

Management Group (MG) of the UN-REDD Programme
Decisions of MG Retreat 1-2 April 2014

Participants:

MG Members and Alternates

FAO: Adam Gerrand, Maria Sanz Sanchez, (Mette Loyche Wilkie by conference call)

UNDP: Tim Clairs, Charles McNeill

UNEP: Tim Christophersen, Edoardo Zandri

Secretariat: Mario Boccucci, Thais Linhares Juvenal, Mirey Atallah, Mike Speirs

Others

Meridian Institute: Tim Mealey, Gary Decker

MG decisions

1. Participant Updates

- a. MG members provided summaries of their recent work as well as their agency's ongoing REDD-related efforts. Furthermore, MG members looked ahead at the global timeline to discuss the challenges and opportunities for the Programme.

2. 2016 – 2020 Strategy

- a. The 2016 – 2020 strategy should be closely aligned with the UNFCCC Warsaw Framework. The Warsaw Framework provides expanded guidance on how REDD+ results are to be recognized and rewarded i.e. "results based payments (RBP) for results based actions (RBA)." RBA is measured in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.
- b. By using the Warsaw Framework as the guide for country support, the Programme will accompany countries through the readiness process, help them achieve RBA, and provide the foundation for the type of measurement, reporting and verification that has been agreed by the UNFCCC parties.
- c. By applying the Warsaw Framework, the Programme will aim to: build confidence in the UNFCCC process; support an iterative, learning-by-doing approach; contribute to RBA experiences; and demonstrate results.
- d. A solid readiness processes under the UN-REDD Programme will allow countries to access payments for their results recognized through the Warsaw Framework. Countries will have the flexibility to seek RBP from emerging sources (including from existing donors, the GCF or carbon markets as these markets develop), but will not be tied to any one carbon finance mechanism.
- e. The MG agreed that it is necessary for the UN-REDD Programme to more clearly define its value proposition and "Theory of Change." Discussion focused on the comparative advantages of each agency as well as delivery of programming as "One UN." The global, integrated, and trusted operations of the UN were particular comparative advantages discussed.
- f. The Programme should continue to consider what it means for a country to have achieved "readiness", how that "readiness" can be measured, and how countries can move beyond "readiness" to take results-based action. It was acknowledge that there is no a sharp line between being ready and undertake results base actions but rather a transition.

- g. Reference emission levels/reference levels (REL/RL) at the country level will need to be a central component of the 2016 – 2020 strategy. In particular, it was recognized that REL/RL support entails both technical and policy elements and therefore lends itself to an inter-agency approach.
- h. The Programme’s ability to demonstrate results and measure impact is crucial in all strategic decisions of the Programme.
- i. There are different ways and approaches to achieve RBA and countries need choices based on their individual circumstances. The Programme has the potential to provide countries the support they need to be in a position to make those choices.
- j. It was recognized that there are other multilateral efforts to test emission reduction transactions leading to carbon markets. While that is important and useful, it is not sufficient to ensure the success of the long-term financing under the Warsaw Framework. It is also necessary to demonstrate that (i) REDD+ countries can navigate their way through the process set out in the Warsaw Framework; and (ii) results recognized through the Warsaw Framework are worthy of being rewarded and can expect to receive RBP.
- k. The Programme is able to help countries build the capacity necessary to undertake RBA and, furthermore, demonstrate those results in a way that allows them to receive RBP from existing public funding sources, or other sources that may emerge as a result of upcoming international commitments.
- l. The MG discussed the concept of “alignment” with other multilateral climate delivery partners to find synergies where possible, particularly with the World Bank. It was recognized that the agreed strategic focus is complementary to the work of the World Bank, but does not lend itself to a “merger” with the FCPF, or even UN-REDD application of the FCPF Carbon Fund methodological framework. In addition to seeking “alignment” with other delivery partners, the Programme should seek to capitalize on the comparative advantages of the 3 agencies and to share institutional learning across the agencies.
- m. The MG discussed the importance of donor support, as well as country support, for any strategy that emerges.
- n. The MG discussed the need to more fully assess where countries are on particular readiness indicators and to be more deliberate about how the Programme can assist partner countries by providing “targeted support” where there are currently challenges or obstacles to readiness.
- o. Although the Programme Evaluation has not yet been published, the Programme’s 2016 – 2020 strategy will need to reflect the feedback received.
- p. The MG discussed the current governance structure of the Programme and how that structure impacts the 2016 – 2020 strategy. The current MOU ends on 31 December 2015 and any emerging strategy will need to address Programme governance in the post-2015 context, providing the flexibility necessary to adapt to post-2015 realities.

