

Minutes
SNA - GPCG Telephone Conference Call
10 September 2013

Attendance

FAO: Adam Gerrand and Maria SanzSanchez

UNDP: Tim Clairs

UNEP: No attendance (Inputs sent by e- mail).

Secretariat: Thais Linhares - Juvenal (Chair), Helena Eriksson (Mirey Atallah and Clea Paz)

Agenda

1. Approval of agenda

2. Targeted support

- General incl. coordination
- Draft Form
- Pending response

3. AOB.

1. Approval of agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Targeted support

- *Application form*: The Group recommended that the form is made available to the countries as a *voluntary* application form. While countries can be encouraged to use the form, countries can also use their own documents if preferred, which also reflects the country-driven character of targeted support. In the latter case, the content in the form can be useful as guidance on what needs to be included. The comments on the initial draft form are being addressed and a revised version will be shared by the Secretariat for comments.
- It was suggested that the external guidance on [assessing targeted support approved at PB8](#) needs to be revised with regard to the application and response process and some other lessons learned.
- The Secretariat mentioned that an updated background note based on the experience of targeted support will be shared for comments.
- *Argentina* was discussed both under the country progress item (NPWG) and concerning the country's request for assistance in its RPP/NP preparation phase. FAO and UNDP are supportive of Argentina's proposal, which UNEP is prepared to financially support, and mentioned their willingness to engage. The question arose whether this support assisting a country in its NP preparation phase and related recruitment of a consultant should be categorized as targeted support. The participants acknowledged that there is a grey zone and that there is a need to clarify the labeling of this type so the same approach across the Programme is used (also concerning narrative reporting and accounting). The process should be as smooth as possible and if countries need to request specific support for NP preparation through this mechanism, it could actually be an extra layer for the countries. Instead backstopping was considered more appropriate. It was agreed that each agency will look into how they treat these cases to allow for a joint recommendation.
- The Secretariat gave a situation update on *Honduras'* targeted support, with the last inputs received from FAO explaining the process in the country leading up to the request related to the

country's legal framework. FAO is ready to financially support the request. Following the written comments from UNDP, FAO clarified that both SERNA and ICF should be included in the response. (The registered focal point responsibility is with SERNA, while ICF plays a central role in forest law revision). It was clarified that the request is for preparatory work *prior* to the revision of the forest law and that the recommendations made through the GIZ work in the country will be considered. UNEP had already expressed support to FAO to proceed and UNDP mentioned in the call that they also give their 'green light' following the clarifications and involvement of relevant stakeholders in the country.

Actions:

- Secretariat sends an updated applicant form for comments.
- Each agency will look into their categorising of backstopping and targeted support to allow for a joint recommendation and to ensure the same approach is being used across the Programme.
- Following agencies' agreement on Honduras targeted support request (financial support by FAO), Secretariat will proceed with the response. (A draft to be shared for comments before submission).

3. AOB.

No other business was reported.