**Minutes / Action Points**

**Safeguards Coordination Group**

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

**22 August 2013, 14:30 CET**

**Attendance:**

FAO: Emelyne Cheney, Maria SanzSanchez

UNDP: Kimberly Todd, Jennifer Laughlin, Claudia von Segesser

UNEP: Lera Miles, Julie Greenwalt

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of draft agenda
2. Decision tree tool
3. Additional funding for safeguards
4. AOB

**Minutes:**

1. **Approval of draft agenda**

The draft agenda was approved.

1. **Decision tree tool**
* UNDP started the discussion by giving a general overview in how the different inputs and recommendations (received through the safeguards group review as well as sharing with those agency focal points for the tools and guidance documents referenced in the decision-tree) were addressed. Then UNDP went on to address particular, overarching comments received on structure and form of the tool and proposals for addressing those comments, as discussed and developed between UNDP and FAO (Emelyne as FAO focal point on this work):
	+ *Ensure that the tool is not too structured so countries don’t think they need to implement these steps in that specific order.* Proposal: The Yes/No guiding texts are not meant to be seen by users but rather serve as indications in the design structure to guide the developers to automatically direct the users to the next activity. In addition, however, UNDP shared a proposal that the user should be able to visualize the overall structure/recommended sequence but click through out of sequence rather than that precise order of steps and activities.
	+ *Add additional, clarifying text at different steps, activities.* Proposal: To keep the steps, questions and activities as streamlined and simple as possible. If additional considerations are necessary, the proposal was to include pop-up boxes to provide clearer explanations and items for consideration.
	+ *Make sure the tool includes information regarding other initiatives (i.e. FCPF, REDD+ SES) so countries can more easily place themselves no matter which process they are engaging.* Proposal: To keep activities general and to add pop-up boxes indicating the more specific, corresponding steps/activities under those other initiatives so that countries can place themselves across the different stages.
	+ *Add additional tools.* Proposal: As a significant number of additional resources has been suggested and to ensure that the overall process is clear to the user and not overwhelming it will be necessary to include a brief description on how the tools can be used. Two examples have been prepared as a sample.
* UNEP commented that one of the main values of this tool is to represent both UN-REDD and non-UN-related tools and questioned why other tools had been separated out
* UNDP explained no substantive reason it had been separated or focused on yet. As a first step, the priority had been to get the placement of UN-REDD tools right before expanding out.
* FAO mentioned that the decision tree is useful even as a visualization of the framework and doesn’t necessarily need to be interactive. The group should aim to have an evolving-non-static product that illustrates the steps, which could be tested in the first regional workshop and collect countries’ reactions hence improve (if necessary) the tool with their feedback.
* UNEP remarked that the tool still appeared too prescriptive in terms of the wording of the questions but that the content was good – more a need for reformulation to avoid being prescriptive. Additionally, UNEP offered the reminder that there will be a place to put the tool (as a table or an interactive tree) and its resources in the Multiple Benefits website and that that content management system can be used to store the resources and include the brief descriptions of each.
* UNDP observed that some questions are redundant when compared with the activities, and therefore column C (the questions) could be eliminated altogether. It was also mentioned that this tool is highly important to the safeguards work because it targets where/when we are in a position to provide guidance and therefore where to target/focus our services, in order to be prepared to respond to immediate country needs/requests.
* UNEP cautioned that though there is redundancy between the questions and activities, there is some text in the questions that is not in the activities. If we make the decision to eliminate the questions, we just need to ensure we don’t lose some of that content.
* FAO shared that their experience in MRV showed that countries are overwhelmed with all the documents they need to read and that they need such a breakdown tool to fully understand where they need to go and what they need to build; therefore that the group has to make sure that the message is been conveyed. They added that the tool, in its current form, was already of value and that it could be seen as working product and consequently we need to interact with the real world and get feedback.
* UNEP commented that it important to agree in the basics, i.e. the entry point, the placement of the UN-REDD (related) in the right category, etc., that they can devote time to present the tool in a specific session during the Africa Regional Workshop.
* UNDP also agreed with the idea of presenting the tool in the workshop.
* FAO commented that the questions were formulated in order to develop this as a decision tree, but if the group decides in proceeding with a format that is more of a “mapping” of the safeguards work and guidance/support available, we can adjust. FAO requested the group be flexible on this point and still consider questions if deemed useful.
* UNEP mentioned that having a single column for all tools could also be fine, suggesting that UN-REDD tools could be in a different color. They also supported the idea of running the tool in the Nairobi workshop, pointing out that for this purpose, questions should be formulated to pose to the participants to get the most out of the exercise. This will also be very helpful to the facilitator(s) of this session. UNEP (Julie) suggested a willingness to facilitate such a session.
* UNDP added that there was another important comment to be considered:
	+ *Include a reference for countries that have or will consider the development of national set of safeguards.* Proposal: Make an explicit reference - currently, it’s been added to the “planning the safeguards approach” step.
* UNEP explained that they had seen this as implicit in the development of PLRs activity, but agreed that perhaps too implicit and would be an improvement to include an explicit reference. They added that this is quite a start stage question that can ask whether they have intentions or they are currently working on that.

