

MEETING WITH PNG AND DRC TO CLARIFY COMMENTS MADE ON THE GLOBAL
PROGRAMME
JUNE 14 2011

Present:

PNG: Ambassador Kevin Conrad and Federica Bietta

DRC: Vincent Kasulu and Brigitte Brigitte Eale Mukundji

UNDP: Veerle Vandeweerd

FAO: Danilo Mollicone

Secretariat: Yemi Katerere and Thais Juvenal

Purpose of Meeting

Seek clarification on the comments provided by DRC and PNG on the Global Programme

Opening Comments

1. DRC/PNG: The two countries reiterated their support for the GP. However, they wanted to ensure that there was transparency in what was being proposed.
2. The two countries also pointed out that their proposal for partial approval was consistent with the Rules of Procedure of the Policy Board
3. Secretariat expressed its appreciation for the comments and for the willingness of the two countries to engage in a dialogue regarding potential improvements to the GP document

Overall Comments on the Document:

1. Each budget line should be accompanied by appropriate text. There are a few budget lines that are not explained,
2. There needs to be some editorial work done on the document to address the “red flag” areas that were not adequately addressed in the last version
3. There is a concern that decisions taken at workshops are used to bind the PB even though there might not have been prior discussions at the Policy Board. The two countries consider a need for coordination regarding organization and substance of the workshops, otherwise it might be more opportune for the agencies to host some workshops under their agency brand and not UN-REDD. Feeling that UN-REDD includes the countries so care needs to be taken when branding activities as “UN-REDD”
4. The GP is a living document and should be amended in line with the country needs assessment. The secretariat indicated that it has started working on the concept note for the country needs assessment

Specific Comments on Work Areas

1. Work Area 1:
 - i. Output 1.2, activity 1.2.1: Training courses in forest and natural resources monitoring: This activity is seen as too broad. Which natural resources are included? This activity should be presented to PB 7
 - ii. Activity 1.2.2 and Activity 1.2.3 On capacity building for GHG inventory
 - iii. should be moved to output 1.4
2. Work Area 2

- i. Under delivery approach on page 28 there is reference guidance “frameworks developed by FAO will be tested through PGA assessment processes”. DRC and PNG indicated that this was never discussed at the PB hence the PB is not aware what these are. **To be clarified and presented to next PB**
- ii. Similarly, footnote 9 on the same page makes reference to the information framework developed with Chatham House. Again the PB is not aware of this
- iii. On the budget, outcomes 2.1 continued and 2.2 continued are not explicitly described in the GP document. **To be clarified and presented to next PB**
- iv. Bullet 4 under activity 2.3.1 refers to “.... Guidance on monitoring governance for REDD”. This should be deleted and we did identify it a “red flag”

3. Work Area 6

- 1. Support to this work area only to Output 6.2. “Technical advice in support of investment options for REDD+” there is a request that UNEP explain how this output relates to REDD+. **To be clarified and presented to next PB**

Summary of discussion on work Areas

- 1. The GP framework document is approved for two years with the exception of the above areas of concern which should be presented to PB 7 for discussion and final decision. There should be no expenditure in the above areas until they have been presented to the PB 7.

4. Other points of discussion

- a. The three agencies need to improve coordination amongst themselves and with the countries in two areas:
 - i. Logistical arrangements of various activities
 - ii. Coordination with respect to decisions taken at workshops/meetings. Often meetings that the PB members have not participated in take “decisions” which are being imposed on the Programme. An example was given that Parliamentarians were invited to the GLOBE workshop but the UN-REDD countries did not know this
- b. The agencies should be bound by similar governance requirements as the countries with respect to transparency
- c. Governments would like to be consulted when hiring staff and consultants that they have to work with
- d. The three agencies are perceived to managing different interests and often this leads to some sort of conflict of interest
- e. Regarding the allocation of 2/3 of the budget to National Programmes, the Secretariat informed that the Programme is committed to adding 20 additional countries for initial readiness as outline in the Policy Board endorsed strategy and is seeking funds for supporting the additional countries.
- f. In addition the Secretariat has developed a fund raising plan and has been trying to increase the number of donors to the Programme
- g. PNG and DRC demonstrated sympathy for our fund raising efforts and mentioned they could take the opportunity of bi-lateral discussions to raise funds for the UN-REDD Programme. At the same time they would like to see improvement in Board governance