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| 1. Practice area : BPPS | | | | |
| 2. Mission period (incl. of travel days)  From: August 9 to: August 15 | | | | |
| 3. Type of mission: Official | | | 4. Clients  14 countries from LAC participating of the workshop | |
| 5. Purpose of mission  1. Deliver the second South-South Exchange "Practical Experiences towards the Implementation of the Warsaw Framework for REDD+. Challenges and Opportunities", in Guadalajara, Mexico, from August 11-13. With the following roles:  - Clea Paz (general coordinator, and session 9 facilitator)  - Francisco Hernández (logistics coordinator)  - Marco Chiu (General facilitator)  - Pierre Guedez (Session 3 facilitator)  - Bruno Guay (note taking, presenting summary of Day 2)  - Kimberly Todd (Panelist session 2)  - Edgar González (General support and liaison with CONAFOR)  2. Participate on inter-agency mission on the targeted support to Mexico on safeguards on August 14 (Only E. González, F. Hernandez, K. Todd, and C. Paz) | | | 6. Documents, materials, resources   * Workshop Agenda * TS2 meeting minutes | |
| 7. Mission members   * Marco Chiu, Bruno Guay, Pierre-Yves Guedez, Clea Paz, Kimberly Todd (regional and global), * Edgar González and Francisco Hernández (UNDP CO) | | | 8. Costs | |
| 9. Brief summary of the mission  *9.a Findings*.  **Preparation meeting on the 10**   * Logistics were revised and agreed upon including: Room setting, meeting with the panelists to go over each session, meeting with webcasting team and hotel representatives.   **Workshop on 11-13**   * Overall the workshop was successfully delivered, providing an space for sharing lessons and knowledge amongst countries, with the facilitation, and provision of technical support from the UN-REDD Programme * The workshop counted with the participation of 63 representatives (35% women) from 14 countries from the region, and 18 representatives from UN organizations * [Agenda](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=14521-agenda-finalintercambio-sur-surlac-experiencias-practicas-hacia-la-implementacion-del-marco-de-varsovia-para-redd&category_slug=agenda&Itemid=134), [Presentations](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?view=list&slug=presentaciones&option=com_docman&Itemid=134) and [Participants list are available in the UN-REDD workspace](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?view=download&alias=14522-lista-participantesintercambio-sur-surlacimplementacioin-del-marco-de-varsovia&category_slug=agenda&option=com_docman&Itemid=134) * Mauricio Ramírez, UNDP’s Country Director delivered the opening remarks on behalf of Marcia de Castro, Mexico’s UN Resident Coordinator * Key messages included:   Relationship among the Warsaw Framework’s elements   * In moving from Cancun to Warsaw, there was an evolution in how countries viewed the 4 main REDD+ elements were seen as isolated pillars of work when were first designated, but evolving in thinking after the Warsaw Framework which led countries to think of the 4 elements in a more integrated manner * The National Strategy can be seen as an umbrella to frame the four elements and help to ensure coherence, providing a space to strengthen the links between the REDD+ elements and demonstrate the overall coherence in the country approach * Decisions on scope, scale, and/or priority drivers will have implications for each of the Warsaw elements but also the work falling under each of the elements will feed into the decisions on scope, scale and drivers – so not unidirectional * There is some clarity in terms of sequencing of work within the Warsaw framework context, for example the FREL clearly needing to be developed and assessed before results can be reported. But overall it’s not a linear one size fits all sequence. * Causes of deforestation are multiple, is not only a forest/environmental sector issue, therefore the design of PAMs should be a joint venture between the different governmental institutions with sufficient political will at the highest level   Integrating Policies and measures (PAMs) with national policies   * PAMs can be designed with a landscape approach, including diverse and complementary interventions thus contributing to various national policies and objective already defined. REDD+ can be one of the means to reach these national objectives. * Countries that have clarified their national REDD+ strategic vision, have been able to link more easily the REDD+ PAMS with existing PAMs. This has helped them understand the role that REDD+ may play in support of national objectives. * In order to have a dialogue with other sectors it is necessary to have available information that allows parties with different interests to reach a common understanding of the issues. For example, this means that PAMs designed for REDD+ must be explained in the language of the finance sector.   Legal aspects   * Countries seek to clarify the legal framework needed to support the implementation of REDD+. There are several challenges to integrate the Warsaw REDD+ decisions in the legal framework of the countries. These include how to implement inter-institutional agreements. * There are several elements of the REDD+ implementation that need legal clarity/security. This is necessary among other things to facilitate the relevant investments for the preparation and implementation of the policies and measures. * The source of financing (market vs. non-market), has an impact on the legal aspects that must be addressed by the countries in their legal readiness for REDD+. Legal implications of buying and selling of emission reductions units will be different from those of receiving a results-based payment coming from an international fund. * It is necessary to work on a solid articulation of the national and sub-national legal frameworks in particular in countries that have a high level of decentralization (e.g. Federations).   