

**Minutes / Action Points**  
**Safeguards Coordination Group**  
**Support to National REDD+ Action / Global Programme**  
**Teleconference No. XX**  
**05 June 2013, 14:30 CET**

**Attendance:**

FAO : Serena Fortuna  
UNDP: Kimberly Todd, Claudia Segesser von Brunegg  
UNEP: Julie Greenwalt, Lera Miles

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of draft agenda
2. Recent requests for inputs/comments:
  - a. AP regional workshop concept note
  - b. Vietnam roadmap for environmental and social safeguards
3. Workplan items
  - a. Web-based decision tree
  - b. BeRT
  - c. Safeguards tracking tool
  - d. Improved presentation slides
4. Targeted Support Updates:
  - a. Argentina workshop
  - b. Costa Rica – participation
  - c. Peru – first product under safeguards component
5. Updates on participation at upcoming REDD+SES meetings
  - a. Expert workshop on approaches to monitoring and assessing REDD+ safeguards performance, Oxford, UK, 4-5 June - UN-REDD's perspective on SIS
  - b. REDD+ SES meeting in Bogor, Indonesia, 1 – 3 July – participation/presentation to be developed
6. Publications Review:
  - a. Climate Focus paper: "Safeguards in REDD+ and forest carbon standards: a review of social, environmental and procedural concepts and applications" – Table 3 and Section on Applicability  
<http://www.climatefocus.com/documents/safeguards>
    - i. Safeguards publication log
7. Logistics for Operation of the group:
  - a. Regular meetings: proposal to set up standing meetings (set day or week/time every 2 weeks)
  - b. Set up dedicated calls on key work products (e.g., BeRT and decision-tree)
  - c. Proposal for Knowledge Management activities
8. AOB

## Minutes:

### 1. Approval of draft agenda

The draft agenda was approved, though workplan items were shifted earlier, as the first topic, followed by recent requests for inputs from the group.

### 2. Workplan items

#### a. Web-based decision tree

- UNDP:
  - summarized the two main steps carried out so far for this workplan item. Firstly, the mapping of the processes under the main safeguard programmes, initiatives, etc. (UN-REDD conceptual framework, WB FCPF SESA, and REDD+ SES) across each other. The next step taken was to generalize steps/activities to make the tool generic enough so that it can be useful to countries no matter the approach they apply or in what stage they are.
  - continued by explaining that this tree should guide the countries in terms of when the related UN-REDD tools/guidelines/methodologies should be used.
  - explained that next steps are contacting the specialists/authors of the related documents to be sure we are reflecting the most appropriate placement of each tool/guideline/methodology.
- FAO inquired about the timeline and UNDP explained that the feasible timeline not only relies on the engagement of the group but also on the responsiveness of each of the authors when we share the draft tree.
  - UNDP clarified that although informal comments from the Safeguards Group are more than welcome at this stage and continually, the drafted tree will be uploaded to SharedDocs for a specific comment period from the group, once the authors of the related tools had been contacted and provided their feedback.
- UNEP provided brief reactions at this stage, reminding the group that the steps are not sequential and therefore to avoid language like “If yes, then proceed to next activity.” UNDP agreed on that the tree should not be that sequentially structured and urged all to consider revisions to propose to the text.
- UNEP commented that the draft tool was informally floated with counterparts during a workshop in Kinshasa the previous week, and that they expressed interest in such a tree, finding it very helpful.

#### Action item:

- All to provide comments and inputs at any stage, but particularly during the specified comment period on the next version circulated to the group.
- FAO/UNDP to schedule a dedicated safeguards group call on the decision-tree, at the end of that comment period.
- FAO/UNDP to considering rephrasing of questions and text for guiding the user to the tool.
- FAO/UNDP to contact authors of related tools/methodologies/guidelines.
- FAO/UNDP to share version via SharedDocs for comments once authors/specialists have provided feedback on the placement of tools/guidelines/methodologies.

