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

**Meeting Agenda of August 26th 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: Jessica Holterhof

1. **Approval of minutes of previous call, August 19th 2015**

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

Approval of agenda

* The Green Climate Fund discussion will be postponed to the next MG call on September 2nd, to allow for a proper update within the UN agencies before.
* Any other business – UNDP will provide a short update on the current situation of UNORCID. A new Memorandum of Understanding to expand the programme for its second phase will need to be signed before the end of September 2015.

No further comments have been provided by the MG on the minutes and decisions of the previous call.

Decisions and Actions:

* + The MG will provide written comments on the minutes and decisions from the last MG by Friday, August 28th, if necessary.
  + The Secretariat will amend the minutes and decisions and post on the workspace.

1. **Update on the UN-REDD 2016-20 Terms of Reference process (1h)**

*Following extensive discussions on the Terms of Reference during the MG call on August 19th, as well as a first informal feedback from representatives of the Norwegian government, the Secretariat will highlight outcomes of subsequent discussions with the MPTF, Norway, Mexico, Colombia and main changes to the revised draft of the Terms of Reference (will be circulated prior to the call), with a focus on the governance arrangements.*

* The Secretariat updated the MG on the internal discussions with Colombia, Mexico and Norway, and identified three main issues:

1. The structure of the EB – The idea of a consultative assembly to replace the PB is gaining interest with partner countries. Norway sees it as a great opportunity to maintain the inclusiveness and philosophy of the overall UN-REDD Programme, and furthermore thinks such an assembly is a good option to further knowledge management with all stakeholders. It has been proposed to host the assembly on a bi-annual basis. Mexico and Colombia agree that this would display a good evolution of the PB that would justify the shift of power in decision-making to an EB in a clear and transparent way.
2. The composition of the EB – Mexico and Colombia insist that a power balance between all partners will need to be maintained. If donors will have three membership seats, the forest countries will need to have the same amount of seats on the EB as well. In regard to UN representation, while Norway would strongly prefer the representation of the UN through one representative, Mexico and Colombia do understand all three agencies to be official members if legal purposes might not allow otherwise. The UN-REDD Programme and the MPTF have the strong preference of keeping chairmanship of the EB by the UN agencies. If greenlit by the legal departments, UN representation could happen on rotational basis, with the other two agencies participating as observers. Norway agrees to a chairmanship of the UN, providing not all three UN agencies become official EB members.
3. Consultation of PB members – No formal consultation has been planned for IPs and CSOs so far. The MG will need to decide on next steps on how to best engage PB members, and furthermore decide on the role of the PB in regard to a final discussion on the results framework and the selection criteria for countries in the next Programme phase, as it would provide further legitimacy for the work of the EB in 2016. The Secretariat will facilitate further internal discussions, and will be able to provide final draft documents of the TOR, MOU, etc. by the end of October 2015 to be sent out to PB members intersessionally.

