**UNDP Comments on the “UN-REDD Viet Nam Programme Phase II: Operationalising REDD+ in Viet Nam”**

These comments represent a compilation of comments provided by several UNDP reviewers.

**Logical framework**

As previously commented, there are three issues to be addressed:

**Output 1.1**: It should not be assumed that the coordination mechanism designed for the initial phase of readiness (National REDD+ Network) is appropriate for scale-up and eventually for coordination during implementation of REDD+. Furthermore, it is understood that the UN-REDD PMU is preparing for an evaluation of the National REDD+ Network, so depending on the results of that evaluation, the Network might not even survive to the start of Phase 2. Suggested revised wording (2nd and 3rd sentences of the Output):

“*An appropriate coordination mechanism will be designed to ensure effective stakeholder engagement and participation in Phase 2 implementation and further scale-up to a national level and full implementation of REDD+. The capacity of the mechanism will be developed during Phase 2 to ensure sustainability thereafter*.”

An indicator could then be added to the logical framework matrix, to the effect that an appropriate mechanism is designed and established within 4 months of the start of project implementation.

**Outcome 3**: Although the actual emission reductions are intended to be secured under this Outcome, the text is not clear on this issue, and the indicators do not measure performance.

Suggested new title for the Outcome: “*Verifiable reduced emissions from, and enhanced removals by forestlands in the pilot provinces*”.

Suggested re-wording of initial paragraph:

“*This outcome will ensure that reduced emissions from deforestation, reduced emissions from degradation, and enhanced carbon storage are achieved in the pilot provinces, leading to verified performances payments being made. Supporting activities leading to this result include providing individual forest users with the required skills, information and support to develop livelihoods that lead to reduced emissions or enhanced carbon storage*.”

Output 3.3 seems to be stakeholder-endorsed plans, and Output 3.4 would logically be the results of implementation of those plans. It is not clear, therefore, why the title of Output 3.4 is “Ad hoc” plans ... . Why not reflect Output 3.3 by titling 3.4 as “*Stakeholder-endorsed plans under implementation*”, or similar?

The indicators for Output 3.4 in the logical framework matrix should include:

“*By the end of the 2nd year of programme implementation* (or ... *after 18 months of programme implementation ...*), *stakeholder-endorsed plans under implementation in each province*”; and

“*By the end of the 4th year of implementation, net emissions from each pilot province reduced by the following target amounts: Province A, x tonnes; Province B, y tonnes;* etc.”. The targets would then be established during the next 9 months, using “Quick Start” funds.

Thirdly, UNDP would endorse UNEP comments on the need to look at other drivers beside wood-based industries, which are covered in Output 1.6. Since Outcome 2 deals with operationalizing the National REDD+ Programme in pilot provinces, a viable new Output, mirroring Output 1.6, could be Output 2.5: “*Major primary industries in the pilot provinces endorse and implement plans to increase sustainability of production of their raw materials and to reduce emissions*”.

The indicators for Output 2.5 in the logical framework matrix should include:

“*By the end of the 2nd year of programme implementation* (or ... *after 18 months of programme implementation ...*), *at least one* *industry-endorsed plan for increased sustainability and reduced emissions, including objectively verifiable measures of sustainability, under implementation in each province*”; and

“*By the end of the 4th year of implementation, measures of sustainability for each industry for which an industry-endorsed plan has been implemented, show statistically significant increases in sustainability*”.

**Stakeholder Engagement**

Overall the document is well thought out and pays close attention to the differentiated needs of ethnic minorities and women. There could, however, be greater clarity on certain issues outlined below.

Ethnic Minorities and Indigenous Peoples:

* There is reference to the term “Indigenous Peoples” on page 9. Other than this the term “minority ethnic groups” or “ethnic minorities” is used throughout the document. It is assumed that these terms are being used somewhat inter-changeably. However, if there are Indigenous Peoples with a long-term social/cultural/spiritual/economic association with particular lands or resources, these groups should be highlighted specifically.
* It is noted in the document that poverty is persistent for ethnic minorities in the upland forested areas (p14), and that ethnic minorities are, in general, likely to have a high dependence on forested areas. It would be useful to state what the status of ethnic minority and Indigenous Peoples groups are with regards to political marginalisation, particularly with regards to decision making processes and political representation.

Stakeholder engagement:

Intent to support meaningful stakeholder engagement and the full and effective participation of ethnic minorities, Indigenous Peoples and other forest dependent communities could be better expressed in the outcome areas.

