# Minutes from SEPC conference call 28 Jan 2012

## Preparatory discussion with Thais

**Present: Thais, Estelle and Leo**

General comment: have to be very clear on the purpose of the SEPC. Is it something to be used to review performance or not? There is a need to separate out aspirations and what is a workable tool.

In revising the tool it may be necessary to break it into parts in order to address its different objectives. A lot of work is needed on language as some of the criteria and very strong principles.

Before the CG call tomorrow there is need for a note on a proposed way forward for the CG. Following this 2-3 people can work on restructuring next week.

## Working group call

**Present: Thais, Clea, Leo, Estelle, Val, Julie, Gaya, Jen, Nina**

Thais gave an overview of feedback and a proposed way forward, which could possibly include dividing the SEPC into 3 parts:

1. Aspirational principles reflecting what UN-REDD thinks countries should do
2. Minimum standards for UN-REDD operations that will apply these (or a revised version of these) P and C
3. An instrument for assisting countries with the development of safeguards systems

Discussion points:

* Is the CG call about the status of UN-REDD guidelines in general? There seems to be a bigger issue here about the status of the SEPC
* What does Policy Board approval mean?
* Can we solve SEPC/BeRT issues without solving the bigger issues?
* What is the difference between P and C and policies? Some of these things are included in the ProDoc.
* P and C are already being used in a performance based way – e.g. the agreement with PNG includes reference to the P and C
* These are very old questions about how SEPC/BeRT will be operationalized. Still, a focus can be made from now to further clarify things.
* The overarching needs is to ensure that we are in a position to help implement national programmes and support countries
* If agencies feel they are demanding strong commitments from countries they may be unable to support them to meet these. This is a justification to divide things into aspirational principles plus a small number of P and C to guide operation.
* Still a need to discuss what Senior Management see is the use of the P and C – will happen tomorrow. Particularly because it is evident that there are Qs about the coverage of UN-REDD programmes vs national strategies
* Clea has lots of ideas on ensuring operational procedures incorporate some of the things discussed – follow up.
* Important legal concern surrounds whether it is appropriate for UN-REDD to set minimum standards
* It is going to be very complex to change things and very difficult in the timeframe
* We have been criticised in the past (including from CG) for saying that we’ll provide support to countries for the development of safeguard systems, especially before any UNFCCC agreement was reached

Way forward:

* Need a decision from the CG. 1 page for tomorrow with a few paras on the history of/demand for SEPC, references to it in the Global WP, and proposed way forward following Thais’s proposal. This should also include an indication from the group on if it can be restructured and how.
* We can’t move forward without a clear decision on this
* The workshop can help to clarify some of these things and we can use the comments as justification for doing so