* The MG raised further questions which need clarification; those include (i) a limitation of donor membership, (ii) the overall role of the National Steering Committee, (iii) the consultation process with MPTF in regard to the overall composition of the EB.
* The Secretariat reported that Norway as the main donor will facilitate a discussion with other existing and potential new donors on the potential limited membership of donors in the EB that will maintain a power balance and not pose a barrier for new donors to join. There are different options that are possible, including rotation, certain donors to be present for decisions on earmarked funding, the main donors have permanent membership, etc.
* In regard to membership of the NSC, it will include all stakeholders, containing IPs and CSOs. No difference will be made on decisions on earmarked or non-earmarked funds.
* The MG agreed that the consultative assembly might need to be renamed, as it might steer confusion of the overall role of such an assembly.
* The MG agreed that the Secretariat will need to provide a narrative and background information on how the governance arrangements have been put in place, how the consultation process has positively brought forward the discussion, and what the benefits are of the new structure. This document will be sent out with the final draft of the Terms of Reference to all PB members at the end of September 2015.
* FAO mentioned that it would be useful to discuss with the MPTF whether there are existing joint programmes that are currently having a similar structure to the one proposed for the next Programme phase. Those documents (i.e. TOR, MOU) could be used as precedence, and will help the legal departments of the UN agencies to better understand what is planned.
* UNDP provided further comments the annotated SG agenda. There are currently too many questions posed to the SG. The Secretariat will need to adjust the agenda, and rather ask for confirmation of the agreed MG decisions than causing more confusion. This will further the effectiveness of the MG work. Additionally, the updates for the SG (for FYI) should be shifted to the annex rather than making it an official item to discuss on the agenda.
* The Secretariat will introduce the new structure of the governance arrangements to the SG, and will start producing the narrative on an agreement is reached.
* The Secretariat mentioned that it will be important to have all nominations for stakeholders in the transitional EB by the end of PB15, as it is most likely that a first UN-REDD Programme assembly might not take place before the summer of 2016.
* FAO reminded all call participants that it might be difficult for the current PB to decide on the composition and nominations of the transitional EB. It would therefore be good to check whether MPTF has had experience with such a discussion, and might be able to support the process.

Annotated agenda for the SG on August 27th

* The MG agreed that the Secretariat will need to revise the latest draft of the annotated agenda for the SG call on August 27th. Currently, too much questions have been posed. The MG is rather seeking for confirmation and feedback on their decisions than causing more confusion and issues to be raised.

Consultation process to include IPs/CSOs

* UNDP does agree that an assembly is a good idea to streamline the governance of the overall Programme, and it has to be kept in mind that when the Programme was first established there was no clarity or existing fora on REDD+. Now that different platforms are provided for further discussion on several REDD+ topics, and ad-hoc REDD+ focal points are captured under the UNFCCC process and other initial initiatives, it will be easier to justify the need to narrow down to a leaner EB and develop an assembly to provide a platform for knowledge exchange. UNDP furthermore stressed that while this seems to be a good option for the donor and forest countries, it will need to be discussed with the IPs and CSOs, as they have not been involved in the consultation process so far. The Programme will need to identify a strategy on how to best include them in the consultation process. They supported the idea that a narrative on the new governance structure is needed to make them understand the decisions better. UNDP has offered its support on this matter, and is happy to bring this forward and identify such a strategy.
* UNEP and FAO welcomed the efforts of UNDP, and agree that a participation of the IPs and CSOs in the consultation process will provide useful input and is necessary.
* The Secretariat acknowledged that the engagement of IPs and CSOs is important, and will add a consultation with them in the overall timeframe and scheduling for finalization of the Programme fund documents. The Secretariat welcomed the leadership of UNDP in that regard, and planned to have a first session in the afternoon of the same day. He reminded the MG that both the IPs and CSOs will have EB membership, and their relative membership will be increased due to the decrease in overall membership numbers. The Secretariat agreed that sending out a narrative together with the concept for new governance arrangements will be useful, and should be sent out by the end of September to all PB members intersessionally. This will allow for all partners to decide on nominations for the transitional EB ahead of time of the PB15.
* The MG made clear that when those documents are sent out, it will remain clear that no further consultation with stakeholders will be done. Therefore, the narrative will need to have a detailed description on how the comments from donors, forest countries, IPs and CSOs have been integrated and taken into account.
* UNDP reminded the MG that the following item might help ensure the constituencies – there is an option to have a pre-EB meeting especially for IPs and CSOs, which will provide them with a proper platform to discuss and agree on their joint statements during the EB.

Decisions and Actions:

* The Secretariat will introduce the new structure of the governance arrangements to the SG, and will start producing the narrative on an agreement is reached.
  + The Secretariat will update the annotated agenda for the SG call on August 27th based on the comments provided by the MG, and focus their attention on governance arrangements and the role of the UN in the EB.
  + The Secretariat will provide a new draft of the governance section in the TOR by COB on August 26th.

