**Draft Minutes / Action Points**

**Safeguards Coordination Group Teleconference**

**Support to National REDD+ Action / Global Programme**

**4 April 2013, 2.30 pm CET**

**Attendance :**

FAO: Maria SanzSanchez

UNDP: Kimberly Todd

UNEP: Julie Greenwalt

UN-REDD Secretariat: Helena Eriksson

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of draft agenda
2. Finalization of recommendations and workplan to forward to the MG
3. Preparations for next week’s Paraguay workshop
4. Feedback on 2013 monitoring framework
5. Safeguards on PB10 agenda
6. Reports from recent meetings:
   1. FCPF C Fund Meeting on Safeguards, benefit-sharing and grievance
   2. Bangkok Regional Exchange on Safeguards
7. AOB

**Minutes:**

1. ***Approval of draft agenda***

The draft agenda was approved.

1. ***Finalization of recommendations and workplan to be shared with MG for information***

* Need to forward the meeting report, including the recommendations and workplan, to the MG. Secretariat will do so.
* The questions was raised regarding the option to forward only or to also have a safeguards group member available for an MG call to summarize outcomes/highlights and answer questions.
* The Secretariat explained that the current version of the meeting report (on Shared Docs) is still long and needs to be edited to a shorter document. .
* When returning to this agenda item later in the call, it was agreed that the workplan should be revised to have a quarterly timeline, i.e. what activities to be completed by Q1, by Q2 etc) rather than specifying dates, so that frequent revisions of deadlines aren’t required.

**Action items:**

* The Secretariat to follow up with Mario on preferred approach – have a safeguards group member on an MG call or not The Secretariat has done so and is awaiting a volunteer from the group who would be available)
* Group members to provide comments on the draft report uploaded on SharedDocs, help summarise the sections, edit and provide views by email on whether we should keep it as it is or should the product be forwarded as a “light” version, a summarised 3-5-page report with the recommendations. Regardless, the longer version would serve as a detailed record for the safeguards group use.
* Everyone to provide their inputs by **Wednesday April 10** and the Secretariat to assist in finalisation by **Friday, 12 April**.

1. ***Preparations for next week’s Paraguay workshop***

* UNEP was surprised with how international the focus was – the workshop proceeded very quickly and not a lot of advance notice was given; urged communicating these planned events as soon as each agency has the information; recognized in this particular case, it was quick-moving in the planning on “snuck up” on all 3 agencies a bit
* Concerns raised again about election timing
  + UNDP explained that this concern was discussed with the UNDP country office but the timing was inflexible and there was a need to be responsive to FAPI’s request
* FAO – also surprised that the it’s framed as an international workshop but also very Paraguay focused; National-level workshop with a few international experts – it’s being framed as an international workshop; but if that’s the case a few countries should be invited in the region
* UNDP agreed to follow up with Veronique in the UNDP Paraguay Country office to pass along this feedback requesting a clarification on the agenda that it is a national-level workshop to which international experts and representatives from other countries in the region were being invited.

1. ***Feedback on 2013 monitoring framework***
   * The Secretariat gave feedback on calls with Keith Lindsay and asked for clarification if we had been contacted by him on safeguards at all – would the group members be free for a call with him?
   * All agreed that it would be useful to have a call with Keith as a group but recognized it would need to happen quickly - UNEP raised timing issue in that each agency was asked to provide input by the next day.
   * Call scheduled with Keith for the following day (participation by Julie, Kim, Maria)
   * UNEP raised the question of whether his suggestions on changes to outputs are actually Ok. The Secretariat provided clarification that we should be making only minor changes to outputs, and if going beyond this, it would need to be well-justified.
2. ***Safeguards on PB10 agenda***

* Info session is the preference – experience from Brazzaville was that it’s a more relaxed atmosphere - invites more discussion; comments
* Not seeking a decision on this so not on the official agenda
* FAO - It has not been requested from the PB so there’s no need to have a PB decision; should be shared as information instead – more appropriate
* The Secretariat to share this view by the Group and insert a comment on this point in the draft agenda being circulated.

1. ***Reports from recent meetings:***

* FCPF C Fund Design Forum on Safeguards, benefit-sharing and grievance (Feb. 26 – 28, 2013; Washington, DC)
  + UNDP provided highlights of the safeguards sessions but will send around more detailed BTOR
  + Explained the discussion on World Bank safeguards vs. UNFCCC safeguards
  + Participants urged a comparison of the two and how WB safeguards provide a means to address Cancun safeguards; the FCPF FMT has developed such a comparison but it has not been publically released yet – they will prioritize this as an output of the meeting
  + Will aim to re-frame the methodological framework being developed for the C Fund Feedback:
    - Are the safeguards for the financing institution considered equivalent to Cancun– do these have to be mirrored?
    - They should not be framing WB safeguards = Cancun safeguards
    - C Fund is just a pilot – this should be clear in the methodological framework for the FCPF C Fund
    - UNDP offered further clarification that it didn’t seem to be approached as an equivalence issue but more that everything a country is doing should fed into its national approach, rather than doing different things for different donors, so this is why they wanted to see consistency with Cancun.
  + As follow-up, a request was made for any report from FCPF on the outcomes of the meeting to see how they are framing it; UNDP will follow up to check on this with the FMT
  + The safeguards group should be keeping the lines of communication open with the FCPF FMT
* Bangkok Regional Exchange on Safeguards – No read-out given, but UNEP will follow up with Thomas to see if there will be a meeting report coming

1. ***AOB***

Other items raised:

* Internal workplan updates– where do we stand on the decision-tree?
  + Challenging to visualize this, but FAO is progressing
* Next call – aim for every 2 weeks (2 weeks from April 4 call would be 18 April, but we’ll follow up by email)
* Costa Rica call – Scheduled for Monday, 8 April; Question of whether we were all set with participation for that call; UNEP was to follow up with Gabriel on Secretariat participation.