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# Introduction

This document[[1]](#footnote-1) provides standards and processes for collecting **impact narratives** from UN-REDD partner countries’ on key technical work areas related to meeting the UNFCCC REDD+ requirements. These guidelines are aimed at facilitating and increasing the collection of impact narratives by UN-REDD Comms/KM staff, Regional Technical Advisors, country teams and national partners.

# Definition of UN-REDD Impact Narratives

For the purpose of these guidelines, **impact narratives** are defined as information material describing change contributed by the UN-REDD Programme both at the **outcome** and **impact** levels. Although outcomes and impacts are different steps on the causal pathway, both levels will be jointly covered when referring to UN-REDD *impact narratives* as a means to facilitate collection of evidence and communication on programme achievements.

# Scope of Impact Narratives

UN-REDD Programme outcomes and impact are grounded in the programme strategy and theory of change. The programme strategy sets the technical areas covered by impact narratives and countries of focus. The **Warsaw Framework** for REDD+ and Associated UNFCCC Decisions remain the backbone to documenting how countries are progressing against the framework of the convention. Accordingly, UN-REDD impact narratives focus on the following areas:

1. National REDD+ Strategy or Action Plan;

2. Safeguards and Safeguards Information System;

3. National Forest Reference Emission Level/National Forest Reference Level; and

4. National Forest Monitoring System.

In order to account for the pervasive nature of knowledge, UN-REDD impact narratives describe changes stemming from the provision of **technical assistance**, **advisory support**, **capacity development**, or **knowledge management** products and services. The initiating event in the causal pathway may serve to anchor the impact narrative in one or another support area (e.g. outcome of an advisory mission from a RTA, outcome of a webinar, outcome of a technical knowledge exchange event or workshop).

Attribution of results remains quite frequently elusive to prove when it comes to knowledge work. Outcomes and impacts of knowledge products and services or technical assistance and advisory support are frequently difficult to track and assess. Therefore impact narratives should concentrate on demonstrating the **contribution** of the programme’s knowledge brokering activities to outcomes and impact.

Impact narratives may describe change at the individual level in terms of new skills, behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and practices. At an organizational level, outcomes may translate into new systems, procedures, governance structures, partnerships, capacities, etc. At an environmental level this may imply new policies, strategies, institutions, resources, etc. However such generic outcomes are only illustrative. The 2016-2020 programme strategy and its results framework come with a range of **indicators** that should be leveraged to guide the collection of qualitative and quantitative evidence on the achievements of the programme and lead to formulate impact narratives[[2]](#footnote-2).

Although having some commonalities, impact narratives differ slightly from success stories in their scope. Impact narratives can be turned into **success stories** although the opposite is not always true. Success stories can relate to a larger spectrum of programme components such as its relevance, the efficiency of its implementation, the quality of its partnerships, or achievements in terms of mere outputs like the number of participants to an online or face-to-face event, number of downloads of a publication, etc. Impact narratives usually focus on the bottom line, i.e. they convey evidence of a change in local, national, regional, or global conditions.

# Objectives and Target Audiences

Impact narratives respond to different objectives and address various target audiences.

* **Monitoring**: Impact narratives convey evidence of results. They complement other reporting and monitoring mechanisms implemented by the programme in order to inform **donors** and **partners** about the achievements of the programme.
* **Advocacy**: A key objective of impact narratives is to promote the usefulness and value of the programme. In that regards impact narratives have a communication and advocacy role with a view to influence and engage additional partners in increasing sponsorship and upscaling benefits. The primary target audiences for such purpose are **donors** and **policy makers**.
* **Learning**: A central objective fulfilled by impact narratives is to inform readers about the capabilities and pathways taken by the programme to achieve the intended outcomes. Impact narratives spread knowledge about good practices and foster further uptake. Impact narratives are a learning tool especially for **practitioners** and **CSOs/NGOs**.

Impact narratives can also provide indirect benefits. They may spur new knowledge exchanges and south-south collaborations between countries, thereby participating in the knowledge **brokering** role of the programme. By showcasing countries’ achievements they also increase the visibility of national partners and contribute to raise public expectations and strengthen **accountability**.

# Mega Process

The mega process followed to collect and disseminate impact narratives is presented below.

