Regional UN-REDD Country Programme Teams Information Exchange Meeting

Bangkok, 8-10 Nov., 2010

Background

The aim of the meeting was to exchange information among national UN-REDD teams. The direct exchange of information is one element of the comprehensive process of information exchange for Asia-Pacific which the UN-REDD Programme is developing.

This report provides a summary of key issues raised and discussions in the meeting
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| DAY 1 – 8 Nov 2010 |

Introduction to UN-REDD Global Programme, Tim Clairs:

UN-REDD PB meetings transitioning out of procedural discussions to information and policy lesson sessions.

Update on country programmes:

* PNG – Importance of governance structure that welcomes and respects the positions of CSOs and IPs; need for stronger stakeholder engagement and validation process.

Update on UN-REDD Regionally, Petteri Vuorinen, FAO Regional Co-ordinator:

Approved national programmes

* Cambodia
* Indonesia
* PNG
* Philippines
* Solomon Islands

Japan Government and UN-REDD Regional Programme agreement: Pacific Islands and Mongolia supported through Japan-funded Regional Project (Oct 2010)

Regional support activities:

* REDD roadmap in Cambodia
* Analysis of Benefit Distribution Systems Viet Nam
* REL study in Viet Nam
* FPIC pilot in Viet Nam
* Regional database on REDD+ Readiness capacity by country

Regional work summary:

* Information sharing
* Increasing awareness of UN-REDD programme
* Harmonization of proceedings
* A lot of the work is invisible/behind the scenes

Q&A:

Q – Akiko Inoguchi, FAO, Viet Nam:

* Is there an intentional effort being made to try to engage as many countries as possible to avoid leakage?

A - Tim Clairs:

* Effort to co-ordinate countries, to harmonize and ensure consistency in approaches
* On leakage issue, yes REDD is generally trying to. However whether the different countries have the ability and capacity to address this is another question. Need to consolidate and deliver before we expand out into other countries.

Q – Martin Krause:

* What will be the funding base for REDD? Market-based or fund-based?

A – Tim Clairs:

* Mentioned Solheim’s comment on a market based mechanism being 10 years away; still an issue
* Fast start pledges of about $4 billion have been made; ODA and public funding. Supposed to be carried out until 2012
* Going to be a few years as a fund-based mechanism, but the market-based mechanism will

International coordination mechanism for REDD+ readiness: the interim REDD+ Partnership, Leif-John Fosse, Senior Advisor, Ministry of the Environment, Norway:

* Objective to scale up what is already happening and allow lesson learning and information exchange.
* Voluntary framework/non-legally binding
* Based on the safeguards provided by the draft AWG-LCA text

Cancun 2010:

* Unlikely to culminate in approved REDD+ text as the text is not at an advanced enough stage and political will from some of the larger countries is lacking

What could be achieved?

* Scope of REDD+ (which activities would be eligible)
* Phased approach (capacity building to
* Guidelines to safeguard biodiversity and indigenous peoples/communities; fiduciary safeguards; benefit sharing
* MRV – close to agreement on this
* Assessment of financial options for implementation of all phases
* Guidance on bi-lateral/multilateral initiatives until global REDD+ mechanism is in place
* Provide REDD+ Partnership with guidance on MRV, principles and safeguards, phased approach

Q – Martin Krause

* Support is being delivered through UN-REDD, FCPF or bilateral initiatives. Different modalities for offering support. Norway is involved in 3 different ways of delivering aid. From a perspective of aid effectiveness, countries in the region are concerned about the complex landscape of aid disbursement and a transaction costs at the country level is quite high. What is the donor perspective on this?

A – Leif-John

* It is complicated, REDD+ Partnership may be able to provide greater co-ordination on this.
* The only thing that pre-dated Norway’s pledge to REDD+ was FCPF’s pledge in Bali. Norway could have channeled all funds through the World Bank, but after discussions with other agencies the UN-REDD Programme was set up in response to perceived needs to support. FCPF is not taking a big role in many countries in phase 2 of REDD+. While the World Bank provides the financial muscle and overview on REDD+, the UN provides different skills such as MRV, stakeholder engagement and programming for phase 2 activities.
* Many countries getting to engage in phase 2 are interested in implementing activities on a national basis with bilateral funding. This is why there are combinations of funding and perhaps there should be room for these types of funding mechanisms at the national level.
* Countries where sectors that make the backbone of the economy may need some changes, FIP becomes a useful partner for changing incentives away from current practices.
* Each of these instruments has their own strengths and weaknesses. Try to avoid too many bilateral actions. Norway does not have the framework to support and follow up large bilateral actions, therefore depends heavily on the multilateral initiatives. Only use bilateral when it is a negotiated outcome that is seen as adding value with specific countries.

Q – Tim Clairs

* Interim REDD+ Partnership – concerns on the openness and inclusiveness employed by this process, e.g., the exclusion of civil society

A – Leif-John

* This was not the mandate of the partnership and actions of the co-chairs have not been consistent with the partnership’s principles. And there is a need to ensure that both the current and next co-chair-ship need to adhere to these values.

Establishing and managing broad-based multi-stakeholder networks, Tim Boyle:

Models for stakeholder engagement

Many government ministries and non-governmental stakeholders (positive and negative REDD+ impacts)

* LESSON: Impact and sustainability are impossible without broad-based “ownership” of the process

Need: Broad-based multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism for developing and implementing REDD+

* LESSON: Start this at the beginning – retrofitting painful and difficult
* LESSON: Slow at the beginning but time invested will result in more rapid progress later

Excellent progress in Cambodia with roadmap etc, because of good investment at the beginning.

