**Management Group (MG) of the UN-REDD Programme**

**Draft - Meeting Minutes of 12 August 2015**

**14h00 Geneva/Rome & 15h30 Nairobi**

**Attendance:**

MG members and alternates

FAO: Maria José Sans Sanchez

UNDP: Tim Clairs

UNEP: Edoardo Zandri

Secretariat: Mario Boccucci and Mirey Atallah

Others

Secretariat: Mike Speirs and Reem Ismail Saadeh

**Agenda**

1. **Approval of minutes of previous call, 5 August 2015**

The Secretariat has sent the documents for revision and comment by the MG the previous week.

* No further comments were provided on the minutes and decisions from the last MG call on 5 August.

Decisions and actions:

1. Comments, if necessary, can be sent by 14 August after which the Secretariat will upload the decisions to the workspace.
2. **Documents for donors: TOR, Result Framework, Code of conduct, updated response to Programme evaluation, following inputs received from UN agencies**

*Process*

* The Secretariat provided an explanation of the process/timeline set out to finalize the documents (TOR and related annexes) by 30 October and logic behind each milestone in the *Timeline for ToRs + Annexes* document circulated to the MG.
* The MG raised concern about what the implications of the 30 October deadline would have on the 15th PB meeting
* The Secretariat reassured the MG that this deadline (though later than had been anticipated) provided an opportunity for further refinement; and if specific issues cannot be resolved between the UN agencies or donors or stakeholders on specific matters that cannot be resolved ahead of the PB (i.e. balance with composition of representation on the governing bodies) then there would be a need to reassess the approach and perhaps provide an update in the form of a presentation to the PB. However, to pre-empt this and minimize the likelihood of this outcome ongoing conversations are being had with those concerned to work towards a compromise and positive outcome.
* The Secretariat explained that Norway had requested to see the package of documents prior to their meeting with the MPTF on the 17 August in Oslo, and if in agreement the package would be sent on the 12 August or latest 13 August, reminding the MG that there are still opportunities for further refinement between now and 21 August when all documents would be sent to all donors.
* The MG having not seen the final versions prior expressed concern in sending out preliminary and incomplete documents.
* Secretariat having heard the concerns, suggested that they would be sent with two caveats: 1) these documents are confidential and are being sent given they have insisted and 2) each document with sections that revisions are still being made will be explicitly highlighted as such. In addition, there is a plan to have a discussion with Norway to ensure they are clear and on the same page before sending the package.
* The MG understood that it was a difficult decision not to respond to the request made by Norway and felt reassured that with an additional opportunity for review, including the caveats to be added, and with the call to Norway there was sufficient confidence in the Secretariat to proceed.
* UNEP requested clarity on when the SG would come into the process
* Secretariat clarified that as has been done in the past, the MG should continue to individually liaise with their respective SG members on the progress with the development of the documents, and that on the next MG call there would be some time to further discuss.
* UNDP highlighted that they would also be participating in the mission to Oslo next week (in addition to the MPTF) and would keep the MG abreast of any relevant updates, but noted that the mission focus is on the new Africa Trust Fund.

*Results Framework (RF)*

* The Secretariat highlighted that the document is almost ready to be sent off for the 21 August deadline to all donors and will also be accompanied by a two page narrative. The Sec underscored that the process thus far has helped get the document into good shape from which the MG can work to further refine during the retreat.
* UNDP noted they had sent extensive comments on the RF and hoped they were useful and provided sufficient impetus to move the document forward.

*Response to external evaluation*

* Secretariat reminded the MG that the final version was shared on 17 July and having heard no further feedback wanted to check if there was any additional feedback before considering the document cleared.
* The MG had no additional feedback.

*TOR*

* The Secretariat laid the background clarifying there were five sections that required adjustment as follows:

1. Introduction: Context, rationale and TOC –shorten as they are covered in the strategic framework
2. Governance:
3. Balance of functions across the PB and EB (approval and guidance on country selection)
4. EB and PB composition, specifically if all Agencies agree to have one agency in PB and all three in EB, and if MG agrees to have one UN agency to chair EB
5. Overall clean-up and harmonization of text
6. With the revised function of the PB and strengthening of relationship between EB and his/her constituency whether or not we need a PB with the level of participation we have now or if it should be substituted by an Assembly as raised during PB 14
7. Programming Cycle
   1. Substantial review and simplification is needed
   2. Fix the text on ear-marking, introduction of threshold, and process for earmarking
   3. Text on TS, specifically on scope and approval of TS requests by UN agencies and MG (which is absent at the moment)
   4. Global or regional programme – may be able to add text about interim arrangements to cover staff costs
8. Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation
9. The need to agree on annexes to be included and suggested they be kept to a minimum: strategic framework, results framework, templates for annual report and final evaluation and code of conduct.