Financing   * Variety of options to reach the objectives of mobilizing and managing financing hence is critical to have a clear vision of the national objectives and clearly understand the needs of national financing to then be able to identify and target financing. * Needs of financing are established based on the activities to finance: PES, forest and agricultural improvements, enabling activities. There are several sources of financing for these activities (credits, donations, result-based payments). It is useful to differentiate between financing for “enabling conditions”, financing for “implementation” and payment for results. * National tools have been created to receive and manage REDD+ funds such as the Amazonian Fund in Brazil. In addition, currently a National Forest and Climate Change fund is being developed in Peru with each their lessons that include the need for:   + A robust NFMS robust and efficient, transparent, MRV linked/integrated in the Fund operations,   + Encouraging the participation of the interested stakeholders, periodically review guidelines and criteria for investment (interest focus), Invest in transparency. * On financing PAMs: is important to properly assess the costs of implementing, the contribution the RBP can make for the financing of these PAM, and how is this potential contribution compares with the costs of transaction to access the RBP. Also a better understanding of Payment based on results is needed (Is it ODA? A transaction? The beginning of a new opportunity or the worst of both worlds?) * On RBPs: Countries need to ensure the coherence between the Warsaw Framework and current payment based on result scheme (REM, FCPF) but there are many questions: How to go through the “valley of death” (REDD+ phase 2) without access to an ex ante finance? Mechanism for results-based payments imply a transaction? Is it in the country’s interest to transfer of the title to ERs? If so, how can this be done at reasonable cost? Countries mentioned the need for support in defining efficient legal frameworks to support these processes. * Some countries (environmental sector) have identified their needs and have begun to take actions to approach the financial sector related mainly to agricultural activities under the understanding that some of their instruments are related to land-use change, and there are problems of managing the same language even to keep the dialogue and approach. * It is clear that it is necessary to visualize several sources of financing to be used by different users and different ways. It is relevant to identify actors from the financial offer side and the demand side. * The structures and instruments to mobilize financing must be flexible and adaptable to the characteristics of the sector. * On one hand public sector investment can be improved through a better coordination between the sectors that can result in a public investment that is consistent with the REDD+ objectives. * On the other hand, as a source of financing it can offer a big opportunity to harmonize the use of resources to harmonize them with the REDD+ objectives. * A good part of the financing related to the changes in land use are related with the financing for activities that can cause emissions. * These activities may or may not be related with the private sector, but it is relevant to study this relationship and verify possible alternatives.   Forest Reference levels (FREL) and Technical Annex   * Important to build technical capacities installed in the country. Create/strengthen capacities in the institutions in charge of monitoring forests and for the reference level, allowing the country to answer technical revisions and improve the FREL by stages/phases (need of vision short, medium and long term) * Inter-institutional coordination / between technical units and develop policies of the units in charge. * Consistency between FREÑ and the NFMS/GHGI (the data necessary for the construction of the FREL have to come from the NFMS) and more importantly FREL and the UNFCCC and in case they are different – for payment based on results initiatives. * Need national agreements about the definition of forest. * Persistent challenge in integrating Sub-national FREL towards a national FREL and the inclusion of activities beyond deforestation (degradation and others), and on synchronizing of the several process of the national and international reports.   Safeguards   * The interpretation of the safeguard concept and each one of the safeguard from Cancun, are processes and critical steps to advance toward answering the requirements of the safeguards from the UNFCCC. * Links between the REDD+ activities (national strategy) and safeguards, is necessary to take place in the following steps: 1) when defining the scope of the safeguards we have to consider the REDD+ approach the country wants to implement, 2) in the development of SIS given than the design of the SIS must be able to provide information within the context of the application of the REDD+ activities, and 3) in the summary of the information since it is expected that the summary provide information on the approach and accountability of the safeguards win the context of the application of REDD+ activities. * Socialization and involvement of civil society is very important, in particular the definition of the safeguards, preparation of the summary of the information and the design and implementation of SIS.   