

Sub-Working Group on Local Implementation (WG-LI) – Meeting one

Date of meeting: 20/08/2010

Attendees:

Tim Holland (SNV) Facilitator
Vu Thi Hien (CERDA)
Akiko Inoguchi (FAO)
Josh Kempinski (FFI)
Samantha Citroen (FFI)
Vu Huu Than (FSSP)
Nguyen Thanh Tung (FSSP)
Marc Dumas-Johansen (ICRAF)
Richard McNally (SNV)
Nguyen Thi Thu Huyen (UN REDD)
Le Thuy Anh (WWF)
Nguyen Quang Tan (RECOFTC)
Ngueyn Thi Thanh Van (Spatial Decisions)
Sarah Remmei (Spatial Decisions)
Gabriel Levitt (PACT)
Eiji Egashira (JICA)

(i) Background on organisations

- Each organisation provided an introduction on current projects relevant to local implementation, as well as proposed projects.
- This included FFI [scoping in Kon Tum]; SNV [Cattien, scoping in Ca Mau and Nghe An; UN REDD [Lam Dong and FPIC]; WWF [Quang Nam]; RECOTFC [local capacity building and capacity needs assessment]; FSSP [co-ordination]; JICA [Phase I: Binh Phuoc, Dak Nong, Nghe An; Phase II Kon tum?, Nghe An?]; ICRAF [Bac Kan]; CERDA [support to community groups].
- There was the feeling that the WG-LI group lacks government partners and further outreach is needed to include them.
- It must ensure linkage to other networks and working groups working on similar issues (e.g. CC Working Group)
- Many of the groups were unaware of others groups work, highlighting the need for more information sharing. Presentations on each other's work was welcomed.

(ii) General comments on ToR

- The other sub Working Group on MRV does not have a ToR. So far it has not felt necessary. This is partially due to the fact the issues for discussions are quite clear. This is less the case with the WG-LI, so it is recommended to develop a TOR.
- There is general agreement that the five areas: (i) *capacity building*; (ii) *information sharing*; (iii) *co-ordination between local and national*; (iv) *FPIC*; and (v) *alternative livelihoods* should be the focus of the group
- Comment was made that the WG-LI should initially focus on finding areas of potential collaboration that already exist, as opposed to trying immediately to create new initiatives.
- The first area discussed was *capacity building*. RECOTFC has a project starting soon which is working on capacity needs assessment. They will share information on the project and this will be monitored to see if it could be used as an example for others, as well as provide recommendations to the NRWG.
- It became clear that, although the issues are all relevant there may be a need to focus on some before others, in particular *information sharing*. It was felt that there is a need to collect information on what each organisation is doing on Local Implementation. This can build on existing info sheet/databases but providing more up to date information, focusing on Local Implementation.
- The information sheet/data base should also highlight areas/provinces that different groups are exploring. This will allow for greater collaboration and ensure less replication.
- As an immediate **Action Point** SNV will put together a template to fill out by the different organisations. This information can then be used to update current information. An info sheet will be produced from the WG LI.
- There was some confusion on where this information should be housed (FSSP website or the VN REDD website) and whether the FSSP is the Secretariat of the sub-technical working groups as well as the National Working Group. This needs to be discussed outside the WG-LI.
- The information should be constantly updated, however once it is compiled this work area will require less investment of time allowing more focus on other areas of focus. In addition to existing projects, should include information on planned projects, although that should be visible to group members only. Akiko (FAO) will investigate whether a partitioning of website between public / protected is possible.

Comments on the Working Group meetings

- There was much debate on whether the role of the WG was to provide and share lessons from ongoing project or be more proactive in developing work together and feeding this into the NRWG. Opinions differed in this respect.

- There is general consensus that the Working Group meetings should have three elements:
 - (i) *Information updates and sharing* (ongoing and new REDD Projects)
 - (ii) *Thematic discussions* [a segment on particular issues of interest to some, or all the WG LI (e.g. SNV Cattien Project, FPIC, community engagement etc)]
 - (iii) *Developing recommendations on the focus areas* to feed into the NRWG [capacity building, co-od, FPIC, alternative livelihoods etc]
- It may be the case that the Thematic discussion will not be of interest to all so we could have it last and those who are not interested could leave.
- Given that this sub-WG has only just been established it is unlikely that any recommendations will be provided to the NRWG prior to its next meeting in November. It is expected that a final agreed ToR and the information database is produced prior to this meeting. However, there will be one more meeting of the sub group before the NRWG so there is still opportunity to discuss our initial feedback.

Overall logistics

- The WG will meet once every two months. The next meeting was scheduled for October 15th. It needs to be in good time before the NRWG. An agenda should be sent out at least one week before. SNV is happy to house the meeting in its office.
- It was suggested that the Working Group sometimes meet in the Project sites of ongoing REDD initiatives to discuss with local groups. Given the practical difficulties this may be challenging. However, if the opportunities arise then this should be explored
- It was recognized that if this group wishes to be more ambitious and actually undertake tasks (e.g. develop best practice guidelines etc) it will need to find financing. The UN REDD was identified as a source of Funds.