Promotion

Topic selection

Synthesis and formulation

Data collection

The main steps involve the following activities:

1. **Topic selection**: This implies selecting the story topic and country with descriptive details of the impact. Selection can be based on primary sources (e.g. RTA) or secondary data (e.g. annual report);
2. **Data collection**: Data collection relies on primary sources consulted through a qualitative survey (skype, conference calls) and secondary sources (desk review);
3. **Synthesis and formulation**: Synthesize data and draft the story- e.g. 500 words-. Identify photos if relevant or quotes;
4. **Promotion**: this implies disseminating the story to target audiences through relevant media channels.

# Data sources and Data Collection Instruments

The UN-REDD Programmme can rely on several sources of data and data collection instruments to gather evidence of impact. Primary sources of facts and evidence of results are national partners and country teams as well as Regional Technical Advisors. Engaging these sources in developing impact narratives is likely to be more effective when relying on existing processes. In addition a range of secondary sources that collect information on the programme outcomes and impact are available for review and reuse.

1. **Country teams and national partners**: National staff and partners are the primary source of information regarding the outcomes and impacts of the Programme. Collection and dissemination of impact narratives may be part of a national communications plan. This may also form one of the knowledge products that the country team may develop as part of the programme. Alternatively, reporting processes embedded in the functioning of the programme convey information that can be turned into impact narratives. Additional inputs can be collected through interviews –Annex 1- and/or survey questionnaires –Annex 2-.
2. **Regional Technical Advisors**: Instruments like Back to Office Reports or direct consultations with RTAs are obvious means to collect information after the delivery of some technical assistance. Advisory support may take time to translate into outcomes and impacts, therefore evidence may need to be collected through additional in-country consultations using a survey questionnaire and/or interviews.
3. **Country programme reports**: Annual reports provide a description of key achievements made by the NP or TS in relation to the 4 pillars of the Warsaw Framework and how the NP/TS have supported those. While these reports are the most obvious secondary source to collect evidence of outcomes and impact, they may not be worded in ways that can directly build a narrative on impact. Therefore annual reports may have to be reviewed and analyzed in relation to the knowledge support received by the country during the year and complemented with information on the causal pathway, i.e. how knowledge based activities have contributed to the reported outcomes and impact. Additional data would be collected through interviews.
4. **Annual report**s: The UN-REDD semi-annual and annual reports and reporting templates are a second key mechanism to collect evidence of outcomes and impact. Data may be extracted as such or complemented with interviews depending on the format of the narrative –confer next section-.
5. **Evaluations**: All National Programmes conclude with a final evaluation that compiles detailed information on the achievements of the programme according to the intended outputs, outcomes and impacts. Although findings and conclusions may be contrasted, evaluation reports hold most often some positive assessments that can feed into an impact narrative. Additional in-country consultations are likely to be needed to substantiate a narrative. Methodology to collect additional inputs would be interviews. As a potential alternative, mainstreaming data collection in the TOR of the evaluation itself may facilitate and provide more scale to the process. For instance one approach could be to include in the evaluation methodology the development of a case study.
6. **Post knowledge event survey**: Participants to a UN-REDD knowledge exchange could be consulted 3 to 6 months after the event in order to provide an ex-post assessment of its usefulness, use and outcomes. The methodology should be based on an online survey eventually complemented with phone interviews. Design and implementation of the survey[[3]](#footnote-3) would require consulting with the RTA(s) and country team(s) involved during the event in order to formulate questions that gather detailed feedback on the technical outcomes of the event and may also assess remaining knowledge needs.

1. **Post knowledge product dissemination survey**: All knowledge products developed by the programme could be jointly assessed once a year in order to collect anecdotal evidence of uptake and influence. Such survey could be addressed to all registered users of the Collaborative Workspace for instance or to the recipients of the UN-REDD Newsletter.
2. **Annual needs assessment survey**: Knowledge needs assessment surveys are currently implemented by each region without necessarily assessing the impact of the knowledge support previously received. Such surveys could be complemented with a brief section assessing outcomes and impact of KM activities for instance and proposing to provide concrete examples of use and influence.
3. **Communications tools**: Additional channels may be used already to disseminate impact narratives but without proper categorization or recording. Success stories disseminated through UN-REDD Facebook page, Twitter account, Newsletter, Workspace announcements, etc. may deserve a periodic review to extract facts and evidence of results as relevant. Alternatively a hashtag #unreddimpact, workspace tag *UN-REDD* *Impact*, or ad hoc section in the newsletter could be created to facilitate identification and retrieval.