National Forest Monitoring Systems (NFMS)   * The NFMS of each country supports the country beyond REDD+, although it focuses to begin with in the REDD+ process, the session highlighted the following functions and importance of the NFMS:   + Support decision-making and the preparation of the REDD+ strategy (for example, identifying hotspots and priority areas)   + Show performance of the REDD+ strategy (and/or forest national policies), activities and actions from REDD+. Therefore, representing the basis to received payments based on results with robust and transparent data   + Generate data necessary for the construction of Forest Emission Reference Levels (I-GEI and others) and contributes to maintain consistency between the reports (CN, BUR, FRA, etc) and the REDD+ elements (NFMS/FREL)   + In addition to the relationship between NS and FREL previously highlighted, the NFMS relates/can be related with the SIS (although the countries do not have to monitor the safeguards instead they can be used and link the SIS with the NFMS when they consider it appropriate and cost efficient):   + Support in having useful date to report about the safeguards “f” (reversion) and “g” (displacement of emissions)   + Supporting the involvement of local communities (and other parts of the people, for example small producers) in data capturing in the field.   + Support in increasing access to information (through geoportals) to the public and decision makers for a better governance.   + Whenever the country requires it and the NFI can handle/modify in consequence- provide information about biodiversity.   + We highlight that the preparation and implementation of the NFMS is a continuous process, continuous improvement that has to be sustainable in time in order to continue demonstrating the performance of REDD+ in the country. * In spite of the considerable progress in the monitoring issue in the region, there are several pending challenges:   + Technical challenges and the relative importance of continuing strengthening the national capacities in monitoring and ensuring the permanence of human resources in the governments/interested parties.   + Inter-institutional and intra-institutional coordination (between the units of the same institute/ministries) to improve the inter-operability of current systems (both data generation as well as dissemination/technological platforms) allowing the dialogue, exchange and use of data. 🡪 Need of a shared methodological/institutional matrix and adjust arrangements when necessary.   + Financial sustainability: importance of coordinating monitoring activities with Budget planning/institutional operational plans; (go from external financing, step by step towards a national private financing and finally total national financing plans)   Challenges for implementing the Warsaw framework   * Although the Convention gives guidelines, these must be contextualized to the realities of the country. * Need for a political will and that the REDD+ be anchored to other processes already ongoing in the countries (for example AVA FLEGT in Honduras) * Ensure the institutionalism and legal framework that supports it. * No single way to relate and sequence the elements of the REDD+ preparation, given the circumstances of each country are different, but the NS can serve as umbrella * The different pilot RBP schemes are in different stages of development, but some are more demanding than those required by the UNFCCC. For example the need to have a registry and in the calculation of emissions, as well as the verification process. * The rules in general are more imposed than agreed upon. Especially in the revision mechanisms. Discussions could be held to negotiate among countries, adjusting their positions and improving the capacity to negotiate. * Titling of emission reductions: each scheme has a different approach and the legal aspect of each one is different. The modalities and mechanisms for the transfer of resources are also different. The definition of several issues such as prices, payments ex-ante, etc. is still pending. These modalities in general do not have definitions. * Report process and MRV: the UNFCCC established some requisites and for other schemes such as FCPF and REM the situation is different. Some schemes have additional requirements such as registry or how to ensure additional benefits. * The process for a PPR is already clarified in the UNFCCC, in other mechanism the conditions for eligibility are not clear. * Sometimes the rules are not clear and transparent and depend on the capacities of negotiation. Possible solution would be to advance with the GCF and afterward the other schemes are aligned. Regional positions toward the GCF should be worked (exchanges with the experts that attend the GCF board are needed)   On financing GAPs:   * Before speaking of the gaps, discussions began raising expectations of the different stakeholders. Interest of the stakeholders can be lost due to long periods of time before receiving benefits. * It was agreed that the process is non-lineal but iterative and financing should be also be adjusted in this senses. * Ex-ante support should be channeled. * REDD+ needs to burst its bubble and define what the country can offer to really reach emission reductions. * The various measures that countries are taking toward a Green economy should be considered. A better articulation in this sense could even attract additional financing. * Key stakeholders should be in the negotiating platforms (for example the environmental ministries are not the most suitable to negotiate national financial issues). The same requirement should be made to the donor countries. * Articulate the costs of all the REDD+ phases is key to start the process to cover the gap. This must be defined at the level of what can be done in each item (economic and financial evaluation). Afterwards the sources can be identified and later look for the harmonization of the requisites and rules within the frameworks of national policy. * Private sector: first we must understand and characterize the private sector (there are several branches of the private sector. * Countries call for a workshop specifically on financing.   