**Management Group (MG) of the UN-REDD Programme**

**Meeting Minutes of September 2nd 2015**

**9h30 Geneva/Rome, 10h30 Nairobi**

**Attendance:**

MG members and alternates

FAO: Maria José Sanz Sanchez

UNDP: Tim Clairs

UNEP: Tim Christophersen

Secretariat: Mario Boccucci, Mirey Atallah

Others

Secretariat: Mike Speirs, Jessica Holterhof

1. **Approval of minutes of previous call, August 26th 2015**

*The Secretariat has sent the documents for revision and comment by the MG.*

Approval of agenda

* Any other business – The UN agencies will provide a short update on new staff appointments.

No further comments have been provided by the MG on the decisions of the previous call. The session on Viet Nam will be amended, as there is no further discussion during today’s call due to time constraints.

Decisions and Actions:

* + The MG will provide written comments on the minutes and decisions of the last MG by Friday, September 4th, if necessary.
  + The Secretariat will amend the minutes and decisions and post on the workspace.

1. **Update on the Terms of Reference process and read out of SG call on August 27th (1h)**

*Following extensive discussions on the Terms of Reference during various MG and SG calls, the Secretariat will give an update on the latest discussions with donor and partner countries, as well as consolidate on the outcomes and decisions made during the SG call on August 27th, especially in regard to the structure of the proposed new governance arrangements and the programming cycle.*

**Update on the SG call**

* The Secretariat provided an update on the last SG call on August 27th. The SG acknowledged that good progress has been made by the MG and the Secretariat to identify the way forward on the future governance arrangements. The SG agreed that having one UN agency represent the other two on the EB would be the best option, with the caveat that the FAO lawyers still advise to the opposite. They additionally stressed that as this will need to be reflected in the MOU, it needs to be discussed with the legal departments concretely as soon as possible.
* The MG agreed that to ensure a proper consultation with all legal departments, the most current draft of the MOU should be sent to the agencies as soon as possible by the Secretariat or the MPTF.
* FAO further wanted to know if there are any MPTF precedents that might allow the legal departments to better understand the implementation of such arrangements in practice.
* The Secretariat has discussed the issue with MPTF, and currently the only cases where one UN agency represents all other participating resident and non-resident UN agencies are country level One-UN funds where the UNFC represents the UN.

**Update on the discussion with donors**

* The Secretariat summarized the discussions with the European Commission, and although an overall agreement has been reached on the balanced membership for the EB, the EC voiced concerns on the following issues – (i) the weight of voting rights (as donors should have a share of 50% of voting rights to keep the Programme attractive for new potential donors), and (ii) UN agencies should only have observer status rather than being members of the EB.
* As the Fund for the Programme is handled by the MPTF, the UN will need to have an official EB membership. All three UN agencies raised strong concerns that the EC does not seem to understand the overall model of a MPTF and of the UN-REDD Programme. The Programme does not work on the basis of voting rights, but is rather based on a consensus process where all stakeholders are actively involved. The MG agreed that this discussion should be resolved as quickly as possible and that the formal EC counterparts of the MPTF and the UN should be identified and involved (including the option to contact the Commissioner for DG Climate).
* UNDP offered to go through the UN/UNDP office in Brussels, which manages all engagement of the EC with the UN system. This office would be able to facilitate a better and more detailed discussion on the issues presented, and know the right contacts.
* The other two UN agencies welcomed the offer from UNDP, and agreed that the Secretariat should provide the UN office in Brussels with a background information note on the current situation that will go along with the request for support.
* The Secretariat updated the MG that it is currently exploring the best options to define an EB quorum, which will be presented to the MG once some of the issues have been checked internally.
* UNEP reminded the other MG members that it has already been agreed at the last PB meeting to have the future decision-making body of the UN-REDD Programme be based on consensus.
* The Secretariat informed the MG that the European Commission might not be able to make an official pledge before the beginning of 2016. Current expectations range between 10-15 M Euro.

**Presence of donors at NSC level**

* A second item raised by the EC, and still echoed by Norway, concerns the representation of donors at the National Steering Committees, with a preference of donors to have this representation as wide as possible. This is in opposition with the position of forest countries, who would rather maintain the participation of donors at NSC level as limited as possible. A question was put forward whether to maintain the current text in the Fund TOR, which only mentions ‘donors’, or replace it with ‘three donors’.
* The UN agencies agreed that this will need to be further discussed on a case-by-case level, giving each programme country the change to discuss this further with any involved donors, and recommended maintain the text as it currently reads in the TOR.

**Discussion of the results framework and the criteria for country selection at PB15**

The updated draft version of the results framework will be presented during the next MG retreat in Nairobi. Guidance is needed by the MG on how to best integrate PB members in the current consultation process.

