

REVIEW OF THE UN- REDD POLICY BOARD STRUCTURE

baastel



Presentation to PB Information Session

Lombok, 25 June 2013

CONTENTS



- ☐ Objective and scope
- ☐ Review approach and methodology
- ☐ Review context
- ☐ Review findings
 - ☐ Role and relevance
 - ☐ Effectiveness
 - ☐ Efficiency
 - ☐ Sustainability/leverage
- ☐ Recommendations

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE



- **Examine the composition and governance structure of the PB, how it conducts its business, and how it assists the Programme in the fulfillment of its mandate**
- **Assess the existing UN-REDD Programme Rules of Procedure and Guidelines and PB ToRs**
- **Propose changes, if necessary, to the existing UN-REDD Programme RoPs and Guidelines and PB ToRs**

☐ Main Questions:

- ☐ **Role and Relevance:** Is the organization and management of the PB's functions, composition, and structure conducive to fulfilling program objectives?
- ☐ **Effectiveness:** Does the PB conduct business effectively and responsively, with appropriate guidance and oversight in order to reach programme objectives?
- ☐ **Efficiency:** Does the PB have a clear functional role in order to conduct business in a timely fashion, and in such a way that reduces duplicate efforts?
- ☐ **Sustainability/Leveraging:** Is the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board positioned to enable fulfillment of the Programme Strategies?

REVIEW APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY (CONT.)



☐ Inception phase

- ☐ Inception report, including a Review matrix
- ☐ Highly consultative approach

☐ Data collection phase

- ☐ In-depth documentation review
- ☐ On-line survey (266 persons contacted) [See distribution](#)
- ☐ Key informant interviews (40)

☐ Analysis and Reporting phase

☐ Global challenges in REDD+

- ☐ UNFCCC negotiation process; Redd+ financing; Green Climate Fund

☐ Trends surrounding UN-REDD

- ☐ Countries moving from phase 1 to phase 2 or 3; Proliferation of REDD+ relevant-funds and other IFIs; Increasing need for more tailored, targeted advice at a national level

☐ Trends in the UN-REDD Programme

- ☐ Increasing operational and technical demands from countries; Role of the Tier 2; Findings of the country needs assessment

☐ A rapidly evolving context...

- ☐ Evolution of delivery mechanisms towards Direct Access and even Enhanced Direct Access (i.e. through National Funding Entities)
- ☐ Stronger piloting role of developing countries in climate funds (AF, GCF)

☐ ...leading to the need to establish a shared Vision of Board members:

- ☐ what is, and what should be after 2015, the UN-REDD Programme, its role and positioning vis-à-vis these global trends?

□ Main findings:

- Current functions of the PB are rather clear and relevant, but some adjustments are required to balance the split between strategic level and administrative/operational functions
- This would allow to slowly evolve the governance structure of UN-REDD for both more effective governance between now and 2015, and prepare the ground beyond 2015
- The PB operations are not fully satisfactory and fully conducive to fulfilling programme objectives due to a number of factors:
 - Lack of shared vision
 - Lack of clarity in membership, in the role of different PB members, in the decision making processes
 - Heterogeneity in the profiles of the delegates and their level of knowledge/competencies vs what is necessary to fulfil their role in the PB

REVIEW FINDINGS: EFFECTIVENESS



□ Main findings:

- Many of the procedures used in the conduct of meetings have considerably improved over time. That being said, some confusion remains, calling for a more detailed set of procedures to be described in the RoPs and validated by the PB.
- Financial reporting: it is hoped that recent decisions regarding reporting formats of the three UN agencies will help meet the needs for reporting from the PB
- The level of responsiveness of the PB can be qualified as relatively good with well appreciated material and knowledge products, strong coherence with UNFCCC guidance and relatively good responsiveness to participating countries' requests

REVIEW FINDINGS: EFFECTIVENESS (CONT.)



□ Main findings (cont.):

- The level of guidance and oversight on financial matters is rather good and in line with international fiduciary standards
- Significant room for improvement remains with respect to:
 - Procedures for the conduct of meetings, which need to be completed and more detailed;
 - Financial reporting, which requires more harmonised reporting formats;
 - Budget discussions, which need to enable PB members and observers to clearly understand the choices proposed in terms of budget allocations, without getting into micro-management;
 - Ensuring a good feedback from experience to the UNFCCC;
 - Monitoring and reporting of programme progress to the PB; and
 - The overall organisation of the conduct of business, which includes, among other elements, the possibility for the PB to concentrate on more strategic level issues.