3. Resource Mobilisation

- a. The MG discussed the current and expected resource needs of the Programme, including the current donor mix of funding.

- b. MG members received an update on recent outreach efforts to gauge appetite for supporting the Programme with either increased contributions in addition to countries that would constitute first-time funders.
- c. In order to demonstrate efficiency and accountability to funders, the MG discussed potential cost savings in the SNA for 2015.
- d. Further savings and efficiencies can be gained by harnessing the human capital of the 3 agencies and by finding key synergies within and between the agencies.
- e. The MG agreed to present scenarios for Programme action based on the amount of funding received from donors, in addition to aligning these actions with the strategic priorities of the Programme.
- f. The MG discussed the need to diversify the Programme's funding stream and that a clearly-defined 2016 – 2020 strategy is intimately linked to the Programme's ability to do so.
- g. Similar to above, measurement of the Programme's impact is necessary to explain to current and potential donors the value proposition of the Programme. Furthermore, a strong communications effort will be crucial to continue to secure the diverse and robust funding stream that the Programme needs.
- h. The mobilization of resources requires a focus on demonstrable results. Countries that are currently supported by the Programme should be engaged so that their voices can be heard related to the value of the support that the Programme has provided and should provide in the future.

4. Streamlining National Delivery

- a. The MG discussed an options paper on how best to streamline national delivery of funds and Programme assistance, with particular reference to the Tier 2 Phase 2 programme in Viet Nam.
- b. Any adjustment to national delivery will need to be accompanied by clearly-defined delivery roles for each agency as well as the appropriate distribution of fees.
- c. Discussion of how the Programme can continue to support those countries that have achieved an advanced level of readiness and are ready to move beyond the national programming for readiness, and how the 2016 – 2020 strategy can achieve this goal.
- d. Tier 2 efforts should be clearly focused on supporting the emerging 2016 – 2020 strategy. Countries receiving Tier 2 support should be evaluated through the lens of the emerging strategy and theory of change of the UN-REDD Programme.
- e. The MG explored ideas about how to keep countries engaged beyond readiness activities, once they have "graduated", and how these countries might be utilized to support other countries that are still advancing on the readiness scale.
- f. The MG will produce a coordinated discussion document on the proposed path forward to streamline national delivery and the impact a new strategy will have on the delivery of country support as well as country selection for this support. Having such a document will allow MG members to speak with their agencies and to be aligned on the conversations that need to occur to move forward.

5. United Nations Secretary General's Climate Summit

- a. The MG received extensive background briefing on the upcoming Climate Summit, including about the people within the UN system and beyond that will have key roles in Summit preparation.
- b. The MG discussed the 9 action areas at the Summit and, in particular, the forest and land use deliverables.
- c. The MG conferred about the opportunities presented by the upcoming Climate Summit for the Programme and for the integration of these efforts into the Programme’s emerging 2016 – 2020 strategy. MG members were encouraged to provide further feedback about how the Programme can take advantage of the Summit, in addition to the other forest-related events between now and the Summit in September.
- d. In the forest action area, the Summit presents an opportunity to make progress on 4 tracks: forest countries, donor governments, private sector, and in particular geographies.
- e. The World Economic Forum has been asked by the UNSG to be a strategic partner for the Summit, including in the planning of the upcoming Abu Dhabi Ascent (ADA).
- f. The MG discussed the recent joint note from the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat and FCPF and what this note means in terms of “alignment” between the two programmes.
- g. Taking advantage of the opportunities presented by the Summit will require coordinated action by the Programme, in addition to the individual efforts of the 3 agencies to engage on the country level ahead of the Summit.

