

Management Group (MG) of the UN-REDD Programme
Decisions of meeting of 21 May 2014

Participants:

MG members and alternates

FAO: Adam Gerrand, Mette Loyche Wilkie

UNDP: Tim Clairs

UNEP: Tim Christophersen

Secretariat: Thais Linhares Juvenal

Apologies: Mario Boccucci, Charles McNeill, Edoardo Zandri

Others

Sharon McAuslan, Mike Speirs, Jennifer Ferguson Mitchell, Rod Abson

1. Approval of minutes of previous week (14 May)

- a. Approved, subject to inclusion of summary of MG discussion under item 1 regarding the course of action taken regarding PB rotation and the importance of following agreed process.

2. Update on SNA budget and funding perspectives for 2015

- a. The MG thanked the Secretariat for coordinating the preparation of the 2015 workplan and budget in line with the PB11 decision. A number of concerns were raised about the need for enhanced systems (clearly defined process and timeline, including templates), in order to streamline future planning exercises.
- b. The MG also recommended that a more strategic approach is applied to subsequent exercises, to enable development of scenarios (e.g. reduced, BaU, increased). Such an approach would also reduce the need for additional work in the event of additional funding being received either from existing donors, or to use in discussions with new donors/partners.
- c. Given the positive indication from Norway of the likelihood of additional funding for 2015 and invitation to present proposals (ballpark figures by July in the first instance), it was agreed that the GPWG would start to consider this beginning next week, with a view to holding discussions with Norway prior to PB and submitting a budget revision at PB13. Initial suggestions for proposals for the additional 2015 funding included areas reduced or omitted in the initial 2015 budget, including Targeted Support and the REDD+ Academy.
- d. *Actions: GPWG to consider and develop additional 2015 proposals, based on strategic planning approach; Secretariat to organize call with Norway to have initial brainstorming on emerging proposals and priorities before PB12.*

3. Programme Evaluation

- a. The MG provided some additional feedback and guidance on the preparation of i. the response to the draft report to be submitted by the end of May (extended deadline), and ii. The management response to be presented at Policy Board, with the key elements discussed at the SG call on 6 June.
- b. Regarding the response to the draft report (i), key points included:
 - Section 1. General observations
 - The majority of the general observations don't need to be included in the response to the draft report sent to the Evaluation Team, some are more appropriate for the MR.
 - Need to ensure overall response from MG is balanced and constructive in tone. Can also provide suggestions for fine tuning some of the text to better explain some of the findings and recommendations made by the ET that are currently lost in the document.
 - Section 2. Corrections
 - Should be restructured, perhaps in summary form, with detailed suggestions for corrections in an annex.
 - Section 3. Comments on the recommendations
 - Can acknowledge areas where the evaluation validates issues already identified by the MG, along with additional aspects identified afresh.

- Need to challenge the areas where the ET have misunderstood the context/proposition of the Programme.
 - Request UNEP and UNDP to provide comments on the recommendations (provided by only FAO to date).
- c. *Actions: Secretariat to review ToR/Inception Report to check whether report fulfills/oversteps mandate; MG to provide any additional written comms by Fri 23 May, particularly UNDP/UNEP comments on the recommendations; Secretariat to prepare consolidated response in advance of MG call on 28 May.*

4. Capacity Building workshops

- a. The MG welcomed the positive feedback following the first two CB workshops in Asia-Pacific and Africa, including the subsequent confirmation of nominations from the Africa region. In addition to the outreach being coordinated through the Secretariat/regional team, the MG suggested there may be the need to send another email reminder to A-P regarding the deadline for confirming the new PB members and sponsored country observers.
- b. *Actions: Secretariat to continue to coordinate outreach in Asia-Pacific and LAC, supported as necessary by regional teams.*

5. Comms, KM and events

- a. The MG welcomed the update on Comms, KM and Events activities; feedback raised included whether there is a need for a separate group on KM. The MG also recognized that whilst there is a need for an interagency WG to ensure coordination across the Agencies, the Secretariat remains well placed to lead on Comms, and this should be the case as much as possible to avoid unnecessary duplication. Further information was requested on i. roles of WGs (including what roles are new in comparison to previous iteration of CEWG) in order to determine appropriate representation, and ii. timeline for completion of KM strategy.
- b. *Actions: MG to send any further feedback by email; Secretariat to respond to issues raised.*

6. Indonesia/UNORCID update

- a. Initial feedback regarding the UNORCID P5 positions indicated there is low potential for moving them under the LoI.
- b. The UNDP regional bureau raised the issue of a midterm review/evaluation and will further explore with UNEP and FAO focal points.
- c. *Actions: Issue to be brought back to a future call to allow sufficient time for MG discussion.*

7. Heads up on SG call agenda

- a. The SG call will take place on Fri 6 June, 2.30-4pm CET, with the draft agenda proposed as:
i. SG Climate Summit, ii. Programme Evaluation, iii. Programme Strategy
- b. *Actions: Secretariat will circulate draft annotated agenda next week for quick MG review/feedback.*

8. AOB: n/a