□ Main findings:

- The functional role of the PB needs to be clarified in relation to the respective roles and responsibilities of the other elements of the governance structure (Secretariat, SG, MG)
- Whereas the prevailing model does present a number of advantages (e.g. rapidity in the delivery of funds), duplication of efforts and overlaps do exist at different levels, conducting to efficiency losses
- Although a number of those aspects may not be amenable to change between now and 2015, changes and adjustments in the organizational structure of the UN-REDD Programme should aim to improve efficiency and reduce overlaps

□ Summary of findings:

- The structure developed (experimenting “Delivering as one”) has its merits and has allowed prompt implementation and disbursement to assist in meeting programme objectives
- It is too early to assess whether the relationship between the PB and Tier 2 contributors will be conducive to meeting programme objectives, but this modality is an innovation that
 - (i) modifies the relative power of the PB in the conduct of the UN-REDD programme;
 - (ii) positions the UN-agencies as ‘gatekeepers’ of the Programmes’ principles, criteria, guidelines and quality assurance measures; and
 - (iii) opens the Programme to new funding possibilities and can contribute to its adaptation to future climate finance funding modalities

□ On the ToRs / RoPs:

- R1/ Both the ToRs and the RoPs need to clarify the status of each category of stakeholders and their specific role in the PB, in order to avoid any confusion.
- R2/ The rationale behind the inclusion in the ToRs of section 5. *Participating UN Organizations' Coordination Group* needs to be clarified, completed (e.g. including the UN Strategy Group) or deleted.
- R3/ In order to avoid inconsistencies and possible discrepancies as mentioned above, one could recommend that PB membership be defined in detail in the ToRs.

RECOMMENDATIONS



☐ On the conduct of business:

- ☐ R4/ Clarify and better detail procedures for the conduct of meetings
- ☐ R5/ To avoid any conflict of interest in the discussion on funding allocations, countries and UN Agencies who have been working on specific allocation demands and are interested in their implementation, should not participate in the consensual decision on that specific allocation
- ☐ R6/ Ensure discussions on financial matters occur
- ☐ R7/ For a stronger cooperation between actors at the national level, continue to promote the establishment of 'National Coordination Groups' in REDD+ countries
- ☐ R8 Ensure feedback from experience to the UNFCCC is sufficiently organized

□ On the evolution of the Policy Board structure and its composition:

- R9/ Depending on the answers to the questions on the role and comparative advantages of UN-REDD until and after 2015, and on the positioning of the Programme in the global REDD+ arena beyond 2015, one can therefore envisage the following options
 - **OPTION A:** Life expectancy of the UN-REDD programme is likely to be short (not much beyond 2015). The PB remains essentially as it is currently with:
 - Changes in governance: improvement of the rules of procedures for the conduct of meetings
 - A Bureau is established to assist with the preparation of meeting Agendas and inter-sessional decision making mostly to ensure a better balance between strategic and administrative/operational matters in the PB discussions

REVIEW FINDINGS: SUSTAINABILITY / LEVERAGE (CONT.)



□ On the evolution of the Policy Board structure and its composition (cont.):

□ R9/ ... (cont.)

- **OPTION B:** UN-REDD wants to be well positioned for the long -term under the global REDD+ agenda. In addition to the changes under Option A above, changes in the PB set up would be as follows:
 - A Broadened PB/UN-REDD participants' Forum, gathering all UN-REDD Programme constituencies (meets once a year; strategic and information exchange)
 - An Executive Committee, gathering a limited number of representatives for each group of stakeholder (meets twice a year; operational and administrative decisions)

REVIEW FINDINGS: SUSTAINABILITY / LEVERAGE (CONT.)



□ On the evolution of the Policy Board structure and its composition (cont.):

□ R10/ Proposed division of labour under Option B further facilitated by:

- A clarified status and role of the Secretariat, the SG and the MG
- A well established Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- The addition of the two elected co-chairs of the Executive Committee meetings to the newly created Bureau for the purpose of setting the Executive Committee meeting Agendas

DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY INVITEES AND RESPONDENTS AMONG ... THEIR RESPECTIVE CONSTITUENCIES



	Member distribution according to RoPs	Invited Members & observers	Responses (% excludes 'Other' cat.)
Developing Country Partner	50% - 9 members	51% - 105	36% - 9
Development Partner	17% - 3 members	18% - 37	12% - 3
Civil Society Organization (CSO)	6% - 1 member	11% - 22	8% - 2
Indigenous Peoples (IP) organisation	6% - 1 member	5% - 10	12% - 3
UN Agency	17% - 3 members	15% - 32	28% - 7
Ex-officio member	6% - 1 member	0,5% - 1	4% - 1
Other (UNFCCC Secretariat, IAG, RRI, FCPF, etc.)	-	59	2
Total	18	266	27

[> back](#)

POLICY BOARD STRUCTURE AS OF NOVEMBER 2012



UN Org

1. UNDP
2. UNEP
3. FAO
4. MPTF office

UN-REDD
Secretariat

Donors

1. Norway
2. Japan
3. Dk/Spain

Countries

1. Paraguay
2. Panama
3. Ecuador
4. Zambia
5. Nigeria
6. DRC
7. PNG
8. Vietnam
9. Cambodia

Civil Society

1. CSO
2. IP (UNPFII)