Country based approaches to compile substance for impact narratives such as system analysis, network maps, outcome mapping, or participatory rural appraisal are out of scope due to capacity limitations. Similarly, desk reviews such as policy tracking (e.g. FAOLEX, national websites) cannot be conducted without ad hoc capacity.

# Formulation and Format

UN-REDD impact narratives can be formulated in a couple of lines, a few paragraphs, or in the longer form of a case study –Annex 3-. Some examples of formulation include:

* In Vietnam, the UN-REDD Programme provided technical support on the topics of institutional capacity building, analysis of drivers, stakeholder engagement, safeguards, National Strategies/Action Plans, and Forest Reference Levels, resulting in 18 new REDD+ Policies and Measures, in six provinces (Bac Kan, Binh Tuan, Ca Mau, Ha Tinh, Lam Dong, Lao Cai – these are provinces in Viet Nam), representing 20% of the county’s forest. This enabled each province to finalize and begin to their respective Provincial REDD+ Action Programme in 2015.
* In Africa, the Regional knowledge exchange on Policies and Measures in the context of REDD+ with participation of 28 countries (35 national representatives) led to a number of countries to advance their work on legal frameworks at national level- in **Kenya** a legal framework promoting the involvement of non-state actors in REDD+ decision making processes developed and REDD+ infused into the legislative and participative processes advancing the concept of community land and tenure issues, with six policies and bills being selected for integrating REDD+ considerations, in **Madagascar** the final PLR analysis report and the resulting roadmap have been completed, identifying immediate opportunities to modify/improve legislation and policies to better include REDD+ considerations issues and **Malawi** has finalized the legal and policy framework assessment, institutional and context analysis, corruption risk assessment, and tenure assessment.
* The Knowledge exchanges organized during July 2014 and August 2015 by UN-REDD at regional level (+83 participants/15 countries) have played a significant role in strengthening capacities and putting knowledge exchange into action to: assist LAC countries in advancing to **complete the requirements of the Warsaw Framework**. Specific impacts in this regard include: **National REDD+ strategies** anchored in national development plans supported in seven LAC countries. (Ecuador has a finalized REDD+ Action Plan along with a financial strategy. Ecuador and Costa Rica plan submit the link to the information hub in 2016; and Colombia, Honduras, Peru, in 2017). Core elements of **Safeguards Information Systems/National Safeguards Systems** developed in five countries. (From these Chile, Ecuador and Mexico will have an operational SIS and submit their summaries to the UNFCCC in 2016).  *\*Note: Advances on* ***FRELs*** *and* ***NFMS*** *already included in reports provided by FAO.)*Contribute to clarifying the linkages of REDD+ for the development of INDCs through the [INDCs and REDD+ Processes Webinar](http://www.unredd.net/index.php?view=list&slug=indcs-and-redd-1&option=com_docman&Itemid=134) delivered in May 2015 (28 participants/9 countries) which along with other efforts was instrumental to the submission of INDCs by LAC countries during 2015; Provide countries with key information to make informed decisions towards the **negotiation of results based payments agreements** signed recently (Norway with Peru; Norway, UK and Germany with Colombia).

The context in which the narrative is to be used and target audience drives the selection of an appropriate format[[4]](#footnote-4). Typically the following good practices should guide formulation:

1. **Target audience**: As with any other communications or knowledge product it is important to write with the target audience in mind. This includes avoiding any format that is supposedly reaching all sorts of readers –e.g. donors and researchers, policy makers and NGOs, etc.-. Donors are likely to be particularly receptive to public value for instance, to outcomes that demonstrate the relevance of the programme or that integrate specific priorities (e.g. gender, national ownership, south-south). Research and academia may be more interested in hard facts and figures, in scientific outcomes, in future research areas. Policy makers may be sensitive to public opinions or evidence conveyed through quotes from well-known policy makers or global leaders. Etc.
2. **Structure**: Impact narratives should at least describe the issue, the intervention, and its impact. Length allowing, additional information can be conveyed about the context such as timeframe, location, actors; the methodology of the intervention; means to ensure sustainability of results; methods used to evaluate impact; future potential and upscale pathways.
3. **Facts**: Impact narratives need to rely on facts and figures. However statistics must be understandable by the target audience and contextualized. Claiming that 10 Mio acres of forest have saved may be less self-explanatory for some readers than indicating this is the size of Switzerland. Comparison with a baseline or counterfactual analysis can also put figures into perspective.
4. **Style**: Some of the advice provided when developing success stories can be translated to impact narratives such as to adopt a style that connects with the readers, to avoid technical jargon, to translate the material in the national or local language, to use quotes from beneficiaries or well-known leaders, etc. Pictures, data visualization techniques, charts and graphs are also recommended companions.

