**Response to Input on Forest Day Concept Note and FD4 Update**

***Prepared by CIFOR 26 April 2010***

This document is a response to feedback on the Forest Day Concept Note from CPF members and an update on planning. The document is presented in three parts: I. Points of Agreement and Discussion on FD4 Concept Note; II. Progress Report; and III. Next Steps and Member Actions Required.

**Deadline for Member's response: May 10, 2010**

**Points of Agreement and Discussion on FD4 Concept Note**

1. **Logos**. Thank you for all of your comments. There seemed to be general agreement that we need to try again, and prepare another one for your review. Back to the drawing board.

2. **Respective roles.** There seemed to be overwhelming agreement that we should maintain the characterization of the respective roles of CIFOR and CPF as first presented in FD1:  "*Forest Day is a joint venture of the members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), with the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) providing the leadership*."  The branding and spirit of FD4 will reflect the collective of the CPF. Certain members may elect to take a heightened role as their mandates, funding limits and resources allow.

3. **Number of learning events.** The majority favored 12, six to be managed by CPF members and, six to be managed by CIFOR for the stated purpose of reaching out to non-CPF members as hosts/co-hosts of learning events. All events should reflect a diversity of region, nationalities and opinion. And all proposed learning events will be approved by the Steering Committee. A sample Learning Event proposal template is attached.

4. **Learning Events and media/messaging**. Last year we did considerably better than the year before in smoothing out the final messaging process. However, members felt we could improve on, and could raise the profile of, the messages emerging from the learning events. This can be done with the help of the communication focal points.  For example, those focal points could prepare individual press releases on the learning event topics, with the assistance of message takers assigned to each event. What worked well last year from the media standpoint was to add a section after the preamble, with quotes from the high level speakers. It also worked well to prepare the preamble in advance and to generate early draft messages.

5. **Electronic voting.** While members liked the Electronic Voting, many felt this could be dropped for budget savings.  CIFOR and participants surveyed, found this process extremely useful for producing unified messages emerging from the sub plenary, and for attracting media attention. We also found it an excellent input mechanism for participants. With that in mind, we would like to keep this on board for now, as it can easily be dropped next November if cuts are needed, following fund raising efforts.

6. **Speaker list.** CPF members would like more input into the list of speakers. CIFOR will ensure this happens, beginning with the call for proposed speakers in section III below.

7. **A special event targeting climate change negotiators.** All members agreed on this. We welcome proposals, and we will generate proposals as well, for discussion by the Steering Committee.

8. **Spanish translation.** All agreed to the need for Spanish translation, and one member requested consideration of adding French. Unfortunately, the costs of translating the entire event into French would be prohibitive; however the member may consider the possibility for making French translation available at one of the learning events.

9. **Branded events.** Members agreed this required further discussion by the Steering Committee.

10. **The use of media moderators.** This was not commented on in the actual responses, but some members commented verbally, so we raise it here. We came to the conclusion that print journalists do not make good moderators (in one case it was terrible, but saved due to fast action). Our experience with a broadcast journalist on the other hand, at the Adaptation Sub-plenary and High Level Speakers session, was highly successful. CIFOR proposes to use broadcast journalists again as moderators in the events it organizes, and will the leave that decision open to the organizer of the other sub-plenary (CIFOR will assist in identifying if needed).

11. **Basic structure of Forest Day.** All members agreed on the basic structure, on page 6 of the Concept Note, as last year, with the exception of the branded events to be discussed.

12. **Learning event topics**.  All members, including CIFOR, agreed on the need for a greater focus on the “+” in REDD+.  We may want to draw this out at the sub-plenary level on REDD+, or more specifically at the learning event level.

Members also agreed on the need to draw a closer link between CC and poverty alleviation, and between Adaptation and Mitigation. We believe these are related, and CIFOR agrees with these suggestions. However, our scientists feel it is still preferable to separate Mitigation from Adaptation at the sub-plenary level (we find there remains a lack of understanding or clarity among donors and others on the relationship between M and A).  We would prefer to make poverty alleviation one of the key themes in the Sub-plenary on Adaption.  We could then have a special focus on CC and poverty alleviation as a Learning Event.

ICRAF, and other members concurred, felt there needed to be a focus on the interaction between the "institutional" forest concept in REDD+ and how it interacts with the gradient of tree densities in the landscape (i.e., trees on the farm, agroforestry...). We agree and recommend ICRAF join other interested members in preparing a learning event on this topic. This is a natural link between agriculture and forests. We would also like to consider a learning event called “Agricultural drivers of deforestation.”