On participatory processes:   * Need to take into account the consideration of costs, expectations and requirements. * On representation we must ensure that the speaker of the groups really represent their constituencies. Work needs to be done with the indigenous bases and strengthening them. * Temporality is also important. Taking into account the precise moment that is relevant for the participation. * Political openness and will. * Guarantee the upholding of rights. * The inter-sectorial participation and involvement of the actors that make decisions such as Treasury and planning. * The principal solutions include: * Strengthening the political backing that define participative processes (Peru, Chile, and Mexico). * Preparing participatory plans is key and they must be developed in a clear and transparent way. * Work with the bases, the territories, the regions, to ensure appropriation, strengthen those stakeholder and platforms, and then raise them to a national level. * Take advantage of the presence of the agencies to speed-up discussions. * Proposal for a need to organize a regional workshop on stakeholder engagement, with emphasis on indigenous peoples and also ministries such as Treasury/finance.   **Bilateral meetings on the side of the workshop**  **Costa Rica:** FONAFIFO informed that they are concerned with the performance of the TS2 coordinator and requested if we could send a message requesting corrective measures ASP. The results supported by UNEP are the ones that have progressed more, thanks to the excellent work of the consultant. Concerned for the lack of progress on the FAO and one of the UNDP results (operational framework for options different than the PES)  **Colombia:** The team was very pleased with the workshop, and it help them clarify their approach to safeguards. Based on this, revised TORs for the safeguards specialist will be prepared. Also, a UNEP mission focused on discussing the spatial/economic analysis for the strategy and safeguards was confirmed for the week of. I requested to be connected in the safeguard’s session.  **Mexico (from UN-REDD Serena Fortuna, Clea Paz and Lucio Santos, UNDP: Edgar González, Jorge Morfín and Ernesto Diaz Ponce de León, CONAFOR. Ana Karla Perea, Francisco Quiroz and José Medina More)** During the visit to CONAFOR a meeting with the MRV project and CONAFOR´s personnel was held to discuss collaboration on Mexico’s Virtual Excellence Center for Forest Monitoring an initiative under development as part of [Mexico’s MRV project](http://mrv.cnf.gob.mx/index.php/en/), project to be concluded in December 2015. They presented the status of the center, countries’ demand for it, and its potential to deepen south-south collaboration amongst Mesoamerican countries (as part of the Mesoamerica Sustainable Strategy, EMSA for its acronym in Spanish) to begin with and all Latin countries later. CONAFOR asked for a) opportunities to collaborate with the current activities/processes of UN-REDD Global Programme, and b) indicated they will like to request a second targeted support for 2016 on this. We responded that we can immediately explore a) including potential collaboration with the REDD+ Academy, and that for b) we need to wait until the next Policy Board and the confirmation of availability of funds for new TS.  **Mexico’s safeguards TS meeting (August 14)**   * Participants: UN-REDD: Serena Fortuna, Edgar Gonzales, Clea Paz, Kimberly Todd, Steve Swan, and Judith Walcott, CONAFOR: Ana Karla Perea, Francisco Moreno, Norma Pedroza. * The meeting focused on: revision of progress upon the TS agreed work-plan, definition of next activities, revision of implementing challenges * In general and despite the delays in initial contracts, the TS project has advanced well and the main contracts are assigned or close to assignment, on substance CONAFOR has launched an inter-sectoral and inter-institutional dialogue on REDD+ safeguards, and the first and second products of the UNEP supported consultancy (SIS) are concluded. In addition there have been internal capacity building activities on safeguards within CONAFOR, for which UN-REDD’s inputs were used (questions from SIS paper) * Next steps include launch of the paper on national interpretation of the REDD+ safeguards in September, a national workshop in October for consulting the national interpretation of safeguards and SIS, and the dissemination/communication products in November * On the challenges: Considering the delays on the contract for UNDP’s large consultancy and general delays, an extension should be expected. It has been challenging to operate with the three administrative channels, in particular with UNEP, and CONAFOR has officially requested that remaining UNEP’s fund are implemented to UNDP, and that FAO Rome transfers its funds to FAO Mexico. * As this TS is strongly country-driven and the national counterpart has high capacity, for future missions, number of UN-REDD mission members should be reconsidered.   *9.b Results achieved (key outputs)*   * In depth discussions on lessons learned, challenges and opportunities of the Warsaw Framework among 14 countries from LAC * Improved capacities of 81 participants (35% women)   *9.c Expected outcomes and impacts*   * As a result of this mission, the UN-REDD Programme has consolidated as a neutral platform were countries can exchange knowledge, lessons and best practices. | | | | |
| 10. Key counterparts   * CONAFOR, and UN-REDD’s LAC partner countries | | | | |
| 11. Follow up action matrix | | | | |
| Action to be taken | By whom | | | Expected completion date |
| Brief global team on the workshop results | Pierre Yves | | | done |
| Complete workshop report | Patricia | | | 17 September |
| Call with Kifah on Costa Rica | Clea | | | done |
| Follow up on the meeting with Mexico about the monitoring center | Clea and Serena | | | In progress |
|  |  | | |  |
|  |  | | |  |
| 12. Distribution list   * Tim Clairs, Berta, Danae, Josep, Wahida, Jen, Bruno H., Joel, Tim Boyle, Fabien, Jyoti * UNDP CO * Matilde Mordt, Helen Negret, Lyes Ferroukhi, Pablo Basz, Soledad Bauza | | | | |