Cambodia Readiness:

Write Roadmap 2010; implement roadmap 2010-2015 (build capacity; align policies); Participate in REDD+ 2015 onwards

Cambodia background:

* 19 technical working groups, quite large, meeting infrequently, slow to make decisions
* Created through high-level decisions – thus difficult to form a new one
* TWG on Forest and Env; Agr and Water; National climate change commission
* National REDD+ taskforce was established – Gov. Agencies with mandate to manage forests; ministry of land management + NGO observers (RECOFTC and Clinton Climate Initiative); may be open to more members
* Consultation on the road-map; focus group meetings with stakeholder groups
	+ CSO was asked what kind of consultation process they wanted (process, how frequently)

LESSONS:

* Need to consider existing coordination mechanisms, see how the requirements of REDD+ readiness
* Viet Nam – large coordination body; any organization that feels it has an interest can decide to join (40+ members, NGOs, dev partners, government partners); CMB smaller body. Depends on the country context
* Need to have a driver. E.g., Tom Clements hired as neutral facilitator/driver of the Cambodian taskforce; Viet Nam is lacking this at the moment.
* Need to take time and effort to invest in an appropriate process

Comment from Thomas Enters on RECOFTC

* Trust and good working relationship with the RECOFTC programme which helped with the positive outcome
* There are 2 NGO/CSO organizations in this working group – why is it that you don’t have local/national NGOs

A – Keo Omaliss

* NGOs included have been working o. Don’t seem to know which local NGOs in Cambodia are working on REDD+. Have been trying to reach out to them but they have low capacity to engage in REDD+, this is one of the main activities in Cambodia to try to build their capacity.

Coordination with other activities in Viet Nam, Akiko Inoguchi:

Need to include all stakeholders in order to call it a success for REDD+

Coordination-related issues:

* Uncoordinated activities (timing, resources: e.g., NGO partners in FPIC, strategy)
* Missed information
* Overlaps/duplication

Mechanisms:

* Set up forum – committees – working groups – different mechanisms
* Vietnam: National network composed of
	+ REDD+ working group – review info and advise government
	+ Secretariat – built on Forest Sector Support Partnership, existing secretariat (aware of partners etc)
	+ Sub-groups on MRV and local implementation (+ new groups being developed on BDS and governance)

Issues with coordination:

* National REDD+ Network doesn’t guarantee coordination – needs more in-depth discussion
* Working Groups – need secretariat/driver; government participation; need to be recognized as official for a and used to
* Network/WG coordinator – needs understanding of REDD and the resources to focus on coordination

Answers to coordination:

* Communication (e.g., national REDD website, google list-serve) BUT need strong website/list-serve manager (perhaps coordination officer?) that has REDD knowledge and skills AND tailored to different audiences)
* Need time and patience; functional mechanisms; communication tools; good coordinator/coordination office; strong links to government
* Political will to coordinate.

What UN-REDD Programme needs to do to facilitate coordination:

* Need to promote coordination across the board
* Use – neutrality; proactive communication
* Need to promote and build capacity in coordination = allocate enough time and human resources to do this

Q – Philippines

* What kind of driver/leadership is needed? Who should drive this?
* Representation in Viet Nam – what about NGOs?

Comment – Cambodia

* Design roadmap as a communication tool before developing programme
* Drivers important in Cambodia (e.g., Omaliss)
* Support from UN-REDD Programme instrumental in giving the process momentum
* Taskforce – people of the same age group and technical backgrounds (climate; forest etc)

Q/Comment – Tim Clairs

* On drivers - Tom Clemments worked for Government of Cambodia and money leveraged allowed them to hire WCS; was a process that catalysed integration across ministries
* Cambodian technical working groups – can only government members be involved? NGOs/CSOs need to be involved in decision making, without duplication of bodies
* Akiko on openness and transparency – UN-REDD Programme has a disclosure policy
* Philippines – need for coordination and involvement of stakeholders; has a REDD+ strategy available on website; achieved this without multi-lateral assistance and was driven by NGO sector that worked to bring in government.

A – Akiko Inoguchi

* NGOs part of the working groups and mechanisms; but how involved do they feel? At the meetings but comments that outputs look like UN-REDD outputs – need for UN-REDD Programme to support but not project itself.

A – Tim Boyle

* Driver, needs to be neutral. Issues with redressing poor existing relationships between different ministries.

A – Keo Omaliss

* Drivers also have to be the government as well; past relationship between NGOs and government poor. Important to build trust; very important.
* National REDD+ taskforce does not allow; but can set up a mechanism to allow other stakeholders to input 1) thru WGs; 2) mechanism to allow stakeholders to comment on decisions. This is a process that allows stakeholders to feel comfortable with process and is in future activities.

A – Philippines

* Government joined REDD+ process later on; it became a good partnership; joint consultation with good working relationship with NGOs; joint effort of government and NGOs

Q – Thomas Enters

* How old were the taskforce members in Cambodia?
* “Stakeholder” – do you include the private sector?
* NGOs and forest management board bureau in the Philippines work very closely together – non unusual for NGOs to kick start the process and Government to partner. Very different from Viet Nam, perhaps things are changing a bit in Philippines

A – Lay Khim, Cambodia

* 35-40 yrs, dynamic people; lesson learning from Viet Nam.

Q – Philippines

* Rights to communities and IP groups; coordination more for government/NGO and funding agencies. Where are they coming into the discussions? E.g., communication tools, leaflets – languages; would communities have access? What are the specific roles of these communities – in international negotiations there are many comments on how we are incorporating rights of the IPs

A – Akiko

* Viet Nam – IPs come under local implementation sub-technical working group which involves some NGOs and work on the ground to include IP concerns. Include meetings in Hanoi as well as the Provinces.

A – Tim Boyle

* FPIC is a continuum of activities from local level up; need to look at it as a harmonized whole – taking a rights-based approach.

Q – Jeeva, Cambodia

* Comparative advantages of different agencies. FAO has been working on PRAs/RRAs – community based interventions on the ground. Is that going well..?

A – Keo Omaliss

* CSO involvement – currently in the planning process. Therefore important to discuss what we plan to do, rather than what we are going to do.
* Consultation is to allow them to decide what they want to do; therefore it’s their responsibility to discuss and decide.

Q – Indonesia

* Very complex when it comes to NGOs; multiple relationships to manage (national NGOs, local NGOs, provincial government, national government). Lack of trust between NGOs and government; can work together when they trust each other and need to build that trust.

