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

**Meeting Minutes of 19 August 2015**

**8h00 Geneva/Rome & 9h00 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

**Agenda** (NB: Given limited time, the meeting focused on two main subjects and there was no AOB)

1. **Review of the ToR and annexes**

In terms of the process for finalizing a draft of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UN-REDD Programme (2016-20), it was noted that following preliminary discussions and feedback from Norway, the deadline for circulating a version to the donors would be pushed back to 28 August 2015. This would allow more time for thorough preparation of a polished document. Comments received from Norway indicated that the proposed governance arrangements were of particular concern.

In order to take account of some observations on the sections describing the context, the “challenges of REDD+”, the rationale and the theory of change (ToC),it is proposed to restructure these sections of the ToR (and include a table of contents and number the paragraphs) as follows:

* Incorporate the section called “challenges of REDD+” in the discussion of the Programme rationale; and
* Add notes concerning the capacities for REDD+ that can be provided through the Programme as well as further indication of the comparative advantages of the Programme compared to other initiatives (as outlined, inter alia, during PB14 discussions in May 2015 and drawing on the text included in the strategic framework document).

There was a lengthy exchange about the Norwegian views on the proposed governance arrangements, notably the apparent desire to limit the role and mandate of the PB. It was noted that other constituencies of the Programme, including CSOs and IPs as well as some country representatives, would be dissatisfied with a proposal which amounts to eliminating the PB altogether. Other options such as the organization of an annual assembly could be explored further. The MG members considered suggestions about the ways and means of making the case to the Norwegians – such as through the SG or senior agency officials or through a concerted CSO and IP lobby - in order to underline concerns about the loss of inclusiveness and the need for broad stakeholder participation, which might emphasise inconsistences that would arise between efforts to promote inclusive decision making at the national and global level for REDD+, as well as being contrary to the core principles of the UN agencies promoted through their boards.

The composition of the proposed EB was also considered, notably the difficulties encountered by the donors in restricting their representation to three members and by the UN agencies in restricting representation to one. It was pointed out that the proposal for a single agency representative on the EB would need to be examined by the legal departments as the EB takes fund allocation decisions.

Three issues in the section of the ToR dealing with the programming cycle were briefly discussed: targeted support, programming documents (the R-PP and national investment plans) and fund allocation through the national steering committees (NSCs).

Decisions and actions:

* A revised timetable for the work on the ToR and annexes will be circulated by the Secretariat as soon as possible.
* A strong message about the importance of an inclusive governance arrangement will need to be conveyed to Norway (either on behalf of the UN agency principles or other).
* The future Programme will need a multi-agency targeted support (or seed) modality in order to respond in a flexible and tailored manner to requests for assistance in completing readiness, developing REDD+ policies, etc.
* The suggested move away from the R-PP as a standard basis for REDD+ preparation and to introduce new templates or new formats for readiness support was considered unwise, inter alia to avoid claims of lack of coordination with the FCPF. For PAMs the issue is still open, but it will be necessary to proceed with caution and to use country processes wherever possible.
* Further interaction with MPTF-O is needed in order to find an appropriate definition of the role of the NSC in fund allocation, given the legal requirements for quality assurance and accountability that the agencies have.
* Regarding the results framework, the Secretariat is preparing an annotated agenda item and revised matrix in preparation for further discussion at the MG meeting in Nairobi in September.

1. **Next Strategic Group (SG) call**

The following four items had been proposed for discussion by the SG members for their calls in the coming months:

1. The Green Climate Fund and the UN-REDD Programme
2. The governance arrangements for the future Programme with a view to engaging Norway
3. Country level delivery, including programming and the code of conduct
4. The hosting of the Programme secretariat by UNEP

Decisions and actions:

* MG agreed on the four items proposed to be tabled for discussion by the SG and agreed to brief the members accordingly in preparation for the meeting, starting with the governance arrangements for the immediate next call (end of August) and addressing GCF and delivery/code of conduct in a subsequent call and with more inputs from the MG.