludes PN | MU coordination n | neetings. | | |
| 2.4.0 | Cui a como a manada | | | dalaren arriaren arriar | | |
| 3.1.8 | | | | ddress grievances of people alleging an adverse | | |
| | | | No | DD national programme: | | |
| | Yes Comments: | Partially | M NO | Not applicable at this stage | | |
| | | ut davialanad a gr | iovanco mochanic | n. It will be developed under the program of a | | |
| | | | | city development in 2012. | | |
| 3.1.9 | | | • | ior and Informed Consent for the implementation | | |
| 3.1.9 | | | | - | | |
| | | of readiness or REDD+ activities that impact Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' territories, resources, livelihoods and cultural identity: | | | | |
| | Yes | Partially | □ No | Not applicable at this stage | | |
| | Comments: | ∠ Turtiany | NO | Not applicable at this stage | | |
| | | ogramme is in th | e early stages of F | PIC piloting at district level. Currently, preparation | | |
| | The UN-REDD Programme is in the early stages of FPIC piloting at district level. Currently, preparation step of the FPIC activity is on the way in a form of developing guideline for FPIC implementation | | | | | |
| | addressed to facilitators and materials preparation for the implementation. | | | | | |
| 3.1.10 | | | | es and livelihood risks and benefits: | | |
| | Yes | | ∏ No | ☐ Not applicable at this stage | | |
| | Comments: | | _ | | | |
| | The UN-REDD program is in the early stage of discussing multiple benefit of REDD+ particularly | | | | | |
| | developing a tool-kit for decision makers on co-benefit (output 2.4-UNEP). | | | | | |
| 3.1.11 | Application of th | ne UN-REDD Pro | gramme social pri | nciples and criteria: | | |
| | Yes | Partially | ☐ No | ☐ Not applicable at this stage | | |
| | Comments: | | | | | |
| | Please refer 3.1. | 9; UN-REDD appl | y multi-stakeholde | er consultation approach. | | |
| 3.1.12 | REDD+ benefit distribution system contributes to inclusive development ¹⁵ , with specific reference | | | | | |
| | to pro-poor ¹⁶ po | licies and gende | r mainstreaming ¹ | ' : | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 15 Inclus | sive development | is development | :hat marginalized { | groups take part in and benefit from, regardless of | | |
| | | | | | | |

¹⁵ <u>Inclusive development</u> is development that marginalized groups take part in and benefit from, regardless of their gender, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, disability or poverty. Inclusive growth implies **participation** and **benefit**-sharing. On the one hand, it ensures that everyone can participate in the growth process, both in terms of decision-making for organizing the growth progression as well as in participating in the growth itself. On the other hand, it makes sure that everyone shares equitably the benefits of growth.

Pro-poor policies are those that directly target poor people (i.e. benefit the poor more than the non-poor), or that are more generally aimed at reducing poverty. There is also a general consensus that pro-poor policy processes are those that allow poor people to be directly involved in the policy process, or that by their nature and structure lead to pro-poor outcomes. For some, the aim of pro-poor policies is to improve the assets and capabilities of the poor.

¹⁷ The overall intention of <u>gender mainstreaming</u> with regard to environment and energy is to ensure the inclusion of gender equality considerations in planning systems at all levels, and to expand both the access of women to finance mechanisms and the direction of that finance to areas that will benefit women. Gender mainstreaming tools include gender analysis, sex-disaggregated data and participatory approaches that

| | Yes | Partially | ☐ No | Not applicable at this stage | | | |
|--------|---|---|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Comments: | | | | | | |
| | The UN-REDD P | The UN-REDD Programme is in the early stage of discussing options for payment mechanism and | | | | | |
| | benefit distribu | tion system (outp | ut 2.3-UNDP). | | | | |
| 3.1.13 | Country adopti | Country adopting multiple benefit decision tool kit: | | | | | |
| | Yes | Partially | ☐ No | Not applicable at this stage | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | | | |
| | The UN-REDD p | program is in the e | early stage to d | evelop this toolkit. We are currently completing | | | |
| | spatial data coll | lection and condu | cted a focus gr | oup discussion (output 2.4-UNEP). | | | |
| 3.1.14 | National or sub-national development strategies incorporate REDD+ based investments as means of | | | | | | |
| | transformation of relevant sectors ¹⁸ : | | | | | | |
| | Yes | Partially | ☐ No | ☐ Not applicable at this stage | | | |
| | Comments: | | | | | | |
| | Both national and sub-national REDD+ strategies include REDD+ financial issues related to sources of funding (hybrid funding mechanism) for REDD+ implementation. | | | | | | |
| 3.1.15 | | _ | | rmprementation. ced so that they take advantage of the REDD+ as a | | | |
| 3.1.13 | catalyst to a gr | = = | teu or illiluen | ted so that they take advantage of the REDD+ as a | | | |
| | Yes | Partially | ☐ No | Not applicable at this stage | | | |
| | Comments: | | _ | | | | |
| | The Government has developed funding mechanisms for initiatives related to GHG emissions reduction and climate change, such as Indonesia Climate Change Trust Fund (ICCTF), Regional Fiscal Transfer, and Croon Economy Investment which is still being developed by the Ministry of Finance. | | | | | | |
| | Transfer, and Green Economy Investment which is still being developed by the Ministry of Finance. | | | | | | |

4. Government Counterpart Information

Comments by the Government Counterpart:

UN-REDD is a joint program involving three UN-Agencies: FAO, UNDP and UNEP to help the government in attaining REDD+ Readiness. The REDD+ issue in Indonesia is currently under the REDD+ Task Force mandates. UN-REDD has taken a position to support the Task Force based on the activities as written in the UN-REDD National Joint Program Prodoc. With the available mechanism in running the project – on budget off treasure-, the UN-REDD has been able to run its program in a flexible manner. The UN-REDD is on track in relation to the dynamic of REDD+ readiness progress in Indonesia. UN-REDD has provided inputs to the Task Force for most basic issues of REDD+ Readiness system at national level. Since REDD+ issue in Indonesia has been a mandate of the Task Force, and UN-REDD has provided inputs for basic REDD+ readiness system to the Task Force, it is a time for the UN-REDD to focus on its sub-national level activities and link sub-national activities with the national system.

UN-REDD has been a key driver for REDD+ Readiness in Indonesia. This has been shown by the way UN-REDD can bring all stakeholders together to take part in REDD+ Readiness, by actively involving government, CSOs, NGOs, universities and private sector. This has a great opportunity to ensure the ownership of REDD+ by all REDD+ related stakeholders. Another example is the FPIC principle to be a national policy in the REDD+ implementation strategy. For the next step, UN-REDD has to be able to show how FPIC is implemented in the field and spread its lesson learned to others.

explicitly consider women.

¹⁸ Relevant sectors denote those that are related to forests and land use, e.g. including energy, agriculture, mining, transport and land use planning.