#### b. BeRT (Lera)

- UNEP reminded the group that they had circulated SharedDocs links to both the “Review of Comments” (.doc) and “Detailed Log of Comments” (.xls) in an email dated 7 May 2013. In addition, UNEP explained that the first document summarizes and categorizes all comments from the matrix, and also includes a set of questions plus some proposed responses/actions, which should be reviewed/commented on by the group. Particularly UNEP flagged the proposal in the document to prioritize revision of the BeRT for use as a tool for gap analysis of PLRs.
- UNDP commented that these documents were also shared with the RTAs but haven’t received comments back yet. UNDP will follow up internally to try to solicit this feedback.
- Serena Fortuna was representing FAO on the call and said that she will follow-up with Maria to make sure comments are made as soon as possible.
- UNEP suggested that the email be re-circulated as a reminder, flagging the specific questions/issues for the group’s feedback in the email itself.
- UNDP suggested that the revision of the BeRT be the high-priority item that should be considered as a next step parallel to the development of the decision tree. In addition, UNDP suggested that due to its priority, a dedicated call on the BeRT revisions should be scheduled.

**Action item:**

- UNEP to send a reminder email, highlighting in the email those specific questions/issue areas in need of interagency feedback. *(Done – Email sent by Jennifer Laughlin on behalf of Lera)*
- All to provide answer/comments within a week.

*The “Review of Comments” containing the “decisions needed for clear next steps” can be found at:*

<http://www.unredd.net/kt/view.php?fDocumentId=1277>

*The “Detailed Log of all Comments” to be downloaded from*

<http://www.unredd.net/kt/view.php?fDocumentId=1278>

**c. Safeguards tracking tool**

- UNDP discussed the need to have a better understanding of the current status of countries approaches to safeguards taking into consideration the fact that the Group has previously discussed the importance of having a compiled table that reflects the progress/achievements of countries in terms of SIS, resulting in the inclusion of such a tracking tool or “log” in the safeguards group workplan for 2013.
- UNDP mentioned that they have gone ahead and initiated the development of a safeguards tracking tool aiming to provide this snapshot of safeguards/SIS work at the country level. It was explained that this is being designed as a kind of internal dashboard that would allow tracking the NP and TS activities in a consolidated way. UNDP explained that as part of the design the “NP Tracking Tool”, mainly focused on financial data and delivery, and the “TS Tracker” that mixes financial data and overall results are being consulted.
- UNDP explained that they inquired with regional colleagues, in order to find out if they have developed a similar matrices or tools. No consolidated efforts have been done yet, but A-P and Africa are in the process of conducting readiness assessments to provide similar results, though not specific to safeguards/SIS.
- UNDP inquired if the group was aware of any tool/matrix/tracker that can be tailored for this purpose but there were no specific examples that the group was aware of.
- UNDP also reminded the group that this is a workplan item but no progress had been made yet so Claudia will be able to dedicate time to this to initiate and then the identified leads in the workplan can be re-engaged, depending on when they are available to do so.

- UNEP suggested that, as an early step, to start to populate the tracking tool/log, the SNA and Individual NP annual Reports could be considered at this stage.

**Action item:**

- UNDP to draft the safeguards tracking tool and to share for comments.

**d. Improved presentation slides**

- UNEP recognized that every workshop, meeting, etc. is different but having a generic Safeguards presentation that can be adapted as necessary for different purposes is very useful. As a starting point the suggestion was made to collate all safeguards presentations in the SharedDocs folder.
- UNEP also suggested that the safeguards folders should be renamed as it is currently named “SEPC”.
- UNDP suggested organizing the safeguards presentation folder on ShareDocs. It was pointed out that having different versions for different audiences (i.e. Cordula’s presentation more focused on SIS) as well as having all presentations in a single folder will be very helpful for upcoming events/meetings.
- FAO commented that this can be very useful, especially for UN-REDD staff involved with country implementation, as there are always counterparts that ask about SIS, therefore having common slides will be very useful for us to send the same message. She particularly emphasized the value for those not involved on a daily basis with safeguards.
- UNEP suggested that it will be important to have the narrative, the text that goes with the slides. Additionally suggested that the presentation should be named clearly indicating the purpose and the target audience (i.e. For Argentina, a less technical presentation that targets an audience less familiar with REDD).