Managing UN-REDD Country Programmes, Tim Clairs:

1. Scoping and formulation stage: completes with submission to PB and approval of funds allocation (e.g., Solomon Islands; Philippines)
2. Revision and finalization: completes with PB approval of national programme (e.g., Bolivia, DRC, Indonesia, Panma, Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia
3. Implementation: DRC, Indonesia, Tanzania Viet Nam

Multiple Delivery Partners for FCPF

* UN Agencies to manage WB R-PP grants (ADB, AfDB, IntAmerDB); 5 pilot countries for pilot phase - Cambodia and Panama have expressed their interest in UNDP as delivery partner; 3 other pilots to be determined by 17 Nov 2010 (may be Latin American)
* CSO and NGO members of FCPF very engaged; shouldn’t be a race to the bottom in safeguards and standards; interest in ensuring that standards are maintained; multilateral banks have similar standards; UN don’t have formal safeguards policies; fiduciary safeguards are similar, but social and environmental aren’t.
* Pilot phase will look at ensuring common approach to social and environmental standards.

Fund disbursement mechanisms:

* Extra layer of bureaucracy to release funding for FAO (letter of agreement) and UNEP (PCA)
* Burden of coordination on National Counterpart
* Could transfer directly and allow agencies to separately retain funds for direct services

HACT

* Risk assessment approach to fund disbursement
* Macro/micro assessment of fund disbursement history at the macro (national) level and micro (institutions within in the country) level (e.g., existing institutional capacity and systems)
* Modalities can be (in decreasing order of risk) direct cash transfer; direct payment; reimbursement; agency implementation (use in post-conflict situation)

Q – Jeeva

* Cambodia example – don’t eliminate the LoA as the FAO still has to internally disburse
* What happens to the taxes and duties paid to government. Another approach? If government is involved in disbursement

Q – Machfud

* Each institution uses its own mechanism and collaboration is thwarted; treating the government as a sub-contractor. What is the process for the UN-REDD programme in this case?

Q – Patrick Durst

* Issues of absorptive capacity and the right pace of funding?
* HACT approach – how long has it been around and what experiences are there with it? Any bad experiences?

A – Tim Clairs

* If there are already LoAs that the UN-REDD Programme can take advantage of, that can speed up the process. Problem with Cambodia NDP was presented; looks like double dipping = reputational risks to all of us. Doesn’t think taxes/duties are an issue, those are usually covered by a standard agreement.
* Must listen to governments which are asking for one interface to deal with; ultimately this is about supporting the countries.
* Want to ensure that this is a country led process and have to work towards ensuring gov doesn’t feel like it’s a sub-contractor.

A – Leif-John

* Norway – want to strike a balance between a breadth of involvement with the depth of tackling certain issues.

Q/Comment – Akiko

* Where are the decisions going to be made on this? Is it going to be top down? The most important thing to get things moving is the scope for flexibility.

Q – Lay Khim

* When will this modality be applied?

Q – Keo Omaliss

* Double dipping not acceptable from Cambodia’s perspective
* Seems disconnect between UN agencies in terms of coordination
* Choose the pooled approach as Cambodia wants a process owned by the country itself

Q/Comment – Tim Boyle

* Have 9 + 20 countries; now strategy asks for support for 11 more.
* Criteria development for targeted support or 9+20? [no answer for this as yet.]

A - Tim Clairs

* Modality hasn’t been decided

Annual and quarterly work planning, Pak Machfud, Chief Tech Adv. UN-REDD Indonesia:

* July 2008 – March 2009: initial analysis
* March 2009 – March 2010: PD approved; SE consultations
* Not sure when programme started as there has been differences between the disbursement times of different agencies.
* LoA and PCA will be signed in Nov 2010

Key stakeholders for UN-REDD:

* Government
* CSOs (AMAN, local NGOs, TNC, WWF, Kemitraan)
* Donors (Norway, Denmark etc)
* Others (CIFOR, Universities private sector)

In process of recruiting communication consultants (both international and national)

Activities –

* Capacity for spatial socio-economic planning
* Inception workshop March 2010 – central Sulawesi main focus (some activities in other provinces in Sulawesi)
* Harmonised Implementation Arrangements (HIA) for UN Agencies)
* HACT analysis has been completed
* Network and outreach (www. un-red.org/id)
* Established network with local NGOs (started May 2010 to present); more than 30 NGOs contacted, 4 meetings conducted
* Official communication with province government
* UN-REDD Province launched 13 Oct 2010
* Recruited regional coordinator (Nov 2010)

Progress and Financial reporting, Programme Manager UN-REDD Viet Nam: Nguyen Thi Thu Huyen, Programme Manager, UN-REDD, Vietnam

Q – Huyen

* How has HACT been implemented in Indonesia

A – Pak Machfud

* HACT has been implemented twice

Q - Machfud

* What should happen after Pilot phase in Indonesia

A – Leif-John

* UN-REDD needs to discuss with the taskforce how it will fit into the picture

Comment – Tim Boyle

* Secretariat is supposed to be developing a monitoring and evaluation process
* Going to have to bring in provisions for that in the absence of that

Q –Keo Omaliss

* Programme is designed with many outputs but cannot go on for more than 2 years. How to manage to deliver them.

A -Tim Clairs

* Not necessarily true, can plan for 3 yrs, but only yearly disbursement
* UN-REDD has a sunset clause of 2012, but that shouldn’t affect things and is most likely going to be extended.

A -Tim Clairs

* Can revise activities/funding, but not outcomes.
* Country-led decision making to decide what is the right modality (re: pooled funding); not up to UN to decide, but need to capture that process so that countries can make informed decisions.

Q-Vietnam

* As Vietnam and Indonesia have problems with HACT, why don’t included micro assessment in the designing phase of the project.
* As the assessment cost is high so it’s better to start the process after project document is approved and signed.
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Preparing a REDD+ readiness roadmap in Cambodia, Keo Omaliss, Forestry Administration, Royal Government of Cambodia:

2 REDD Pilot projects developed for voluntary carbon market

1. Oddar Meanchey community forests: community forest
2. Seima protection forest: indigenous peoples

Roadmap is a planning, not a strategy or implementation plan (this will be developed in next 2 yrs); similar to R-PP format

Process of development:

* Multi agency technical taskforce formed in Jan 2010 (Government and international NGOs); WCS playing coordinating role
* Meet twice a month
* Start with a lot of initial training to build knowledge so they can understand the issues
* Feb-Aug 2010 – background studies on legal; carbon benefit; forest policy and governance; REL MRV etc.
* Feb-July 2010 – consultations with NGO networks in drafting roadmap
* Consultation – government alone can’t do it, so need assistance from other areas

Consultation and participation process:

* Phase 1 – initial awareness raising
* Phase 2 – Small scale focused consultation
* Phase 3 – National consultation mainly first with NGOs who then communicate to IPs and other CSOs

REDD readiness roadmap

* National plan of how to move ahead with REDD+ Readiness
* Has to be approved by stakeholders

Stakeholder consultation

* Will show how stakeholders will be engaged in the process throughout the implementation of the Roadmap – lots of input from CSOs, asking for a lot of capacity building especially on the ground level

Preparing and linking R-PP to other processes in Viet Nam, Richard McNally, SNV:

Phases of World Bank:

1. Readiness (including R-PP)
2. Capacity, reforms and investments
3. Operations

 FIP – looks more at structural reforms

R-PP limited to early planning phase, analytical and systems design

1. Organize and consult (including stakeholder consultation and participation)
* UNREDD and WB worked together to develop the R-PP using their comparative strengths. Provides a common framework for all donors and agencies to follow.
* Need to decide on roles and responsibilities under the R-PP
* Needs to be a country by country
* Needs to be an agency that is the clear lead (UN-REDD in Viet Nam and Cambodia) – should be based on clear criteria

Q – Akiko

* What did you think about the stakeholder consultation process?
* Government should lead the process which can be facilitated by an external consultant

Q – Celia

* SESA was addressed in R-PP and there has been an FPIC process; has this also been addressed in the process.

Q – Chanel

* Ownership of forest by people – how were stakeholders represented in the taskforce?

A – Keo Omaliss

* Each country has a different status, depends on the law. E.g., to be a formal member of the government body is impossible. But there are many ways to incorporate the community. Consultation plan needs to be based on their decision.

A – Richard

* Under R-PP process there is a format for stakeholder consultation that have to take place, could have had more detailed discussions but it met the requirements. Is now a detailed consultation plan.

A – Pham Manh Cuong

* During preparation of R-PP only requires country to sketch out the consultation process rather than carry out the full consultation process. Some reviewers erroneously believed that the consultation process needs to be completed before the R-PP is completed. Need to develop different strategy for stakeholders; avoid flooding people with information and confusing stakeholders. Participation with local communities and forest managers is very important. Private sector consultation missing.

Comment – Lay Khim

* Need to be aware of the impacts of stakeholder consultation. In Cambodia the consultation with the private sector is missing. Need to structure consultation in a way that will be positive. Different groups, e.g.,: Government/policy makers; development partners/donors that could help support but not make policy decisions; IPs/communities/CSOs; groups that could have a negative impact, industrial and private sector. These groups are needed to be balance in stakeholder consultation.
* Cambodia – IP consultation is embedded into the overall implementation structure (NGO and CSO consultation group). But when it comes to the government, Ministry of Rural Development plays a role in designing IP development policy. Also have a Consultation and Safeguards Technical Team, includes consultation with IPs and CSOs.

Q – Machfudh

* What is the relationship between UN-REDD and FCPF. Tried to do the same in Indonesia, collaborating between the two. But UN-REDD has moved a lot faster and FCPF has been left far behind. How, from the UN-REDD standpoint can we manage this?

A – Richard

* Situation is very different in Viet Nam. FCPF is happy to fit into the UN-REDD structure, where the UN-REDD is leading. Needs to be some discussion at the country-level between UN-REDD and FCPF.

Comment – Jeeva

* Collaboration between FCPF and UN-REDD is one issue. What about collaboration between the UN Agencies. Hard to work with UNDP at the country level as FAO is being left outside the process. UNDP is making decisions without consulting FAO or keeping them informed. This affects the relationship during implementation.

A – Keo Omaliss

* Jeeva needs to better understand the process with the Road Map. Tom Clements is a consultant who has been hired to assist the government. Is confusing for Omaliss too, as we engage and consult together; Jeremy Broadhead also involved in the process. Roadmap has been given to all agencies to comment. These consultations have involved all stakeholders that are key in REDD. FAO was at one stage the chair of the workshop. If anything happens, they need to discuss and not ignore the government. FAO didn’t really support the government work on this. Need to let the government know if they have issues. Want to work with FAO but don’t know what the solution is. The process is very clear, consultation is not just with the local community but with everyone. Need to discuss further between the UN agencies. Not easy to get to the stage that we have, have never engaged with local communities and are making a lot of progress. Donors need to ask the UN agencies what their role is; is the money going to the UN agencies or to the country?

Comment – Philippines

* Private sector invited; couldn’t engage in the initial stages, but later on joined. Right now included in all consultations. Now realize that this is very important.

Comment – Tim Clairs

* New version of the R-PP template that has been posted last weeks; includes comments from UN-REDD. More work to harmonize; the R-PP will soon be compatible with UN-REDD

UNFCCC/IPCC guidelines and requirements, Danilo Mollicone, FAO:

Regional perspective: technical requirements and options, Patrick Van Laake, UN-REDD Senior Technical Advisor, Viet Nam:

Have carried out studies to estimate value of forest, estimated $350 million/year

What goes into a REL:

* Scope (what is it about? Deforestation, enhancement, historical or prospective)
* Scale (geographical area over which it applies)
* Period (Backwards or prospective)

Reference levels for enhancements are always forward looking

REL should be a conservative estimate – will make the buyers have more confidence

5 carbon pools

1. Above-ground biomass
2. Below- ground biomass
3. Dead wood
4. Litter
5. Soil organic matter

Country presentation on REL: Indonesia, Hermawan Indrabudi, Team Leader 2 UN-REDD

Presented the different rates of deforestation in different areas of Indonesia

Q –

Forest degradation data is hard to obtain so we are not tackling it, but that doesn’t mean that we can’t think about it now

Q – Georg GTZ

* Indonesia and Viet Nam have different approaches to categorising. Indonesia: Ecosystem based approach; Viet Nam: national boundary approach

A - Patrick

* The two systems are not incompatible

A – Danilo

* Harmonisation of methods could be achieved through the IPCC guidelines.

Comment – Viet Nam

* Other key instruments that could be referred to include Rio Declaration; CBD
* Customary laws in the REDD+ process

Q – Keo Omaliss

* Rights of IPs – why don’t people follow it? Is it because it is not legally binding?
* Consultation process – IPs not represented because they are not going through a voting process. How could government consult with them

A – Lisa

* International law is not enforced, thus need to look at each treaty and convention and see if there are enforcement provisions. ILO have implementation provisions; UNDRIP is not legally binding, but sets out the framework that the international community should work towards. Legal framework will be set in the CoP decision ultimately.
* Provision that IPs have these rights but are not entitled to those rights if they tread over the rights of other people.