1. **Stock-taking of the Vietnam Programme (15 min)**

*The Vietnam country team will have a joint call to do an update and stock-taking of the current UN-REDD Programme Viet Nam Phase II Programme on August 25th specifically on the meetings of the technical team, the effectiveness of implemented measures, and potential new issues that have been arising since the last scoping mission in March 2015. The Secretariat will update the MG on outcomes of the call specifically on the next steps in regard to sequencing of future meetings, including a stock-taking mission from representatives of the Norwegian government, the next EG meeting and potential preceding UN internal meetings and highlight any management action that the MG may need to take.*

Due to time constraints, the discussion has been canceled. A short update has been provided in the draft agenda for the SG call on August 27th, and a first draft for the minutes of the videoconference will be provided by the Secretariat soon.

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

*Prior to the MG call, the Secretariat will have circulated the revised draft of the agenda for the MG Q4 planning retreat meeting from 15-17 September 2015 in Nairobi. The main objective of the meeting is to finalize the transition arrangements and strategic staffing, and clarify the comparative advantages of all three UN agencies for the next UN-REDD Programme cycle 2016-2020. This is just to do a quick check-in for additional feedback on the revised agenda, based on feedback during the call on August 12th, and confirm the agency leads and preparation for the different sessions.*

A detailed discussion on the MG retreat agenda has been done during previous MG calls, and as there are no further pressing issues, the overall session was kept short.

Decisions and Actions:

* + The MG agreed on the latest draft of the MG retreat agenda, and confirmed agency leads for the different sessions.
  + As the Secretariat will need some time to prepare the background documents for the session on strategic staffing, the UN agencies will provide their input as soon as possible, but latest by Tuesday September 1st.

1. **Green Climate Fund – potential options and strategy moving forward (15 min)**

*Following the decision at the last MG planning retreat in June 2015, which states that “the MG agreed that the opportunities and challenges of engagement with the GCF will require more MG discussion and then brought to the SG attention in the near future, also to clarify the overall strategy of the UN-REDD Programme concerning future applications to the GCF and how the Programme should respond to countries seeking support to access the GCF”, the MG will provide an update and agree on next steps including when this issue should be taken to the SG and how.*

As stated in the beginning of the call, the discussion will be postponed to the next MG call on September 2nd.

1. **AOB**

**UNORCID**

* UNDP provided an update on the current situation of a possible extension for the UNORCID programme in Indonesia. The new Memorandum of Understanding for the second programme phase has been prepared and is awaiting signature by Helen Clarke, including several options for extension (one, two or four years). A recommendation has been made to extend UNORCID for the next four years. Norway is currently in discussion with UNDP and the Government of Indonesia to identify potential funding mechanisms, and a request for support in regard to resource mobilization with the Government of Indonesia has been voiced. The UN-REDD Programme might be asked to provide further input. Considering the new results framework of the next Programme phase for 2016-2020, financing UNORCID via global funds of the UN-REDD Programme as has been the practice so far is no longer a feasible option. Potential funding through the UN-REDD Programme might only be possible if Norway would make an explicit request, and provide additional earmarked funding.
* The cost for staff is covered until the end of 2015, and a short-term solution needs to be fund to cover the costs for a D2 salary from January 2016 onwards.
* UNEP furthermore updated the MG on a proposal from UNORCID in collaboration with USAID, which would provide the programme with an additional budget of 2 M US$.
* The Secretariat mentioned that clear sequencing will need to be identified – until when are costs covered, what would be potential funding options, etc.
* The MG agreed that the issue needs to be discussed in further detail, and therefore will be made an item on the agenda for the next MG call. UNDP will lead the session, and provide further detail on the situation.
* The Secretariat will provide a short update on the situation in the annotated agenda of the SG call on August 27th.

Decisions and Actions:

* + The MG agreed that a more detailed discussion and update on the current status of the new UNORCID Memorandum of Understanding is necessary during the next MG call. UNDP will lead the session, and provide further information on the subject.