* The Secretariat updated the MG on the current status of the discussion of how to best include PB members in the overall consultation – the results framework and criteria for country selection will be discussed during a lessons learnt session at PB15, giving the PB the opportunity to reflect and provide considerations that will remain on record for the succeeding EB. It has to be made clear to all members that there will be no formal endorsement of either document. The Secretariat asked for further guidance from the MG on when to best circulate the results framework to all PB members.
* All three UN agencies agreed that sending the results framework at this point in time could cause confusion and might lead to discussions that can derail the overall consultation process. Additionally, UNDP has sent comments that will need to be addressed internally before sending the document out to the PB.
* FAO raised concerns that sending out the results framework without a message that clearly defines the expectations of the UN-REDD Programme might cause further confusion.
* The three UN agencies agreed that the results framework will be sent as an information document as part of the lessons learned session at PB15.
* The Secretariat mentioned that the PB has continually proved itself as a constructive source of valuable input, and benefits of sharing the documents might outweigh potential problems.

**Update on the Terms of Reference**

* The Secretariat has updated all sections of the Terms of Reference based on input from the UN agencies, the MPTF as well as Norway. The key pending section is the programming cycle, where there are still some conflicting and contradicting issues that will be flagged by the Secretariat. The MG will need to provide further guidance and clarification, and it is envisaged to find an agreement at the next MG retreat in Nairobi.
* FAO mentioned that the SG might be of the impression that the Terms of Reference will be very detailed. FAO SG member Eduardo Mansur has raised concern that the TOR should not be overloaded on information, but rather provide more detailed information in later UN-REDD Programme documents.

Decisions and Actions:

* After consultation with the MPTF, the Secretariat will provide the UN agencies with a draft MOU by the end of this week.
* The Secretariat will engage with the UNDP liaison office in Brussels, asking for support in the current discussion with the European Commission.
* The MG agreed that concerning donor representation at NSC level, this will be discussed on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, the text should be kept as such in the current governance arrangements.
* The Secretariat will draft a message accompanying the results framework (when it will be shared with the PB), which will need to be agreed by the members of the MG before being sent out. The results framework will be sent as an information document as part of the lessons learnt session at PB15.
* The Secretariat will send the latest version of the Terms of Reference, including a new diagram on the Theory of Change, by the end of the week.

1. **Memorandum of Understanding for UNORCID (15 min)**

*Following a brief update on the current status of signature of an extension for the second phase of UNORCID during the last MG call, UNDP will provide further information on the subject and update UNEP and FAO on potential issues and potential new funding mechanisms UNDP is seeking.*

Due to time constraints, the session had to be postponed and internal discussion will follow at the next MG planning retreat in Nairobi. The UNDP Regional Director for Asia-Pacific has been in Jakarta this past week, gaining a better overview of the current situation. As stressed before, UNDP is urging for reaffirmation and clarification of a future commitment from the Government of Indonesia.

1. **MG retreat agenda (15 min)**

*This will be a quick follow-up on the agenda for any other feedback. Also, as the agencies have agreed to lead some of the sessions, the MG will discuss on what is expected as an outcome to the session, so the leads can prepare appropriately.*

* The Secretariat asked for input from the MG on the following issues – (i) input from UN agencies on staffing and associated costs, (ii) SNA carry-over and plans for potential new global activities in 2016, and (iii) agency leads for the different retreat sessions.
* All three UN agencies have provided cost numbers that only include staffing costs, and no potential costs arising for projects or activities for 2016. Additionally, UNEP is the only UN agency that has included travel costs into their plans for 2016. Any additional information will be sent to the Secretariat after further internal discussions and as soon as possible.
* The three agencies furthermore assured that their focus for 2016 will lie on finalizing current work and programmes, and no new activities have been planned until the next phase of the Programme is officially launched.
* The UN agencies will prepare the sessions they are leading, and do a quick internal follow-up with the other two UN agencies on their expectations of the outcomes of the discussions.
* The session with the UNEP Regional Team in Africa will be guided by the team’s priorities on issues to be discussed with the MG.

1. **AOB**

**New staff appointments**

* UNEP updated MG participants that Jamie Webb has been appointed as the replacement for Julie Greenwalt.
* UNDP has appointed Danae Maniatis at UNDP headquarters in New York.

1. **Next MG call, September 23rd 2015**

*In light of the World Forestry Congress and the next MG planning retreat in Nairobi in September, the next MG call will take place on September 23rd. Items that will need immediate discussion by the MG will be placed on the agenda once those meetings have taken place. The Secretariat will provide an agenda for the next MG call in due course.*