Comment – Viet Nam

* Toolkit developed by the WRI capturing the implementation of the Rio Declaration

A – Thomas Enters

* Clarified that question was about groups claiming to represent IPs when they are not.

A – Tim Boyle

* This should be addressed in the National REDD+ strategy, there should be a strategy to address that problem.

Stakeholder engagement in the UN-REDD Programme, Gaya Sriskanthan, UNDP HQ

The presentation provided overview of the eengagement of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities, and Civil Society in the UN-REDD programme which lead to a long discussion on FPIC. The presentation cover :

1. UN-REDD and the UN Human Rights Based Approach
2. Governance of UN-REDD: The Policy Board
3. Operational Guidance on Engagement of IPs & CS: Alignment of UN-REDD and FCPF Approaches
4. Free Prior & Informed Consent (FPIC) and Recourse Mechanisms
5. Emerging Good Practice for Consultation: Paraguay

Principles of FPIC and international legal framework, Lisa Ogle, Consultant, Australia

The presentation highlighted the overview of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) included Right of IPs to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) which applicable to UN-REDD programme

Applying FPIC in Viet Nam, Nguyen Thi Thu Huyen, Programme Manager, UN-REDD, Viet Nam

Gave an overview of the process used in Viet Nam

Awareness raising

* Raise awareness but not expectations
* Don’t campaign or violate “free”
* Collaborate with universities
* Use interlocutors

Plans for applying FPIC in Indonesia, Machfudh:

Based on Outcome 3 of Indonesia Programme – community level empowerment to ensure benefits from REDD+

Status:

* National level consultations with multi-stakeholders, including CSOs in development of UN-REDD document and workplan
* Collaboration with National Forest Body’s (DKN) Community Chambers to facilitate DKN in collecting inputs to develop FPIC mechanism
* Conducted dissemination to key stakeholders
* Collaborate with an NGO focused on empowering adat (traditional) communities to develop a framework of implementing FPIC
* Distributed UN-REDD documents (NGOs voluntarily re-distribute the documents to district governments
* Conduct a multi-stakeholder consultation on UN-REDD implementation in Sulawesi
* Discussion on detailed plan of UN-REDD activities in central Sulawesi
* Launched UN-REDD Programme at Provincial level
* Established a REDD\_ taskforce and working group to appoint an institution responsible for REDD+ implementation

Community level consultation framework

* High social conflict
* Bottom up approach involving local players
* Conduct technical discussions with NGOs
* Main objectives
	+ to raise awareness
	+ to pilot FPIC processes, build capacity and experience in FPIC

Activities:

* Meetings with NGOs/CSOs
* Workshop on developing FPIC materials and strategy
* Workshop on establishment of FPIC institution at province level and pilot selection – results in the distribution of information on FPIC at province level

Next steps

* Focus group discussions
* Promoting discussion on key issues
* Collaboration of community chambers on FPIC for future REDD+ activities

Comment – Thomas Enters

* Preparation phase in Indonesia quite different due to local context

Analysis of policy issues for a REDD+ compliant benefit distribution system in Viet Nam, Pham Minh Thoa, National Programme Director, UN-REDD Viet Nam:

Presented a number of policy decisions to support benefit distribution, including policy decisions on strengthening customary law; supporting participatory monitoring; developing an effective recourse mechanism

An approach to ensuring social safeguards, Aki Kono, UNDP APRC, Bangkok:

Inputs to UN-REDD social Principles Risk Assessment Tool, informed by a range of initiatives and instruments e.g.:

* LCA text
* Operational Guidance
* WRI
* REDD+ SES
* UNDP MDG Carbon Facility

Principles and criteria for social aspects, based on 3 principles:

1. Good governance: complies with standards of good governance
2. Stakeholder livelihoods: potential impacts on long-term livelihoods and mitigation of effects
3. Policy coherence: aligns with sustainable development strategies and priorities, forestry plans and other relevant policies and treaties

Want to identify a pilot country – e.g., Central Kalimantan is already a pilot area for REDD+ SES

Should ideally be applied at the design phase.

Q – Akiko

* Would it be useful for phase 2 Viet Nam?

A – Aki

* If the country wishes to use it

Q – Patrick Durst

* Can’t see how to address an inherent conflict of interest – have people involved who are the advocates for a project and trying to facilitate neutral dialogue. How to build in objectivity.

A – Tim Boyle

* Try to address it in some ways – and the fact that they are trying to promote discussion. As you institutionalise this process, the risk will diminish.

A – Philippines

* Experience of the Philippines in implementing FPIC. There should be someone facilitating outside the project process. National Commission on Indigenous Peoples was created to support the implementation of FPIC. There are different customary practices between different groups; this can be compounded with government policies. Short cut the process by having a sunset clause for consent; if over-run leads to immediate
* FPIC has been circumvented by companies with the resources.
* NCIP has met and recognised that there are real problems with the implementation of FPIC
* Integrity of the NCIP people also an issue
* Trying to correct that but it’s a long road

Q – Khim

* Are there any messages that have been defined and conveyed to IPs? Voting – what were they voting for?
* Impact of FPIC – have the attitudes and knowledge of IPs changed? What are the perceptions of that?

Q – Leif-John

* Viet Nam, well prepared and carried out – but what are people being asked to consent to? Should you have a consent process so early in the process when there isn’t really anything to consent to? Very abstract in comparison to the concrete examples presented by Philippines.

Q – Philippines

* What are the issues raised by IPs during the FPIC pilot, particularly those who didn’t give consent? What was the role of government? How did you conduct the validation process?

A – Huyen

* Consent was for support or agreement for activities in the pilot district.
* Local government was kept separate from the process, facilitated some issues but were not allowed to interfere with the process.

A – Cuong

* Decided to test FPIC in advance of when they were going to actually need to operationalise it.
* Found that the best way to do FPIC is through doing public awareness campaigns in advance.
* Those who rejected or abstained from commenting on the activity provided valuable information. Re-evaluated why certain people said no. If it is an issue of them not understanding, need to provide more information. If they disagree to the activity have to re-evaluate whether they will implement activity. Need to manage expectations, particularly regarding when benefits will accrue.