# Dissemination

The UN-REDD Programme offers a wide range of channels and media to disseminate impact narratives:

* UN-REDD Newsletter: 2 paragraphs narratives
* UN-REDD website: 2 lines, 2 paragraphs, and 2 pager narratives
* Collaborative workspace: 2 lines, 2 paragraphs, and 2 pagers
* Annual report: 2 lines
* Social media channels: 2 lines
* Workshops: 2 pagers
* REDD+ Academy: 2 lines
* Slide deck: 2 lines

In order to facilitate categorization and retrieval a tag “Impact narrative” should be added to the taxonomy of the UN-REDD Collaborative Workspace.

# Annex 1: Template for interviews

The following canvas is proposed as a template to articulate a phone interview and collect additional information to substantiate a narrative. Focus is on the causal pathway and impacts of a specific intervention. The phone interviews should take 20 to 30min. Generic questions could cover:

1. Introductions
2. Objective of the interview
3. Context
	1. What was the problem statement?
	2. What was the “knowledge intervention” about? Its objectives?
	3. What were the activities and outputs?
4. Outcomes and impact contribution
	1. Changes at the individual level: new skills, behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and practices?
	2. Changes at an organizational level: new systems, procedures, governance structures, partnerships, capacities, other?
	3. Changes in the external environmental level: new policies, strategies, institutions, resources, other?
	4. Other?
5. Means of verification
	1. Methodology?
	2. Facts and figures?
6. Factors impeding outcomes
	1. Lack of capacities or resources?
	2. Lack of time?
	3. Lack of political will?
	4. Other?
7. Resource materials that could be consulted?
8. Any other person that could be contacted and interviewed?

These questions could be tailored to reflect a particular technical area. The UN-REDD Programme results framework can help to contextualize the line of inquiry by using the set of outcome indicators. For instance when considering outcome 1 and indicator PO1.1:

* Did the intervention contribute to change the degree of completeness of national REDD+ strategies and/or action plans (NS/AP) as defined by whether the NS/AP?
* Did the intervention contribute to identify, assess and prioritize the direct and underlying drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, as well as the barriers to the "plus" (+) activities on the basis of robust analyses?
* Did it contribute to propose a coherent and co-ordinated set of policies and measures for REDD+ that are proportionate to the drivers & barriers, results-oriented and feasible?
* Did it contribute to relate to the scope and scale of the FREL/FRL, taking into account national circumstances?
* Did it contribute to define the institutional arrangements for REDD+ implementation, including governance measures, participatory oversight and inter-sectoral coordination. Score from low to high completeness?
* Did it have any influence on the national contribution to the mitigation of climate change through REDD+?
* Any contribution to the readiness to implement and monitor results-based actions leading to emissions reductions (i.e. “REDD+ -ready”) in accordance with relevant UNFCCC decisions?

Another alternative is to use the REDD+ readiness assessment as a source of questions that can be selected according to the NP or TS at stake and specified according to the intervention being tracked (e.g. knowledge product, knowledge event, technical assistance, capacity development, etc.).