**Action item:**

* UNDP and FAO to digest the group’s feedback, prepare a revised version and share it with the group, taking into account the timeline required in order to have a product ready to share at the Sept. workshop.
* UNEP to present/test an agreed, draft version during the Africa Regional Workshop which is scheduled for 17-19 September in Nairobi.
1. **Additional funding for safeguards**
* UNEP proposed to request funding for safeguards analysis in order to gather lessons learned in how countries are approaching safeguards.
* FAO proposed that taking into consideration the growing demand the safeguards request should focus on calling for additional funds to offer targeted support, in line with the Conceptual Framework. Costa Rica was given as an example of a case where FAO did not have sufficient funds to offer.
* UNEP commented that it will be necessary to confirm if the deadline (14 June 2014) set by Norway implied expenditures. FAO commented that is likely that due date implies only allocation and commitment.
* *Furthermore via email (due to technical problems with the phone line), UNEP proposed that moreover to the TS funding the SCG should also request additional funds to strengthen capacities within the programme as well, in order to provide training and to hire more staff/experts on safeguards. They suggested it was worth considering hiring a “safeguards coordinator”. Additionally they proposed to have funds focused on strengthening collaboration especially with the WB on the SESA process and engaging more with the UNFCCC and CBD to ensure more coherent advice and support to countries.*

**Action item:**

* UN-REDD Secretariat to confirm with Norway the implications of the deadline.
* Agencies agreed in request additional funding (as a group) for TS in safeguards, to ensure consistency with the SCG conceptual framework and the countries’ growing demands.
* UNDP to send the group’s response via email to the UN-REDD Secretariat (Helena) by today COB. *(done)*

*“We see a strong need for additional targeted support on national approaches to safeguards to meet growing demand. Generally, the scope of such targeted support that we could offer would be support on implementing national safeguards approaches, using as a guide the conceptual framework on safeguards which we’ve developed as a Programme. Using this framework as a guide, we could assist countries to consider the steps/activities as part of their national approach to safeguards. Particular components could be emphasized more, given the scope of a particular TS request, but always seeking to ensure that the support well-integrated into their overall safeguards approach. As part of this support, we could guide countries through the application of various tools, guidance and other resources that could be very useful at particular stages or particular aspects of the safeguards/SIS work, including both UN-REDD as well as external tools and resources.*

*In order to meet this increased need we are seeing from countries, and to provide the support in a timely and effective way, we also feel there is a need to need to strengthen capacities within the UN-REDD programme on safeguards and safeguard information systems. This could include trainings for UN-REDD staff but we think it will likely be necessary, with the increasing country demand in this area, to also increase our staff/expertise on safeguards. We realize it could be difficult to specifically indicate staffing costs as a need for this type of proposal, but we think it goes hand-in-hand with providing strong technical and programmatic support to any ramp-up in TS on safeguards/SIS.*

*Additionally, to increase the effectiveness of support, we see a need for strengthening collaboration with key external initiatives and institutions also providing global support on safeguards and SIS.*

*Drawing from the targets in the SNA monitoring framework, the activities would seek to result in those supported countries advancing both (1) measures to address and respect safeguards and (2) design and implementation of the safeguard information system, guided by the UN-REDD Programme approach.*

*The related SNA outputs are:*

*Output 5.2: Countries make use of support to develop approaches to address and respect safeguards*

*Output 5.3: Countries make use of support to provide information on how safeguards are addressed and respected”*