



**Proposals on the Work Program for the REDD+ Partnership 2010**  
**September 7, 2010**

**Amazon Environmental Research Institute - IPAM<sup>1</sup>**

**Overall Comments**

First of all, we would like to congratulate the Partners of the REDD+ Partnership for their hard work to present a comprehensive Work Program adopted by consensus among Partners. We are also glad to see that the Partnership is giving the opportunity for stakeholders to provide inputs on the work program and advising us of the next meeting, which will take place before UNFCCC negotiations in Tianjin, China, in a timely manner. However, we do need to raise that we are disappointed by the fact that the Partnership meetings during Bonn negotiations kept the CSO and IPOs excluded from participation.

Below we reinforce our proposals on stakeholders' modalities as proposed earlier<sup>2</sup>, before commenting on each component of the work program.

**Modalities on Stakeholder Participation**

REDD+ will only work with collaboration among government at many levels, civil society, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, private sector including investors, project developers and commodities producers that actually have influence over land use decisions. The Partnership should reflect this reality of REDD+ by including representatives of these groups in a meaningful way.

In this sense, the REDD+ Partnership must establish rules that guarantee the meaningful inclusion of these stakeholder groups and finally ensure that fast-start funding is spent transparently and effectively. For that, we hope this work plan pays special attention to ensuring implementation of the safeguards agreed on the Partnership signed document (biodiversity and full participation of stakeholders) as well as the respect of international obligations and instruments related to indigenous peoples, such as those contained in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. As such, we expect that the next formal meetings, starting with Tianjin's - are **open** to CSO and IPOs.

---

<sup>1</sup> IPAM is a Brazilian non-governmental institution, founded in 1995, with the mission of contributing to the process of development of the Amazon Basin that fulfills the social and economic aspirations of its population.

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to the integrity of our specific proposal on modalities on stakeholder participation available on [www.ipam.org.br](http://www.ipam.org.br) (<http://www.ipam.org.br/ipam/stakeholder-participation-redd-partnership>)

More than comments we have some questions and suggestions for each Work program Component, which are described below:

### **Work Program Component 1: Database of REDD+ financing, actions, and results**

Question:

- In the approach part, third paragraph the text mentions: *“The FMT/PT will also be encouraged to actively seek inputs and relevant information from Partners and other stakeholders to improve the database”*, we would like to understand who are those other stakeholders. Are they the stakeholders that did not participate in the first survey? Or the few stakeholders invited to Oslo Conference?
- In the immediate action Items it says *“Partners decide to invite all members to update or submit their Survey information under the existing format to the FMT/PT before August 31<sup>st</sup>. “* Does that mean that Stakeholders will have access to the Survey information sent by the Partners and could be able to comment on that before this same deadline? If that was the intention, this survey should be made available for our consultation.

Suggestions:

- The Secretariat could take the benefits of inputs from organizations that are already developing interactive REDD+ databases (i.e. The Global Canopy – The REDD desk<sup>3</sup>) in consideration to design their own database.
- Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) and environmental NGOs representatives should have access to the concept note of this database and should be able to send submissions or at least comments on how that database could be improved. As we hold the Secretariat of the Forum on Readiness for REDD, we could contribute in a meaningful way to this component.
- The information provided and contained on the database must be always updated. Regular reports or newsletters can be developed in multiple languages, in order to call people’s attention to the new developments and actions related to REDD in every region. In this sense, it could work as an incentive for the stakeholders and Governments to provide reliable and most updated information. IPAM’s already working on a similar way asking for the inputs from our regional IPLC and CSO constituencies on their respective national joint programs’ proposals of each country under UN-REDD program in the LAC region. And it is working quite well.
- UN-REDD is currently working on regional workshops to develop guidelines to FPIC (Free Prior Inform Consent) and conflict resolutions. This final guideline, conducted with the participation of three regional CSO and IP, can be included in the database, in addition to building capacity only.
- Subnational information should also be considered when possible, in particularly when there is no information upon the national level<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.theredddesk.org/>

<sup>4</sup> As an example of subnational REDD relevant actions, see the Governors Climate Taskforce GCF ([www.gcftaskforce.org](http://www.gcftaskforce.org)).

- There should be a process of a previous assessment and validation of the information to be included in the Partnership's database as the global civil society, stakeholders and Partners will assume it represents the best possible information of actions of REDD+.

### **Work Program Component 2: Analysis of financing gaps and overlaps**

Question:

- In the stakeholder involvement strategy it is mentioned that *"the co-chairs will invite key stakeholders to provide their comments to the FMT/PT for compilation before the Technical Meeting in Tianjin"*. We would like to know how it is going to be determined who are the *key stakeholders*.

Suggestions:

- Bottom-up information should be used to the extent possible in order to have a more accurate view on financing needs as well as to enhance transparency and inclusiveness of the Partnership. Top-down information, global estimations, while useful, may not be the best option to fully capture the diversity circumstances and needs of each country. As the example provided above, regarding the UN-REDD program, bottom-up information could efficiently be gathered through a professionally-created survey aimed at a broad range of other stakeholders. This includes in addition of environment/forestry ministries in national governments, other ministries such as the agriculture and energy ones, sub-national government officials, NGOs, indigenous peoples, forest-dependent communities, and other interested parties.
- A publicly available online survey in key languages (i.e. English, Spanish and French), structured in a simple and briefly way as to be easily analyzed and summarized may be beneficial. This survey should build upon the initial effort by Australia, France, and PNG and include a broader range of stakeholders and more targeted questions.
- Finally, an online, public comment period on the draft report may led additional insights
- For the potential actions for 2011-2012 period, this gap analysis could be expanded to other scales, in order to analyze gaps and overlaps in technical and institutional capacity, as well as in forestry governance.
- Subnational approaches, information and needs also should be considered when possible in particularly when there is no information upon the national level.

