

Minutes
Support to National REDD+ Action
(Global Programme) Coordination Teleconference
6 November, 14.30 CET

Attendance:

FAO: Maria SanzSanchez

UNDP: Tim Clairs

UNEP: Julie Greenwalt

UN-REDD Programme Secretariat: Thais Linhares Juvenal, Helena Eriksson

Agenda:

- 1- Approval of draft agenda
- 2- Debriefing from the ninth PB Meeting
- 3- Targeted support
- 4- Monitoring framework
- 5- AOB

1. Approval of draft agenda

Agenda approved.

2. Debriefing from the ninth PB Meeting SNA

The Groups' comments included: good set of decisions; logistical difficulties but agencies and Secretariat worked as a team; focus on implementation; improved level of report although still work ahead; partner countries are stronger; a good step forward for the Programme; good coordination between the agencies; more matured capacity; results-based is important; UN-REDD is appreciated as a joint Programme by recipients and donors; countries, agencies and Secretariat are working together and it was a strong sense that the work will continue; Secretariat was supportive and attentive etc.

UNDP mentioned that when aligning the budget commitments to the new period Jan-Dec 2013 it would be useful to know how all agencies are doing.

Secretariat mentioned that funds by donors to the Green Climate Fund 2013 could possibly be channeled to the UN-REDD Programme, e.g. Switzerland, and it is a need to have a strategy in place. New funding potential refers also to Japan, which seems willing to provide funding through MPTF and Tier 2.

UNDP mentioned that Norway is interested in making a multi-year contribution, which perhaps could be agreed on in Doha. The Prince's Rainforests Project has commissioned a paper to assess the current status of interim REDD+ finance, and ways forward for 2013 – 2020¹ on this broader looking approach that allows a possibility of multi-year bridging and long term results-based planning for readiness processes. (It was suggested having the SNA monitoring framework ready for Doha).

In views of improved reporting, the Group mentioned; i) importance of reflecting better based on the reality on the ground; ii) the need to focus on impact - it is a risk to lose the higher level view if going into details; iii) output level needs to be consistent with appropriate level of indicators etc.; iv) currently there is a superficial division between NP and SNA and a more comprehensive picture

¹ <http://www.pcfisu.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Nov-2012-Interim-REDD+-Finance-Current-Status-and-Ways-Forward-2013-2020-Princes-Rainforests-Project.pdf>

needs to be given; and v) it is important to split financial achievements. (MPTF may not be able to automatically report on the level that the programme requests, but manually it is feasible. The Programme needs to be clear on the level of details needed before liaising with MPTF).

Further, there was a strong message from counties and donors to share lessons learnt and approaches by the countries. No workshop has been held on this aspect and the Programme has a key role here.

3. Targeted Support

Two replies have been prepared and will be sent to agencies for no objection; The support to Argentina (request on 12 Sept and concept note on 19 October) will refer to FAO and UNEP with the total amount of US\$ 198,400. UNDP will have an advisory role but won't support financially. The support to Ivory Coast (request on 14 Sept) refers to FAO and UNDP with the total amount of US\$ 235,000.

The Secretariat highlighted a couple of points that came up in Brazzaville when talking with donors and countries; 1) Is this type of support actual requests from countries or agency driven?

2) The procedure tells that the support is small scale and should fill gaps so how does it relate to a 50% allocation of the SNA budget for 2013-2014?

The countries should have ownership; they are signing the requests. FAO meant that backstopping and review of country needs will trigger targeted support. It is important to find ways to show to donors and others where there are progress and where not. UNDP mentioned that the support has been complementary and best practice is evolving based on the process in place (e.g. should not be given to countries with NP of low delivery and where the workplan is already including the activities). On the 50% figure, it is key to go back and review the budget and be clearer on the proportion and what it entails. UNEP mentioned the good feedback from donors but important to report on the support in a larger REDD+ context and comprehensively reflect on the support. Also, see how to best present the targeted support with country examples at the next PB meeting.

Costa Rica was given as a good example by Norway as reconciling and filling gaps of the FCPF Carbon Fund support.

3. Monitoring framework

Elisa, Estelle and Julie were thanked for their contributions to the monitoring framework and for suggesting a time line for its completion. The Secretariat summarized the planned work ahead on the framework, relating to PB Decision 14² and highlighted the documents that were going to be sent for comments; the draft timeline and ToR for a Monitoring and Reporting consultant.

4. AOB.

No AOB reported.

The next SNA (Global Programme) Coordination concall will be held on Tuesday, 13 November, 14.30 CET.

² The Board requested the Secretariat to improve reporting by PB10, including financial report at output level per agency and per categories of support. The Board also requested the Secretariat to develop a results-based monitoring framework, circulate its draft inter-sessionally for comments of the Policy Board and apply the finalized monitoring framework to the Annual Report 2012