Summary of MG decisions and actions

Decisions	Actions
1. Participant Updates	
a. MG members provided summaries of their recent work as well as their agency’s ongoing REDD-related efforts. Furthermore, MG members looked ahead at the global timeline to discuss the challenges and opportunities for the Programme.	
2. 2016 – 2020 Strategy	
<p>a. The 2016 – 2020 strategy should be closely aligned with the UNFCCC Warsaw Framework. The Warsaw Framework provides expanded guidance on how REDD+ results are to be recognized and rewarded i.e. “results based payments (RBP) for results based actions (RBA).” RBA is measured in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.</p> <p>b. By using the Warsaw Framework as the guide for country support, the Programme will accompany countries through the readiness process, help them achieve RBA, and provide the foundation for the type of measurement, reporting and verification that has been agreed by the UNFCCC parties.</p> <p>c. By applying the Warsaw Framework, the Programme will aim to: build confidence in the UNFCCC process; support an</p>	<p>a. The Secretariat will produce a 2016 – 2020 Strategy discussion document to receive input from the Strategy Group based on the initial strategy discussion during the MG retreat.</p> <p>b. In addition to the strategy discussion document, information will be distributed to the SG members to provide a more in-depth understanding of the Warsaw Framework and the opportunities and challenges presented therein</p>

<p>iterative, learning-by-doing approach; contribute to RBA experiences; and demonstrate results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. A solid readiness processes under the UN-REDD Programme will allow countries to access payments for their results recognized through the Warsaw Framework. Countries will have the flexibility to seek RBP from emerging sources (including from existing donors, the GCF or carbon markets as these markets develop), but will not be tied to any one carbon finance mechanism. e. The MG agreed that it is necessary for the UN-REDD Programme to more clearly define its value proposition and “Theory of Change.” Discussion focused on the comparative advantages of each agency as well as delivery of programming as “One UN.” The global, integrated, and trusted operations of the UN were particular comparative advantages discussed. f. The Programme should continue to consider what it means for a country to have achieved “readiness”, how that “readiness” can be measured, and how countries can move beyond “readiness” to take results-based action. It was acknowledge that there is no a sharp line between being ready and undertake results base actions but rather a transition. g. Reference emission levels/reference levels (REL/RL) at the country level will need to be a central component of the 2016 – 2020 strategy. In particular, it was recognized that REL/RL support entails both technical and policy elements and therefore lends itself to an inter-agency approach. h. The Programme’s ability to demonstrate results and measure impact is crucial in all strategic decisions of the Programme. i. There are different ways and approaches to achieve RBA and countries need choices based on their individual circumstances. The Programme has the potential to provide countries the support they need to be in a position to make those choices. j. It was recognized that there are other multilateral efforts to test emission reduction transactions leading to carbon markets. While that is important and useful, it is not sufficient to ensure the success of the long-term financing under the Warsaw Framework. It is also necessary to demonstrate that (i) REDD+ countries can navigate their way through the process set out in the Warsaw Framework; and (ii) results recognized through the Warsaw Framework are worthy of being rewarded and can expect to receive RBP. k. The Programme is able to help countries build the capacity necessary to undertake RBA and, furthermore, demonstrate those results in a way that allows them to receive RBP from existing public funding sources, or other sources that may 	<p>relevant to the future of the Programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Meridian Institute will support the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat by initiating a consultative process with Programme stakeholders about the emerging strategy as well as the Programme governance structure for the 2016 – 2020 period.
--	--

<p>emerge as a result of upcoming international commitments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The MG discussed the concept of “alignment” with other multilateral climate delivery partners to find synergies where possible, particularly with the World Bank. It was recognized that the agreed strategic focus is complementary to the work of the World Bank, but does not lend itself to a “merger” with the FCPF, or even UN-REDD application of the FCPF Carbon Fund methodological framework. In addition to seeking “alignment” with other delivery partners, the Programme should seek to capitalize on the comparative advantages of the 3 agencies and to share institutional learning across the agencies. m. The MG discussed the importance of donor support, as well as country support, for any strategy that emerges. n. The MG discussed the need to more fully assess where countries are on particular readiness indicators and to be more deliberate about how the Programme can assist partner countries by providing “targeted support” where there are currently challenges or obstacles to readiness. o. Although the Programme Evaluation has not yet been published, the Programme’s 2016 – 2020 strategy will need to reflect the feedback received. p. The MG discussed the current governance structure of the Programme and how that structure impacts the 2016 – 2020 strategy. The current MOU ends on 31 December 2015 and any emerging strategy will need to address Programme governance in the post-2015 context, providing the flexibility necessary to adapt to post-2015 realities. 	
3. Resource Mobilisation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The MG discussed the current and expected resource needs of the Programme, including the current donor mix of funding. b. MG members received an update on recent outreach efforts to gauge appetite for supporting the Programme with either increased contributions in addition to countries that would constitute first-time funders. c. In order to demonstrate efficiency and accountability to funders, the MG discussed potential cost savings in the SNA for 2015. d. Further savings and efficiencies can be gained by harnessing the human capital of the 3 agencies and by finding key synergies within and between the agencies. e. The MG agreed to present scenarios for Programme action based on the amount of funding received from donors, in addition to aligning these actions with the strategic priorities of the Programme. f. The MG discussed the need to diversify the Programme’s funding stream and that a clearly-defined 2016 – 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Secretariat will continue ongoing resource mobilization conversations with current donors as well as potential donors to the Programme. b. The Secretariat, with support from Meridian Institute, will engage potential donors