* At the local-level this could be expressed more effectively under Outcome 2 (pp33-34) on the operationalisation of REDD+ in 5 provinces. Under the activity area 2.1 on provincial planning and programming, reference is made to the development of “participatory tools”, the use of “guided participation” and the inclusion of gender and social analysis. This could be expanded to elaborate how important marginalised groups will be fully included in the planning process (e.g., through the development of provincial-level stakeholder engagement strategies; representation of these groups on provincial-level decision making committees etc).
* The development of communications materials for a diverse set of stakeholders (e.g., government, regional counterparts, communities at the local level) may require a broad communications mandate. Suggest reflecting this in the description of communications human resources needs (p44) or elsewhere.
* Will the Executive Board (p72) should also include representatives from Indigenous Peoples/ethnic minority groups and Civil Society (please refer to the UN-REDD Programme Operational Guidance on Stakeholder Engagement for guidance.
* The Participants Board (p72) should also include Indigenous Peoples and women as groups that should be represented.
* The Complaints Board elaborated under the organisational structure (p72-73) could be used to support FPIC. It could be stated that the Participants Board may also appeal to national and international courts to settle disputes as well as any UNFCCC bodies.

FPIC:

There is currently only one mention of FPIC in the document (p27). This does not provide a context or explanation on what FPIC is and how it will be incorporated into work during Phase 2 of the programme. It is suggested that a clear explanation of how FPIC is being developed and will be applied should be presented in the document.

* Activity area 2.1 under outcome 2 should also provide an indication of how free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) activities will be developed at the provincial-level.

UN-REDD Programme Operational Guidance on Stakeholder Engagement:

* The document should refer specifically to the UN-REDD Programme Operational Guidance on Stakeholder Engagement in defining its stakeholder engagement and FPIC priorities, as well as elaborating how Indigenous Peoples/ethnic minorities and other forest dependent communities will be involved in decision-making processes.

Focus on forest “owners” rather than “users”:

* The strategy concentrates on providing support and engaging actively with forest “owners” rather than forest “users”. Given the observation that “only about 1% of land is owned by communities” but that the “area of land under community management is much higher” (p9), it should be clarified whether the programme only intends to work with formal owners of forested land in direct engagement of REDD+ activities and benefit distribution. If so, it is possible that many stakeholders will be omitted. It is suggested that the document be clearer about the different types of formal and informal rights communities may have with the land and how it will include all forest dependent communities; this could be done under outcome 3 (P34-37).
* It is indicated in the document that supporting the decentralisation of land ownership is an activity that is being pursued by the government. Support for this process could be made more explicit in the document under national and provincial outcome areas.

Governance:

* The section on good-governance on page 20 can be significantly strengthened. Information to consider include:
  + The National REDD+ Governance work area section of the [UN-REDD Strategy](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3226&Itemid=53)
  + The Transparent, Equitable, Accountable Management of REDD+ Payments work area section of the UN-REDD Strategy
  + Multi-Stakeholder, Country-Led Governance Assessments. See the [draft UN-REDD note](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3677&Itemid=53) on this approach and note that its application is to be led by the [Oslo Governance Centre](http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/flagship/democratic_governance_assessments.html).
  + Anti-Corruption and REDD+:
    - The [draft UN-REDD scope of work](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3988&Itemid=53)
    - UNDP publication “[Staying on Track](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3773&Itemid=53)”
    - Presentations and reports from the UN-REDD/GTZ side-event at the International Anti-Corruption Conference, available on the [UN-REDD workspace](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=805&Itemid=53)
* We recommend there is also reference in the document to social and environmental principles and how they will be applied in phase II. More information on this is available in the [summary](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3554&Itemid=53) presented to the Policy Board and the [draft risk-assessment tool](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3357&Itemid=53) for social principles
* While the Multi-Stakeholder, Country-Led Governance Assessments and the social principles risk-assessment tool are still under development, they nevertheless both can provide a contribution to the strengthening of the Risk Log in Table 4. Even the current draft of the risk-assessment tool could be used as a contribution to the Risk Log before the prodoc is finalised and submitted to Norway.
* Include the application of Multi-Stakeholder, Country-Led Governance Assessment, social and environmental principles, and anti-corruption measures in the Results Framework (suggest under Outcome 1) and Budget. Also reflect in the TORs for the Forest Governance technical advisors (international and national)

Fund management:

* The arrangements in Annex G should reflect the points agreed with Norway at the meeting in Bangkok on 13th Nov:
  + To be the most efficient for the Government of Viet Nam
  + To reflect the UN-REDD Programme as the supporting mechanism of phase II