* Did the intervention contribute to the adequate information of the representatives of all relevant stakeholders (governmental, non-governmental, grassroots, women) of REDD+, and to the provision of sufficient opportunities to engage and contribute to the national REDD+ process?
* Did the intervention contribute to the establishment by the government of a national team or unit in charge of coordinating and leading REDD+ (e.g. CN-REDD, REDD+ secretariat, REDD+ office)?
* Did the intervention contribute to informing and engaging sub-national and local governments in the REDD+ process?
* Did the intervention contribute to establish a regular dialogue or collaborative platform between national government and REDD+ pilots?
* Did the intervention contribute to the adoption of the national REDD+ Strategy?
* Did the intervention contribute to have REDD+ investment plans designed and aligned to drivers of deforestation?
* Did the intervention contribute to mainstream REDD+ into national policies for climate change, natural resources management and/or sustainable development?
* Did the intervention contribute to demonstrating a strong political leadership from the country in the international REDD+ dialogue?
* Did the intervention contribute to the country starting to implement or mobilize finance for its REDD+ implementation with REDD+ result-based payments initiatives?
* Did the intervention contribute to establish the REDD+ institutional framework?
* Did the intervention contribute to have governance assessments conducted as part of the strategy or implementation framework of REDD+?
* Did the intervention contribute to have transparency/ accountability/integrity risks and opportunities (anti-corruption) assessed through an inclusive and gender-responsive process such as Corruption Risk Assessment (CRA)?
* Did the intervention contribute to have existing relevant policies and regulations reviewed and/or new regulations promulgated with capacity to implement and enforce to integrate REDD+?
* Did the intervention contribute to design, establish and operationalize the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) for MRV-ing GHG emission reductions and carbon stock increases from REDD+ activities?
* Did the intervention contribute to conduct GHG inventories and reporting system for land use, land-use change and forestry with the required enabling elements?
* Did the intervention contribute to develop a national and/or sub-national Reference Emission Level (REL) / Reference Level (RL), consistent with the UNFCCC/IPCC guidance?
* Did the intervention contribute to have the multiple benefits of REDD+ identified and assessed with the tool to monitor its implementation?
* Did the intervention contribute to have the social and environmental safeguard policies, laws and regulations (PLRs) conducted with respect to REDD+?
* Did the intervention contribute to have the content of the social & environmental safeguards for REDD+ defined and agreed across stakeholders, and a safeguards information system (SIS) put in place
* Did the intervention contribute to have a Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) mechanism or equivalent policy designed for REDD+?
* Did the intervention contribute to have a grievance mechanism designed and established for REDD+?

# Annex 2: Template for survey questionnaire

The following questions could be included in a survey questionnaire.

* 1. How do you assess the contribution of this knowledge intervention to the following aspects of your work?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **High**  | **Significant**  | **Moderate**  | **Little**  | **None** |
| Increased your technical knowledge on REDD+ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improved your technical skills or practices |  |  |  |  |  |
| Increased capacity of REDD staff or experts to provide technical assistance  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enhanced the relevance or quality of analyses, research, or advocacy work |  |  |  |  |  |
| Facilitated new connections, collaborations, or networks on REDD+ |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. How do you assess the contribution of this knowledge intervention to the following outcomes?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **High**  | **Significant**  | **Moderate**  | **Little**  | **None** |
| Contribution to the adequate information of the representatives of all relevant stakeholders (governmental, non-governmental, grassroots, women) of REDD+, and to the provision of sufficient opportunities to engage and contribute to the national REDD+ process |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to the establishment by the government of a national team or unit in charge of coordinating and leading REDD+ (e.g. CN-REDD, REDD+ secretariat, REDD+ office) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to informing and engaging sub-national and local governments in the REDD+ process |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to establish a regular dialogue or collaborative platform between national government and REDD+ pilots |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to the adoption of the national REDD+ Strategy  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have REDD+ investment plans designed and aligned to drivers of deforestation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to mainstream REDD+ into national policies for climate change, natural resources management and/or sustainable development |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to demonstrating a strong political leadership from the country in the international REDD+ dialogue |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to the country starting to implement or mobilize finance for its REDD+ implementation with REDD+ result-based payments initiatives |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to establish the REDD+ institutional framework  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have governance assessments conducted as part of the strategy or implementation framework of REDD+ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have transparency/ accountability/integrity risks and opportunities (anti-corruption) assessed through an inclusive and gender-responsive process such as Corruption Risk Assessment (CRA) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have existing relevant policies and regulations reviewed and/or new regulations promulgated with capacity to implement and enforce to integrate REDD+ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to design, establish and operationalize the National Forest Monitoring System (NFMS) for MRV-ing GHG emission reductions and carbon stock increases from REDD+ activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to conduct GHG inventories and reporting system for land use, land-use change and forestry with the required enabling elements |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to develop a national and/or sub-national Reference Emission Level (REL) / Reference Level (RL), consistent with the UNFCCC/IPCC guidance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have the multiple benefits of REDD+ identified and assessed with the tool to monitor its implementation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have the social and environmental safeguard policies, laws and regulations (PLRs) conducted with respect to REDD+  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have the content of the social & environmental safeguards for REDD+ defined and agreed across stakeholders, and a safeguards information system (SIS) put in place |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution to have a Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) mechanism or equivalent policy designed for REDD+  |  |  |  |  |  |
|

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Contribution to have a grievance mechanism designed and established for REDD+ |  |  |  |  |  |

* 1. Please provide a specific example where use of this knowledge intervention contributed to positive environmental of institutional impacts on REDD in your country:

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |

* 1. Please share your contact details in case you would be interested in having these impacts turned into a case study or advocacy materials to promote UN-REDD and your country’s achievements:

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |

# Annex 3: Template for Impact Brief

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Brief** |

**Description:**

A UN-REDD Impact Brief provides short, practical, and convincing information on a specific achievement within a key technical area of the UN-REDD Programme and in the context of a country implementation. The Impact Brief concentrates on what results were achieved. It provides a step by step description of the causal chain taken by a UN-REDD project or initiative to achieve the intended results and returns a factual assessment of the achievements. The Impact Brief relies on UN-REDD results framework that it substantiates with experiential knowledge. It highlights a UN-REDD issue, methodological approaches, tailored response, and evidence of outcomes and impact.

**Purpose:**

The primary purposes of an Impact Brief are to:

* Inform donors about the impact of the Programme, promote results, and advocate for continued or new support;
* Provide policy makers evidence of achievements so that similar programmatic approached can be applied or considered in other countries for comparable outcomes;
* Offer national partners an additional opportunity to communicate their achievements on a national, regional, and global basis;
* Make it easier for practitioners to come up to date on key REDD and REDD+ issues and understand, broadly speaking, how the UN-REDD Programme works on that specific area.

**Target audience:**

Impact Briefs are intended as a knowledge product that can be developed for the needs of specific target audiences such as donors, policy makers, or practitioners. The Impact Brief should avoid targeting all UN-REDD partners and stakeholders at large but focus on cohesive categories of readers.

**Producers of Impact Briefs:**

Impact Briefs can be written by country teams or produced by regional FAO/UNDP/UNEP technical experts, advisors, specialists and programme staff, drawing on their support and analysis of UN-REDD programme implementation and monitoring.

**Quality assurance process:**

An Impact Brief should follow the steps of the quality assurance process as spelled out in *UN-REDD Programme Workflow Process for the Production of Information Materials*. This includes steps such as filling the *Concept Brief template for Information Materials*, circulating it to relevant focal points, and **peer reviewing** the Impact Brief before finalization and dissemination.

**Resources and References:**

* Template for UN-REDD Impact Brief:
* *To be developed*
* UN-REDD Information Materials Workflow Process:

<http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&view=document&alias=14360-information-materials-workflow-process&category_slug=communications&Itemid=134>

**Format/minimum content standards:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Impact Brief****Maximum: 2 pages** |
|  | TitleAuthors |
| **1. Introduction** | An opening overview stating the context, purpose of the document, and points covered.* A paragraph about the UN-REDD Programme
* Historical perspective
* About REDD, REDD+ and the WFR
* A paragraph on the Impact Brief
* State the main topic presented
* Briefly describe the methodology for data collection
* Outline what the reader can expect to find
 |
| **2. Problem statement** | A section on the context and rationale for project intervention. This may include:* The context related to the project intervention (timeframe, location, actors)
* Main issues / challenges and technical area involved
* Lessons learned from previous experiences, local complications, drivers of change
 |
| **3. Programme intervention** | This section should describe the methodology, activities and outputs of the project. It briefly articulates the successive steps, topics or priorities involved in addressing the problem statement. This may include: * Solutions in implementation and methodologies
* Activities conducted and outputs
* Good practices in project management relevant to the outcomes (e.g. mandate of participating partners; project analysis, design, and implementation; advocacy and resource mobilization; capacity development and knowledge uptake; etc.)
* Experiences and supporting evidence
* Boxes that can either:
* Highlight relationships and link the section with international events, conventions, frameworks
* Provide complementary scientific / technical data to the section
* Pictures that show actors or area of project intervention
 |
| **4. Impact** | The final section concentrates on specific results, e.g.: * Key outcomes and results achieved, facts and figures
* Methods used to evaluate impact
* Means to ensure sustainability of results
* Future potential and upscale pathways
* Boxes that present quantitative data in graphical form
 |
| **5. Conclusion** | Outline some of the common challenges that projects/ countries face, good practices in different contexts, lessons learned, scope for lasting impact, replication and scaling up |
| **References** | List of references formatted according to UN-REDD style guide |
| **Endnotes** | Complementary notes (optional) |
| **Acknowledgements** | List of persons consulted (optional) |
| **More information** | Selected list of resources and further reading with hyperlinks to web-based UN-REDD/other resources (optional) |
| **About UN-REDD** | Box presenting UN-REDD services and points of contact (optional) |
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