All members agreed, including CIFOR, that we should not finalize the list of learning event topics too early, lest we lose the opportunity to cover new topics that emerge toward the end of the year. We do think we need to have the bulk of the topics determined by August but could leave two or three open, to be determined by early October.

For the purpose of highlighting general topics for the FD4 brochure, here is a list of broad subjects that have emerged from our discussions thus far. **Please vote on those topics which you favor so we can narrow this down to no more than six**:

1. Comparison of early results of REDD+ demonstration activities

2. Determining the reference levels for REDD+

3. Financing Schemes for REDD+ and adaptation.

4. The role of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in REDD+

5. Climate Change and Poverty Alleviation

6. Focus on the + in REDD+

7. Review of Payments for Environmental Services

8. Bridging the gap between Forests and Landscapes (or something similar).

9. Illegal Logging and Corruption

10. Showing the way on Community Forests (to draw on the expertise of Mexico)

11. Agricultural drivers of deforestation.

12.Open

12. **Sub-plenary topics.** Members appeared to agree that Mitigation, Adaptation, and Biodiversity would be the Sub-plenary topics.

On the issue of Biodiversity, ITTO has offered to co-host this sub-plenary with CBD Secretariat. As it is proposed that the topic will link Biodiversity and SFM, this might be the place to give a heightened role to the CPF Chair.

FAO has suggested it would consider, subject to funding and costs, sponsoring a sub-plenary on Mitigation or Adaptation.

In return for providing half the funding, CIFOR would again sponsor two sub-plenaries (or share sponsorship with the FAO on one of them), the plenary, the high level session and closing event, with input on topics and speakers from the CPF.

13. **Budget.** While members accepted this was a broad budget, many members felt we should look for cuts, possibly in reducing the number of invited speakers (and their associated travel costs) and scholarships (invitations to a select group, say indigenous leaders, who would not otherwise be able to attend), eliminating the electronic voting system, and possibly to charge for food in some way, and to consider cutting other costs.

At this point CIFOR feels there is no need to finalize the budget and can cut many smaller items later as outside funding comes into play, including from the Mexican Government. However, CIFOR believes that we must at least provide snacks and coffee -- we set a standard last year, and asking people to line up for food purchase would lead to program delays; further we have been able to reduce the price of leasing the convention center by including catering.

For the next step, CIFOR will prepare three budgets based on 1,200, 1,600 and 2,000 participants.

We agree that it would be beneficial for interested CPF members, collectively or separately, to seek outside funding, and could use the concept note (to be rewritten) as a foundation for those efforts. CIFOR will be seeking funding from its own donors for its portion of the budget.

In the meantime, please consider the following options for apportioning costs among members, and for raising external funds.

a. The Steering Committee can agree early to set up a maximum level for general contributions from CPF co-hosts.

b. We will again charge for booths, with reduced tariffs for NGOs from developing nations on a case-by-case basis. The cost last year was $1,000.

c. We could consider charging entry fees this year, somewhere between $30 and $50 per person, with reduced tariffs for NGOs from developing nations or others on a case-by-case basis. **If we choose this option, and CIFOR recommends this, we must decide by May 15.**

d. We could design and sell a Forest Day T-shirt.

e. The current budget includes all costs, including translation, for learning events, sub-plenaries and plenary. However, it is proposed that sponsors for the sub-plenary cover associated costs of that session, and that sponsors of learning events pay for those of the learning events. If we do so, we could agree on the costs (a percentage of the total) of a learning event, and sub-plenary (where we consider the costs of bringing in speakers/panelists).

f.  Last, we are now in the final stages of negotiations with the Government of Mexico on their potential contribution, and will inform members of the outcome of those talks soon.

All of these can be discussed in the proposed conference call below.

**II. Progress Report**

1. **National co-host**. The Mexican National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR) has agreed to be the National Co-Host for FD4. We are now negotiating the elements of their sponsorship, such as covering the costs of translation and/or evening cocktail.

2. **Venue.** We have successfully booked the Convention Center for December 5, which includes access on December 4 for those sponsoring booths. We are finalizing the budget to include snacks for 1200 participants (a higher number of participants can be negotiated later).

3. **Local event manager.** After a bidding process, and testing of services, we have contracted an agency for assistance in managing the event on the ground in Cancun. They are paid by the supplier of services as is customary in Cancun. And they are available to all CPF members for assistance in securing hotel rooms for the COP or for contracting rooms for meetings, etc.

4. **Service suppliers.** We have identified, and again carried out bidding processes and reference checks for a team of excellent suppliers (audio-visual support, etc.) for FD4. We have identified, and tested last year in Buenos Aires, a powerful and good-value PR agency that has headquarters in Mexico City, with major offices throughout South America.

5. We have hired an excellent consultant in Mexico City who will serve as a liaison between us and the government on issues of protocol etc.