A – Tim Boyle

* Two important impacts. Raising of confidence amongst the local people. At first there was disbelief that. Now there are commune heads that are big supporters of the process, trust has been built.
* Very skilled team of interlocutors – ready to scale up.
* FPIC is not a one-off process. Need to go through multiple times as you make progress. When it comes to actual interventions, there needs to be another process.
* Have identified that UN-REDD is doing 3 types of activities; e.g., 1. Activities that don’t directly impact communities, e.g., training local administrators; 2. Activities that include people, e.g., participatory carbon monitoring; 3. Activities that will directly impact. For all 3 good to find out why consent was not given.
* RECOFTC carried out independent review. Realised that we needed a common methodology for this. May be recruiting RECOFTC to manage this process of review in Indonesia.

Q – Lisa

* Is the FPIC process compromised if the project proponent does it? Hanoi workshop – this was a controversial issue. Need to bring in an independent authority, e.g., CBO etc, to do this. Note that communities to inform on the risks as well as the benefits. Need to develop capacity of NGOs to assist IPs to engage with REDD+ and help them move through the FPIC process with adequate information.

Q – Georg

* Experience of private sector in FPIC. It is being carried out by mining and oil palm industries because they see the danger of not getting consent.

Comment – Jeeva

* What are the costs of FPIC? The climate change process are not going anywhere so how does one communicate it. If FPIC can’t get the community to agree how can we go forward?
* Is it practical for a national level scaling up and who is going to pay for it?

A – Tim Boyle

* Estimate that in Viet Nam that the cost per province would be $350,000; national level would be $14 million

A – Thomas Enters

* Indigenous peoples have rights therefore you have to do it – not an issue of costs
* Assessment tool is in a draft stage. 4 IPs involved in the process; must be involved as we don’t understand the local context at times.
* What are they consenting to? Explanation not centred on climate chang/REDD but explained that it was an issue of forest protection. Not sure if there is a problem with this – didn’t feel it was an issue, though this may be controversial.

Comment – Omaliss

* Difficult to implement but very important. Has been involved in developing it in east of Cambodia. Have been discussing on what they are going to ask them for consent? Had to first look at the boundary of the project, e.g., there may be indigenous land titles – so what type of consent do you ask for when they already have rights over the land. Then the next question will be what is the benefit and how much? Therefore need to ask at a point when you can provide them with the answers to these questions. May need to compromise on the process a bit otherwise you won’t move. Need to do it for all communities, not just IPs. May need to compromise on this or the forest may be gone by the time it is

Comment – Patrick Durst

* Feels that FPIC is useless. The indigenous people that FPIC is required are not the entire population that we are addressing with the REDD+ programme. If we don’t carry out FPIC how do we achieve what we want to? FPIC is built into REDD+ inherently as you can’t make any progress without it. We need everyone’s consent and participation. Should be talking about awareness raising and effective participation at all levels. The costs are not a cost – as through participation we have achieved emission reductions. Let’s do away with FPIC unless we have to write a nice report on Indigenous Peoples.

Comment – Tim Boyle

* REDD+ is not a magic bullet, and making money by conserving carbon is one of many actions
* FPIC is a tool to promote democratization of that process. Recognising the validity of FPIC obliges you to engage in participatory processes that should be in place anyway.

Comment – Khim

* Are there methodologies for FPIC. Should design FPIC.

Comment – Gaya

* As Tim mentioned, FPIC is part of the democratisation process and it specifically looks at the issue of involving marginalized groups that traditionally have not had sufficient access to decision making processes. FPIC therefore supports participation but makes the extra step of redressing this imbalance. Though some may view FPIC as an inconvenience, as Thomas mentioned, it is also a right and therefore we need to respect that right.
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| --- |
| DAY 3 – 10 Nov 2010 |

UNFCC/IPCC guidelines and requirements, Danilo Mollicone, FAO:

* National inventories of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gasses
* Use the most recent IPCC guidance, as adopted or encouraged, to estimate anthropogenic forest-related greenhouse gas emissions and removals
* For the moment this article requires even non-Annex I Parties to use the IPCC 2003 LULUCF Guidance
* Use a combination of remote sensing and ground-based forest carbon inventory methods

IPCC basic equation to estimate GHG from land use is:

Emission estimates = activity data + emission factors

Regional perspectives to MRV, Patrick van Laake, UN-REDD, Viet Nam:

Tier 3 data:

* Every forest needs to be described in detail, using locally collected data
* Expensive to implement, but it gives the highest carbon credits
* For REDD this may be the only sensible solution
* Need to involve all stakeholders including IPs according to the safeguards of UNFCCC; should involve in monitoring and data collection
* Need to involve local people, and have their implicit consent
* Want the local people to implement REDD on the ground

Verification – likely to be done with remote sensing.

Approaches to participatory carbon monitoring, Patrick van Laake, UN-REDD, Viet Nam:

Management of local forest resources by organized community groups has been very successful (e.g., Nepal, India, Tanzania, Mexico); it is the ethical thing to do.

Need to:

* Raise awareness
* Income generation from REDD+ and sustainable use of forest resources
* Participation
* Pilot studies in 7 countries find that, with little training or support, communities can accurately assess basic parameters.
* For more complex data or data management – more complicated; can involve NGOs or local forest service
* Communities should be given payment for delivering data + performance payment

Should collect data more often than you actually need to for reporting purposes

GIS imagery should not be used to police people but to assess the quality of your data

Conclusion:

* Cost effective
* Involving people that are also going to be involved in the REDD+ ACTIVITIES
* Large volume of data makes it easy to do quality control
* Basic data must be supplemented by professionally collected data to convert to biomass

Q – Jeeva

* How can we use these participatory methodologies to also get FPIC consent

Q – Machfud

* If there are any complaints about data collection who will take care of it

Q – Jeremy Broadhead

* Costs for participatory monitoring in Cambodia $54,000 to set it up; extended for the whole country = $200 million

Q – Robert Mather

* If 50% of money is legitimately captured at the national level = less than $1/yr/family - won’t be an incentive to measure the stocks let alone change behaviour

Q – Khim

* Good opportunity for supporting community based management; added value to managing community forests

Q – Japanese participant

* Time frame for monitoring REDD+

A – Patrick

* Participatory carbon monitoring and FPIC; what we need first and foremost is the engagement of the local communities; without their participation in this scheme, we can’t reduce degradation. It is something that we need. Therefore awareness raising is very important and get their interest to participation – let’s not worry about FPIC. Their willingness is their consent. Have to make explicit reference to the IPs and have to respect their traditional methods of forest management. May need to change these practices to become more sustainable. Not a link between FPIC and PCM; needed to make REDD+ work at this level.
* Conflict: Recourse mechanisms needed to redress the issues. What those mechanisms should be are dependent on the national structures. Essential to be included in the national system.
* REDD needs to be integrated into existing programmes and policies.