**Action item:**

- UNEP volunteered to rename the safeguards folders on ShareDocs.
  - *Done: ShareDocs>Safeguards>Safeguards Presentations:*  
[http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com\\_wrapper&view=wrapper&Itemid=68](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_wrapper&view=wrapper&Itemid=68)

**3. Recent requests for inputs/comments**

**a. AP regional workshop concept note**

- UNEP thanked UNDP for comments on the note “Supporting planning for REDD+ activities through special analysis. Regional Workshop, Asia-Pacific”.
- UNEP commented that the workshop aims to provide a practical understanding of how spatial analysis tools can support what decisions need to be taken.
- UNEP suggested that if anyone from FAO or UNEP is still interested in providing further comments, then these could be still taken into consideration, as Robert Munroe will take up this task again, once back from the Bonn meetings.
- UNEP remarked that the draft file can still be accessed at the Workspace.

**Action item:**

- FAO and UNEP to provide comments, if necessary, via SharedDocs:  
<http://www.unredd.net/kt/view.php?fDocumentId=1285>

**b. Vietnam roadmap for environmental and social safeguards.**

- UNEP updated on the “Roadmap for Environmental and Social Safeguards for Vietnam’s National REDD+ Action Programme: Gap Analysis of Existing Policies, Laws and Regulations”

- UNEP informed that they submitted the collective comments as per the feedback form available at <http://www.unredd.net/kt/browse.php?fFolderId=753>

**Action item:**

- No further action needed.

#### 4. Targeted Support Updates

##### a. **Argentina workshop (Julie)**

- UNEP commented that the workshop took place on 30 May, but after receiving and sharing the agenda, presentations and breakout materials, they haven't had any updates yet.
- UNEP also commented that they had discussed with Diego Martino and the government had a clear idea of what they wanted. This led to some last minute change to the agenda to meet the priorities.
- FAO commented that they did not know who was involved in the TS in Argentina, and that they sent an email to Gabriel, Pierre-Yves and Diego concerning the development of the national forest monitoring system. During the scoping mission in April there was stakeholders in MRV from the "Unidad de Biodiversidad" of the Ministry of Environment, and that they spoke to Jorge Trevin, the focal point that helps the implementation of the TS and they are very interested, willing to collaborate and that right now they are actually working on the revision of the biodiversity strategy and that they are interested in further collaboration with UNEP.
- FAO commented that both Gabriel and Daniel suggested to have a specific teleconference between the three agencies on TS, but they are not sure when this will happen.

**Action item:**

- FAO to share summaries of the scoping mission.
- FAO to provide update on the interagency-teleconference.

*Related workshop documents to be find at <http://www.unredd.net/kt/browse.php?fFolderId=746>*

##### b. **Costa Rica – participation**

- UNEP commented that the inception workshop is scheduled for 4-5 July, that the first session will be an Internal planning day, and that on the second day, the Ministry is leveraging the TS inception workshop as a re-launching REDD + readiness.
- UNEP also commented on the limitation of Spanish speakers to attend. Right now one WCMC participant is confirmed.
- UNDP replied that for this activity the timing wasn't ideal on UNDP side, as Pierre-Yves and Kim will each be on leave, but Kifah from the CO and Arturo from the regional office will be participating. From a language wise perspective this is fine, as otherwise translation will be required. UNDP commented their availability to provide any inputs on the internal planning in advance.
- FAO commented that Maria will not be able to participate, but that Serena will attend in her place. Concerning the updated agenda, they commented that the latest information they have was sent by Gabriel, but they don't have information regarding the detailed agenda. FAO inquired about which will be the responsibilities for each agency.
- Julie: Proposed scheduling an interagency prep call for next week as UNEPO contingent will then be traveling to Indonesia the week of 17<sup>th</sup> June.

**Action item:**

- To have a specific teleconference to plan for the workshop (*Done*)
- To consider the idea of meeting one day earlier amongst the agency participants.

**c. Peru – first product under safeguards component**

- UNDP commented that 2 of the main areas of the TS are stakeholder engagement and social and environmental safeguards. The safeguards consultant has recently been hired and drafted the workplan, which is very specific on participation and engagement involving local communities.
- UNDP also commented that given the scope of participatory monitoring in the context of the SIS, they are eager to give feedback to Peru based on the group's comments. UNDP explained that the document is in Spanish, therefore they are meant to provide feedback in Spanish.
- FAO agreed to provide further comments.
- UNEP expressed that we all should be able to look at this in Spanish. Also that there may be potential to use some of the materials prepared for Ecuador where engagement has already taken place.
- UNEP commented that Peru is outside their UN-REDD work but the Government of Germany is interested in pursuing mapping work there.