* FAO and UNEP were ok with the proposal and would review all upon receipt on the 13 August.
* UNDP raised questions about the process and that perhaps there may in fact be a need to discuss some of the outstanding issues on the call (i.e. Governance, global or regional programme, Programming cycle).
* Secretariat noted that there had been a first attempt at finding a balance on the items listed above and in the versions to be sent on 13 August there will be caveats included in particular on programming cycle and global and targeted support.

*Code of Conduct*

* Secretariat welcomed the solid document from FAO which included UNDP’s position and now with UNEP comments as well, and requested any feedback/concerns with changes proposed by UNEP.
* UNEP explained rationale for edits, where in particular a lengthy discussion was had about the edits made to paragraph 2 of section 3 (Accountabilities and technical focus).
* FAO/UNDP noted that a significant and important point for the rationale of the text in paragraph 2 section 3 is based on the possibility of applying a national implementation modality.
* The MG discussed the edits and rationale and came to a compromise.

Decisions and actions:

1. Secretariat to send revised documents (based on inputs and comments made during the call) via drop box folder entitled “revised 12 August” to MG by 9am 13 August for quick review by the MG.
2. MG to review and provide any additional inputs on revised package of documents before COB CET on 13 August.
3. Secretariat to send revised preliminary package of documents to Norway (informal and confidential consultation) by the evening of 13 August.
4. MG to review documents with SG members between now and MG retreat on the 15 September.
5. Revised response matrix to the external evaluation cleared by the MG for circulation to the PB.
6. UNEP to finalize edits made to the code of conduct document and send to Secretariat to be included in the package to Norway for 13 August.
7. **MG Q4 planning retreat agenda (10 min)**

The draft agenda for the MG Q4 planning retreat meeting from 15-17 September 2015 in Nairobi was sent to MG on 6 August for comments by 12 August and confirmation of Agencies leadership in preparing the sessions on (1) comparative advantages of the agencies, (2) criteria for country selection, (3) GCF. The main objective of the meeting is to finalize the transition arrangements and strategic staffing, and clarify the comparative advantages of all three UN agencies for the next UN-REDD Programme cycle 2016-2020. During the call, initial MG feedback on the agenda was sought, in particular on the time allocation and topics to be prioritized.

* FAO noted some concern that the agenda is tight and noted that the agenda should focus on the main issues with the MG taking hands on approach.
* MG encouraged that sufficient time is allocated for further refinement of the RF, ensuring that any additional resource staff be limited to those key people who can help facilitates progress
* FAO suggested that the session with the regional team be minimized as no FAO staff will be there
* Looking for volunteers to lead on: session on comparative advantages, code and conduct and Lead Advisor, session on criteria on country selection and session on GCF; if desired Secretariat can make suggestions on which agencies lead on which session
* FAO volunteered for session criteria/ or comparative advantages
* UNDP is happy to take on any suggestions to lead on a session as needed
* UNDP also noted that they are not sure if they will be able to have a conversation with the lead on GCF from UNDP’s end before the retreat, and therefore it may be difficult to contribute anything further for the time being.
* UNEP has no particular preference and will lead on any item needed, and stressed that despite no FAO staff will be present it would be a good opportunity for the UNEP and UNDP teams to interact with the MG and we can do our best to involve FAO.
* Secretariat noted that the agenda will be revised accordingly, prioritizing key issues, dropping for instance the discussion on the staff retreat for 2016, reduce time slot for the meeting the regional Africa team and see how we can best accommodate FAO colleagues via a video conference, as well as ensure adequate time for further refinement of the RF. In addition, it would be good to have the GCF conversation as soon as possible as it is a timely issue and before taking it to the SG; suggest tabling it at 26 August MG call just as a check-in point and subsequently will determine whether or not it can be included in the agenda for the retreat, leaving 2 weeks to prepare if need be.

Decisions and actions:

1. Secretariat to revise agenda accordingly (ensuring that there is sufficient time allocated for work on the RF) prioritizing key issues, shortening the session with the regional Africa team and circulate to the MG

Other decisions and actions:

1. Secretariat will send out reminders for feedback (via e-mail) on the following items not covered on the call today due to time restrictions: draft agenda for PB15, draft concept note for all staff retreat, and draft communications plan for participation at the WFC.
2. MG cleared TOR for UN-REDD Communications/KM Working Group.
3. **Next MG call, 19 August 2015 (2hrs.)**
4. *Approval of minutes of previous call, August 12th 2015 (5 min)*
5. *Review TOR and annexes (1.5hrs)*
   1. *Quick overview of process (readout from meeting in Oslo on 17 August and calls with other donors (EC & Spain) and calls with Mexico and Colombia)*
   2. *Review of TOR sections on introduction (Context, rationale and TOC)*
   3. *Review of TOR section on governance*
   4. *Review of TOR section on programming cycle*
   5. *Review of TOR section on reporting, monitoring and evaluation*
   6. *Review of annex on results framework*
   7. *Review of annex on code of conduct*
   8. *Review of other annexes (TOR for final evaluation and template on reporting)*
6. *Check-in/feedback on revised MG retreat agenda (10 min)*
7. *Next SG call (10 min)*