A – Danilo

* Cannot mix MRV with money – it is a mistake
* Participatory approach – not necessary that the participatory approach goes to the carbon stock measurement

Comment –

* Participatory monitoring makes a linkage between performance and benefits. What about Indonesia where most of deforestation is industrial

A – Patrick

* FPIC is important; if we are doing REDD+ properly, we are doing FPIC. FPIC is step one, but step 0 is awareness raisin and the prior and informed.

Comment - Gaya

* Participatory monitoring and FPIC – FPIC would possibly occur somewhat in advance of monitoring activities and may involve different actors (e.g., more technical NGOs Vs rights-based CBOs and IP organizations). As Danilo mentioned, the involvement of communities is crucial, but not necessarily aligned with carbon monitoring activities so it may not be useful to align these two activities closely.
* Clear that FPIC is a requirement under the UN-REDD programme, irrespective of our personal opinions of what consent really means. Behind the manifestation of FPIC in REDD+ has been a long struggle of over 25 years to have these issues enshrined in the Declaration. UN-REDD programme’s consultations with local communities, Indigenous Peoples networks and civil society have overwhelmingly demanded that FPIC be included in REDD+ - thus the demand is from these communities, it should be respected.

Philippines MRV:

Process of developing PNRS:

* NGOs at the forefront of developing REDD+ activities
* Series of consultations and workshops; mobilized resources from NGOs and donors 🡺 Philippines National REDD+ Strategy

MRV Plan of action:

* Development of guidance for effective engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in MRV
* Hoping that the demonstration activities will allow them to contribute to the negotiations

Gender in UN-REDD and the case of Viet Nam, Tore Langhelle:

More effective REDD+ implementation takes into account the status of gender differences:

Roles – use of forest: women use forest to collect firewood, fodder, food, medicines

Rights – who has ownership: women have less land titles; need title to get payment; women will be more affected than men

Values – what does/doesn’t have a market price: what women extract from the forest may or may not have a market price (less so than men)

Gender in Viet Nam:

Phase I: Focused on FPIC; participation of women in some activities and not others – depended on the region whether they were more or less involved; ways of addressing this

Phase II: (currently under planning) – need a social and gender impact assessment, esp if going to carry out activities with different groups in different provinces; need to go to the lowest level to get disaggregated data

Law in Viet Nam requires a social and gender impact assessment for changes to legislation

E.g., protected area set up; stops women entering to gather firewood (may need to go elsewhere or buy fuel). This is an opportunity to introduce something more sustainable, e.g., renewable energy systems.

Difference between giving people cash and giving people services; sometimes giving cash is not the best approach – depends on circumstances

Comment – Khim

* Mainstreaming gender in Cambodia now. Support from Energia and the regional office. Want to look at gender mainstreaming across environmental issues.
* Have carried out scoping mission with gender expert from regional centre.
* Developing a roadmap on gender. Each project should have a focal point for driving gender and develop a gender workplan.
* Over the course of the implementation will generate lessons learned.

Comment – Jeeva

* In participatory forest techniques there are gender analyses.
* Cambodia UNDAF until 2010 stipulated that land titling should be jointly owned between men and women.
* Will look at the different roles of men and women.
* Need to be sensitive and ensure that participatory tools are applied effectively to capture gender issues/FPIC and ensure that it is a cost effective way to include all these aspects.

Comment – Duc, Vietnam

* Gender should also look at men – e.g., men are impacted in different ways, e.g., migration to cities to look for work.

Comment – Thomas Enters

* IPs know the cultural and social value of their forest. A lot of people value the soil on which that forest is standing and will actually cut the forest for agriculture.
* May be labour shortages in the villages that can’t do this work – need to ensure people are there to do this work.
* Cambodia and expense for community forestry; Thomas has calculated a different amount. Costs may go down, may be high when starting. People may not need to have rights to the forest when involved in monitoring.
* No title no payment? Perhaps not directly, but you can still receive indirect benefits – is this correct?

A – Tore Langhelle

* At the household level if you want to receive a benefit you need a title to the land, that is my understanding..?

A – Tim Boyle

* 661 programme mechanisms used to channel benefits to the household level. Many communities are more familiar with the idea of communal ownership of resources. Therefore – there may be scope for channeling benefits to the community level. Beneficiaries may not have specific ownership papers, but that doesn’t mean funds can’t be used.

Akiko

* Could be sub-contracts to communities/families – they would be contracted to carry out activities and be beneficiaries in REDD+

A – Patrick

* In Viet Nam the records are not such that you can identify who has rights to forest land. In terms of the UN-REDD Programme, we are thinking of a concept of self-declared right to forest land. If household/community can make a credible claim to a piece of land they can participate in the scheme on that basis.
* Need differentiated solutions to differentiated situations. May be similar for gender issues.

Comment – Lisa

* PNG – one of the mechanisms they’ve used for benefit distributions is Incorporated Land Groups formed by communities. Not always working well.
* Legislation passed last year to redress this: Improve consent process and revenue distributions processes; must have 2 women on each management committee of these ILGs
* Women are often responsible for food production. Poverty driven clearing; if it excludes women preventing them to create gardens they will have to generate food for their families
* FPIC: May be a need to carry out separate workshops for women, as one gets a totally different perspective.