**Action item:**

- UNDP to send Workplan for comments (*Done*).
- All to provide comments

**5. Updates on participation at upcoming REDD+SES meetings**

**a. Expert workshop on approaches to monitoring and assessing REDD+ safeguards performance, Oxford, UK, 4-5 June - UN-REDD's perspective on SIS**

- UNEP commented that accordingly to Cordula all went well. She will provide a more complete report later.

**Action item:**

- Cordula to send a report and final presentation.

**b. REDD+ SES meeting in Bogor, Indonesia, 1 – 3 July – participation/presentation to be developed**

- UNEP commented that Thomas Enters will participate, therefore the generic slides can be useful.
- UNDP also commented that Aki will also attend.

**Action item:**

- Provide slides to regional colleagues to be used during this workshop. These will be first be circulated to the safeguards group (*Done*).

**6. Publications Review**

**a. Climate Focus paper: "Safeguards in REDD+ and forest carbon standards: a review of social, environmental and procedural concepts and applications" – Table 3 and Section on Applicability <http://www.climatefocus.com/documents/safeguards>**

- UNDP commented that The Secretariat had proposed to discuss the paper, but not to address any specific issue. The suggestion was to omit from the agenda given no Secretariat participation.

**Action item:**

- None.

**i. Safeguards publication log**

- UNDP commented that in order to follow-up on safeguards related documents, they've developed a log of recent REDD+ safeguards articles, reports, etc. that summarizes highlights and areas of relevance to UN-REDD safeguards work. Also that the log has been conceived as a summary matrix plus a specific summary per publication.
- FAO inquired about the audience of the log, if it was meant to be both internal and external.
- UNDP replied that this was planned as an internal source of background information.
- FAO commented that efforts can be put to make one extra step and make it also external if documents were not restricted, as this can be very useful tool for the countries.

**Action item:**

- UNDP will continue to populate and further develop the publication log.

**7. Logistics for Operation of the group**

**a. Regular meetings: proposal to set up standing meetings (set day of week/time, every 2 weeks)**

- FAO commented that this is a very useful initiative but not for every two weeks.
- UNEP support the idea of having meetings every 2 weeks.

**Action item:**

- Liaise among the group for the most convenient day of week/time to schedule the calls.

**b. Set up dedicated calls on key work products (e.g., BeRT and decision-tree)**

- Already discussed earlier

**Action item:**

- Leads on each work item to coordinate these calls after detailed comments have been received from the group on each item.

**c. Proposal for Knowledge Management activities**

- UNDP proposed development of a safeguards wiki to allow access to all the safeguards knowledge and information. This could be located under Multiple Benefits (internal or possibly in the long-term external as well) and can include the following features:
  - Document Management: with links to workspace documents (events, presentations, minutes, summaries of actions points) –Progress Report: Enter the workplan and report progress in the wiki,
  - Include the Safeguards Tracking Tool
  - Include the Safeguards Publication Log
- UNDP explained that this may sound like a lot of effort but once everything in place it will be easier to follow up on our safeguards work.

**8. AOB**

**a. Linkage of NFMS and SIS**

- UNEP mentioned that amongst the work that UNEP-WCMC is undertaking in collaboration with FAO in Tanzania, they are exploring how the NAFORMA may be able to contribute to SIS. The plan is for a brief report on how the current information collected in the forest inventory can feed a Safeguards Information System; and whether there is any scope to modify the survey in

small ways to better provide indicators for a SIS. Additionally, that this was also explored in the session run by Lucy Goodman at the recent LAC MRV workshop coordinated by Adam Gerrand.

- UNEP and FAO would like to discuss with the group, the idea of producing an overview document on the potential role of NFMS in contributing to a SIS, based on the work and outcomes in Tanzania, as well as on any future sessions in FAO's regional workshops.

**Action item:**

- Add this item to the agenda for the next call to discuss & agree scope of any such paper.