6. Shortly we will provide details for Members' access to a Google Calendar/Apps where we will upload all documents and record all important dates and deadlines.

**III Next Steps and Members' Actions Required**

1**. Steering Committee.** Please let us know if you would like to serve on the Steering Committee. All members will be consulted and copied on all decisions of the Steering Committee.

2. **Conference call.** We would like to propose a conference call for the Steering Committee and interested parties on Tuesday 18 May at 20:30 Jakarta time, 15:30 Rome, 16:30 Nairobi, and 09:30 New York.

3. **SBSTA.** Please let us know, if you have not already done so, if you or your representative will be attending SBSTA in Bonn and be available for a meeting in the first week.

4. **Learning events**. Please let us know if would like to sponsor one of the learning events, broadly defined above.

5. Website and promotional materials. We are now hosting the Forest Day website on CIFOR’s sites, but for collective branding purposes it should first be hosted on the CPF website hosted by the FAO. Ideally each member would promote FD4 on their sites and develop their own content reflecting their organization (for example a video interview their director or scientists). To assist this process CIFOR will create promotional material/text/photos, videos, will share this with the communication focal points, including the FAO, for use on various sites. We are now preparing a brochure for the launch of registration in Bonn.

5. **Proposals for speakers.** We are currently preparing a list of speakers, for plenary, sub plenary and high-level sessions and welcome your suggestions. Given our success last year, we expect to be able to attract an equally exciting list of speakers again this year. We plan to send invitations in June or earlier.

Here are some of the names that have been suggested to give you a flavor of what we are considering. Our objective is to again reflect a diversity of stakeholders, regions, expertise, opinions and gender. Beyond that, we are looking for newsmakers, outstanding scientists, Senior Government representatives from important countries (Indonesia, Brazil, Norway) or industries (Nestlé) affecting forests, topical global thinkers and actors on forests and climate change, and this year, on forests and biodiversity. We want great speakers and maybe a little controversy to spark debate.

a. Indonesian President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. We have been told the President would seriously consider this request if his schedule allows.  (Please note all presidential level invitations will require approval of the Mexican Government.) Yudhoyono not only represents one of the most important forested countries but has made climate change a of the key platform of his Presidency. He even has a tree nursery at this home.

b. We must leave a space for a high-level representative from the Government of Mexico, either Minister or President.

c. Liberian President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf; we looking for other suggestions to maintain a gender balance (and great speakers). She is an excellent speaker and thinker (Harvard-trained) who cares deeply about forests and the environment.

d. Joseph Eugene Stiglitz, or another Nobel prize economist/environmentalist. We are looking for an outstanding development economist again, and one that would have a good understanding of the financial aspects of REDD payments etc.

f. Al Gore. He continues to be a major player in Climate Change issues.

g. William F. Laurance, An outstanding Tropical Forest Ecologist at Smithsonian, and expert on biodiversity in the Amazon

## h. Daniel Simberloff, is another outstanding Forest Ecologist.

i. Daniel C. Nepstad,  respected Forest Scientist, Amazon deforestation expert. We are considering adding an outstanding forest scientist as one of the keynotes to balance the celebrity list.

F. Prince Charles. Always a popular and respected speaker on Forests and Climate Change

G. Norwegian Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg, or Minister of the Environment and International Development Erik Solheim. The government of Norway has led the way on funding of REDD+ and forest research.

H. Brazil's President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva. He has strong views on REDD+, and the country is critical to a successful REDD+ strategy. The election to choose his successor will be held in October 2010, but he will still be President during COP.

I.  Outstanding indigenous leader on forest issues (to be identified)

g. Inger Anderson, the incoming World Bank Vice President of Sustainable Development, or the new UNFCCC Secretary. A good choice for the Adaptation sub-plenary.

h. Carlos Pérez del Castillo, Chair of the new Consortium Board of the CGIAR. The CGIAR is going through a major reform and climate change will play a major role in the CG’s new research agenda, across forests and agriculture.

i. Private Sector: CEO of Nestlé Peter Brabeck-Letmathe, or another relevant CEO. Nestle (and Unilever) recently announced they would stop buying palm oil from Indonesia’s largest producer Sinar Mars, after Greenpeace accused the company of illegally clearing forests for oil palm plantations. A senior representative from one of the consumer goods companies is of interests as they directly impact forest clearance.

j. Private Sector; Reinsurance expert on adaptation. There are two or three global experts in this field who would fit well on the Adaptation Sub-plenary.

7. **Approval of Concept Note**. We will assume the concept note is broadly approved with the incorporation of CPF member comments. Please let us know if you have other comments.

Thank you.

John