Development of the multi-stakeholder process for National Strategy Indonesia, Silje Haugland:

A major part of the emission cuts for Indonesia come from forest and peatland

REDD+ taskforce – newly created

1. National REDD+ strategy
2. National REDD+ Action plan
3. National action plan on climate change

National REDD+ Strategy

Developed by:

* 7-person writing group with REDD+ expertise
* Working group – technical inputs, civil society, university
* Steering committee – policy guidelines, members, high government officials

Process:

1. Preparation meetings (create writer team, working group and steering committee)
2. WG and SC meetings and consultations at national level (1st draft Sept2010)
3. Regional consultation process for 33 provinces in Indonesia; UN-REDD developed design and process, NGO facilitated 2 of the workshops, rest facilitated by UN-REDD. Experts presented, participants provided input
4. National expert meeting and international consultation meeting
5. National

Lessons learned:

* High level support to the process; defended the need for the process; strong teams – e.g., writers had different backgrounds and strong technical background; PMU of UN-REDD strong
* Communication process is important

Have documented the process used to develop the document.

Comment – Thomas Enters

* Impact of FPIC, people feeling more part of the process

Vietnam progress of National REDD+ Strategy (NRS), Pham Manh Cuong:

Draft strategy presented at PB5

In early stages of preparation

Elements of NRS:

No specific SE; section on “National REDD+ governance”

First draft to be approved by Prime minister, then sent to stakeholders for input

Going to organize stakeholder consultations in the different regions to speed this process up

Comment – Machfud

Draft development: Truly involved stakeholders; over 300 institutions (government; international/national experts; NGOs[100])

UN-REDD is part of the taskforce

Q – Khim

* Short timeframe for Indonesia – 4 months. Must have very good coordination between taskforce/working group. Preparation before the development – to what extent was this kind of information/assessments carried out.
* To what extent did you take advantage of the national second communication report of UNFCCC if Indonesia produced one.

Q – Tim Boyle

* Stakeholder consultation – no point consulting with people who don’t know much about the topic. In Indonesia you’ve held consultations; in Viet Nam are about to embark on consultations. How do you ensure

Q – Leif-John

* R-PP criticism of low stakeholder involvement – this is a huge improvement of that, though not all stakeholders would have read the document; also drivers of deforestation
* Forestry is going to only make half of the emissions in 2020, but currently 80% are by forestry. Energy emissions are likely to go up. Projections are guesses. Unlike the Amazon Fund which is based on historical emissions – these are guestimates. In Indonesia will be asking for payments for assumed levels of emissions
* Paper and pulp/palm oil are important drivers of deforestation. Needs to come out more directly in the analysis.
* Strategy needs priorities; identify measures; needs to cost these – this is missing in the strategy. E.g., moratorium needs to be reflected in the document.

Comment – Norway

* If you’re making projections into the future, what assumptions are parts of those projections (e.g., regarding emission intensity/macro economic growth levels). Is this accounted for?
* Writing team highlighted inconsistencies between figures/data sets. These need to be reconciled and a decision made on which data sets to use (both in strategy and REDD+ planning)
* Harmonisation of REDD+ strategy and other macro-economic planning tools/processes.

A – Silje:

* Preparation phase had to go very quickly. UNDP LEAD project had used multi-stakeholder process – built on existing capacity/processes.
* Analytical work – based on research carried out before; writers on the team had already been involved in many of these analyses.
* Consultations – many of the people already had knowledge on REDD+ (e.g., NGOs had carried out capacity bldg. Consultation was a few days and took a seminar approach, to introduce main concepts.
* Got many of the same feedback to the questions received today which are being incorporated (e.g., the moratorium is now in the draft; priorities for immediate actions

Comment – Thomas

* Omaliss mentioned that for Cambodia, awareness raising activities before consultations.

A – Machfud

* Speed of process due to expedited workplan, worked every day to achieve this.
* Elaborated on the capacity of the LEAD project to support communication with community to government level
* Indonesia developing a network for data management that will improve coordination

A – Pham Manh Cuong

* Some issues need to be considered in the preparation process. Need to comment on the political will.
* Need to keep close eyes on the CC negotiation process as need support from international decisions.
* Time needed to prepare the data and information for the strategy.
* Political language is very different from the scientific language, therefore need some time to prepare. Also need time for stakeholders to understand and engage in the process; Approval process internally – also has time costs.
* Also having workshop with colleagues from neighboring countries
* CoP 14 2009 – no improvement in the REDD+ text and there was skepticism on this; however subsequently text has improved.

Comment – Thomas Enters

* Noted that he ran a workshop in Viet Nam with high ranking officials and none of them appeared to really know what REDD was.

Philippines REDD+ process:

* Dr Tony La Viña is the negotiator for Philippines for REDD+ - asked why the Philippines was never invited as a pilot country despite being part of the REDD negotiations (criteria explained by Tim C)
* Building on previous experience from CDM
* CodeREDD – NGOs and People’s Organizations, then Academia was invited, then government got involved.
* Had a consultation with all stakeholders, including industry
* Objective was to elicit the information on issues relevant to REDD based on other forestry projects in the past (e.g., from IPs, NGOs)
* Research and development component was included in the national strategy
* Strategy is a living document; available online
* IP federation gave inputs – wanted information on PES
* Feb 2010 – had the write-shop with 7 groups working on each component. Each groups composed of NGOs, POs government
* Learned a lot from other countries

Comment – Thomas

* If a strategy becomes aligned to legislation, perhaps it will become less flexible. This reduces the potential of it being a living document.

Ideas for next time:

* Smaller workshops that are more technically focused, e.g., on FPIC
* Can have a meeting once a year like this. 1 day of plenary and then break into smaller clinics on specific issues; can come back together and have a final plenary on the last day.
* Pak Machfud offered to host the workshop in Indonesia. There was also a suggestion for some kind of event during the UN-REDD Policy Board Meeting in Viet Nam in March 2011.
* Leif-John is interested in cross fertilization in the region; interesting and useful lesson sharing; also interested in the fissures between UNDP and FAO go from the global to regional to national levels.
* Grace, Philippines – learned a lot and realized that there are many issues that need to be settled in order to start with REDD; would like to have the opportunity for bi-lateral meetings with tech. secretariat and regional office to get advice on technical and administrative matters.
* Tim B. talked about Polex; Jeeva mentioned the similar Solution Exchange in India, Indonesia and Cambodia; Thomas – RILNet on reduced impact logging – definitely need to have a moderator, happy to do it, but not happy to be the one to collect the new information.