<p>strategy is intimately linked to the Programme’s ability to do so.</p> <p>g. Similar to above, measurement of the Programme’s impact is necessary to explain to current and potential donors the value proposition of the Programme. Furthermore, a strong communications effort will be crucial to continue to secure the diverse and robust funding stream that the Programme needs.</p> <p>h. The mobilization of resources requires a focus on demonstrable results. Countries that are currently supported by the Programme should be engaged so that their voices can be heard related to the value of the support that the Programme has provided and should provide in the future.</p>	
4. Streamlining National Delivery	
<p>a. The MG discussed an options paper on how best to streamline national delivery of funds and Programme assistance, with particular reference to the Tier 2 Phase 2 programme in Viet Nam.</p> <p>b. Any adjustment to national delivery will need to be accompanied by clearly-defined delivery roles for each agency as well as the appropriate distribution of fees.</p> <p>c. Discussion of how the Programme can continue to support those countries that have achieved an advanced level of readiness and are ready to move beyond the national programming for readiness, and how the 2016 – 2020 strategy can achieve this goal.</p> <p>d. Tier 2 efforts should be clearly focused on supporting the emerging 2016 – 2020 strategy. Countries receiving Tier 2 support should be evaluated through the lens of the emerging strategy and theory of change of the UN-REDD Programme.</p> <p>e. The MG explored ideas about how to keep countries engaged beyond readiness activities, once they have “graduated”, and how these countries might be utilized to support other countries that are still advancing on the readiness scale.</p> <p>f. The MG will produce a coordinated discussion document on the proposed path forward to streamline national delivery and the impact a new strategy will have on the delivery of country support as well as country selection for this support. Having such a document will allow MG members to speak with their agencies and to be aligned on the conversations that need to occur to move forward</p>	<p>a. There was support for Option 2 after discussion related to the options paper presented by the Secretariat, but FAO will provide feedback on feasibility of all options.</p> <p>b. Agency representatives will consult with country staff in Vietnam regarding current obstacles to the delivery of country support.</p>
5. United Nations Secretary General’s Climate Summit	
<p>a. The MG received extensive background briefing on the upcoming Climate Summit, including about the people within the UN system and beyond that will have key roles in Summit preparation.</p>	<p>a. MG and SG members will be encouraged – individually as well as within their agency – to take full advantage of the opportunity</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The MG discussed the 9 action areas at the Summit and, in particular, the forest and land use deliverables. c. The MG conferred about the opportunities presented by the upcoming Climate Summit for the Programme and for the integration of these efforts into the Programme’s emerging 2016 – 2020 strategy. MG members were encouraged to provide further feedback about how the Programme can take advantage of the Summit, in addition to the other forest-related events between now and the Summit in September. d. In the forest action area, the Summit presents an opportunity to make progress on 4 tracks: forest countries, donor governments, private sector, and in particular geographies. e. The World Economic Forum has been asked by the UNSG to be a strategic partner for the Summit, including in the planning of the upcoming Abu Dhabi Ascent (ADA). f. The MG discussed the recent joint note from the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat and FCPF and what this note means in terms of “alignment” between the two programmes. g. Taking advantage of the opportunities presented by the Summit will require coordinated action by the Programme, in addition to the individual efforts of the 3 agencies to engage on the country level ahead of the Summit. 	<p>provided by the Secretary General’s Climate Summit in September, in addition to the Abu Dhabi Ascent in May.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The Secretariat will reach out to the REDD+ Focal Points at the country level to inform them that a joint note has been sent from the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat and the FCPF. REDD+ Focal Points will be encouraged to communicate with the Secretariat if they are engaged about the UNSG Summit.
--	---