### **Work Program Component 3: Discussion on the Effectiveness of Multilateral REDD+ Initiatives**

Firstly, we would like to congratulate this well timing Component as there are many and growing number of REDD+ multilateral and bilateral initiatives that really require an assessment of their effectiveness in this key moment. We welcome and support that the REDD

Partnership is the adequate forum that can coordinate and help to achieve and carry out this assessment.

Suggestions:

- The incorporation of a broad range of stakeholders' views with familiarity with multilateral and bilateral initiatives will be beneficial to the report and should be stimulated. In that sense, we support that the recommendation for targeted improvements includes the bilateral initiatives such as the Indonesian and the Brazilian Amazon Funds, as well and do not restrict to multilateral initiatives.
- REDD+ is not the solution for everything relating climate change, however it is a wind of opportunities that goes far beyond just a forest conservation strategy. It should be seen as a temporary source of revenue to help a country shift its development pathway toward a low carbon future that equates economic growth with forest conservation and sustainable use of the natural resources. In that sense, lessons learned from large and small scale rural and extractives productions towards sustainable development efforts can be very useful.
- In the future, the Partnership could consider an analysis of the effectiveness of such initiatives (i.e. Integrated Rural Development, like the soy sugar cane and beef roundtables; Integrated Conservation and Development etc.)

In respect to Potential actions for 2011-2012:

Include a substantive discussion by Partners and stakeholders on effectiveness of multilateral REDD+ initiatives and recommendations for targeted improvements to multilateral initiatives in terms of **governance and official ways of encompassing participation** of representatives of civil society and indigenous peoples<sup>5</sup>, assessing independence, institutional capacity and a possible required support with the ***objective of enhancing global governance of the Multilateral REDD+ Initiatives.***

**Work Program Component 4: Share lessons on our REDD+ initiatives, share best practices, and promote and facilitate cooperation among Partners**

Suggestions:

- Regarding lessons sharing, best practices and experiences sharing of safeguards, multi stakeholders consultations and benefit sharing mechanisms we do believe that the Partnership should take into consideration the important process that is taking place in Brazil. Like Brazilian process for developing a national REDD strategy including three groups of discussion composed by IPLC and NGOs representatives to discuss the

---

<sup>5</sup> Such as assessing the process of conducting global civil society self-selection process or nomination them by the multilateral organization.

better way to address: i) the institutional arrangements; ii) carbon rights, benefit sharing mechanism and safeguards and iii) resources available and financing options. Another important process that took place in Brazil was the process led by Brazilian NGOs and IPLC. Information on climate change and REDD discussed among IPLC and after a long process of understanding of those concepts they were able to develop their own Social environmental Principles and criteria related to REDD<sup>6</sup>. That was also a very valuable tool because it provided a space for lessons sharing from the ground experiences. These bottom up Principles and Criteria are now the reference to the design of the national REDD strategy and the bill under the National Congress. In addition to this, an Observatory of REDD has been launched by the Brazilian civil society and IPLC to monitor and verify if those Principles and criteria are being respected by the proponent of REDD Projects/ Programs, subnational and national policies, as well as to monitor the Amazon Fund and the multilateral REDD+ initiatives in place, in Brazil.

- Relating to the promotion and facilitation of cooperation among Partners and South-South cooperation and regional REDD+ networks as well as among multilateral and bilateral REDD+ initiatives, we recommend the Partnership benefits and in fact, is integrated to the work that has been developed under the Forum Readiness for REDD<sup>7</sup>, where capacity building relating to REDD+ negotiations and multilateral REDD+ institutions is provided to developing countries, in order to improve their understanding and their position in REDD negotiations.
- As already mentioned, the work developed by IPAM in LAC region, through official participation means in the UN-REDD program, information to constituencies, we represent there, and the work we do in order to engage them in the process, together with the countries, helping to build capacity, listening to their needs and recommendations for REDD+ policies and institutions could also be an example of ways to share experiences and knowledge and promote capacity building through regional networks.
- In this sense, we support that the paper on Facilitating Cooperation on REDD+ that is going to be commissioned, draws on this existing platforms and initiatives such as the Forum Readiness for REDD, Social environmental Principles and criteria related to REDD and the Brazilian REDD Observatory.

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.reddsocioambiental.org.br/>. The principles and criteria are in process of being translated into Spanish and English.

<sup>7</sup> The Forum on Readiness for REDD is a multi-stakeholder initiative focused on practical approaches for building REDD readiness through cross-stakeholder dialogue, South-South collaboration, and linking expertise and resources with regional readiness efforts. It operates as a neutral convening space to allow various stakeholders involved or interested in REDD readiness to build their understanding and capacity, and interact with different stakeholder groups and regions, to increase dialogue, information exchange, and collaboration and consensus building on the implementation of readiness activities. Since 2010, the Secretariat of the Forum resides at IPAM. For further information, please refer to this link: <http://www.thereddesk.org/reddready>.