

Views expressed on joint assessment of countries readiness needs with UN-REDD Programme

March 12, 2012

	Country/Oberver	Comments
1.	Australia	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Terms of Reference on the Assessment of REDD+ Country Needs. We see this as a valuable piece of work and as such are very supportive for the desk study and surveys to commence now with the aim for this initial analysis to be shared at the next meeting in Paraguay. However, we are interested to hear the views of REDD participating countries on the value of the more in depth field studies and suggest this next phase of the analysis is discussed further in Paraguay. Perhaps the ToRs could be divided and approved in two phases to allow the first phase of desk top analysis and surveys to commence as soon as possible with the second phase to be agreed in Paraguay?
2.	CSO	The proposed needs assessment seems to contain no evaluation of the nature, extent and schedule for a country's explicit commitment to specific reductions in emissions of forest carbon from deforestation and forest degradation. Nor does it contain an evaluation of the plans and programmes for replacement or enhancement of livelihoods which might be affected (reduced or eliminated) through implementation of a REDD+ strategy, or loss of other 'co-benefits' or 'additional benefits'. These seem to be major omissions. Methodology 4a refers to MRV and monitoring? – why 'and monitoring' in addition to Monitoring, Reporting and Verification? Why have MRV if there is no REDD+ strategy in the first place?
3.	Finland	we support the view that separate assessment of FCPF countries is not warranted and would like to see an integrated approach in terms of both methodological and analytical work between UNREDD and FCPF.
4.	Germany	<p>We are concerned that the scope of the proposed study by far exceeds what was intended in the PC resolution. Instead of identifying "technical, institutional and financial needs...to complete their readiness phase (phases I and II Cancun Agreement)", we had in mind to suggest topics for FCPF analytical work and south-south exchange for the next 1-2 years, i.e. mainly technical needs. We are not sure whether a more fundamental and long-term exercise is appropriate at this moment of time, especially since the R-Package is not yet defined and will likely provide further insights into what is needed for countries' readiness. Also, the proposed study does not seem to take into account FIP or activities related to FLEGT, as mentioned in the PC Resolution.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it will be interesting to hear the preliminary results on the joint UN-REDD/FCPF day - but we should not decide to engage in this effort before that and before hearing countries' views on such a comprehensive exercise. We would also like to ask the FMT whether it would be possible to suggest knowledge-sharing topics and a budget for the next 2 years at PC 12 (as foreseen in the resolution) without engaging countries into a lengthy assessment process? Possibly it would be easier to put an overview of planned activities by other initiatives and a few suggestions by the FMT to consultation e.g. in an online-survey.</p>

5.	Mexico	<p>Mexico would like to thank you for the opportunity to give feedback on the proposed approach for the assessment of REDD+ Country Needs.</p> <p>We fully agree on conducting the assessment in a cost effective manner, and understand the advantages of doing a joint assessment of countries' needs with the UN-REDD program. However, we are not clear on how the methodology proposed will provide the FMT with the necessary information to present a proposal and budget that includes south-south exchange activities and the linkage between FLEGT and REDD+.</p> <p>On the one hand, the proposed approach exceeds what was agreed on Resolution PC/10/2011/1, where the FMT was instructed to do a quick assessment of the REDD countries' readiness needs, while on the other hand, the Terms of Reference do not take into account the activities undertaken by the FIP.</p> <p>On other matters, we would like to remind the FMT of the importance in providing the same information in the 3 languages. While we recognize that the note was written in French, English and Spanish, we would like to bring to your attention that the Terms of Reference were only available in English.</p> <p>It has been overwhelming to receive so many notes with very relevant information and we are worried that REDD+ countries may not have enough time to analyze carefully all the inputs, at least that is how we feel. We may need to slow down on the pace in order to give all the participants in the FCPF the chance to effectively participate. We have notice that in many discussions and teleconferences, there are almost no REDD+ countries participating, in many occasions we have been the only ones. It is really concerning to see decisions been made and resolutions been approved without countries giving feedback, and we believe that this may be a symptom that the current work dynamics are not appropriate for all countries. If we really want to be a partnership, we may need to rethink the organization of work and to slow down.</p> <p>We look forward to keep discussing all these issues with you.</p>
6.	Norway	<p>Our understanding from the meeting that was held in Geneva is that it is still quite uncertain how this exercise will cover the needs of FCPF in this regard. We are a bit concern about the scope of the exercise, which seems quite comprehensive.</p> <p>Our understanding is that the proposal and decision taken at PC10 in Berlin was to do a quick assessment of the countries needs and that FMT should identify areas where support is most urgently needed and optimum ways of providing this support. However, this said, we indeed support the idea of coordination and harmonization with the other REDD initiatives (both UN-REDD and Forest Investment Program), and it is indeed important to seek synergizes with regards to the countries needs study to avoid duplications.</p> <p>It was proposed at the meeting in Geneva that the working group should be expanded to include one REDD-country that is also a FCPF member, we think that is a good idea as it is very important to hear the REDD countries views on this exercise. We also support the participation of the FMT in the working group and ask that the PC members are involved in relevant processes.</p> <p>We are looking forward to receiving more information and to discussing this in more detail with you in the PC11 meeting in Paraguay.</p>
7.	Suriname	<p>The proposal seems to make sense. I am however wondering if it might make sense to gain an understanding of the methodology that is to be applied.</p> <p>It would seem important to understand the applied methodology in order to</p>

		<p>ascertain the extent to which these outcomes will provide us with a balanced view of readiness within the countries, and to be able to distill how to best frame the intensified support from the FMT.</p> <p>To sum up, I think it is a good idea, but I would like to know more about the chosen approach for the assessment, and if this is not possible, please ensure that the consultants provide sufficient insight into this during their presentations.</p>
8.	USA	<p>The United States fully supports conducting an assessment of needs, as decided in Berlin, to ensure we are taking into account both existing and planned activities by other initiatives. We are also supportive of the collaboration with UN-REDD to synergize this work. However, the current proposal submitted for comment on February 10 suggests a scope of work that we believe goes beyond the “quick assessment of REDD countries’ readiness needs.” The proposal to complete “a desk review of relevant documentation, a survey of all UN-REDD Programme and FCPF REDD+ countries, and in-depth, field-based assessments in up to nine countries” seems a larger, and more expensive, project than we had anticipated. We do not believe that this larger scope represents what was agreed to by Participants and may be duplicating much work that has already occurred. Multiple studies, as referenced in the Methodology section in the proposal, already exist documenting REDD+ country needs, and countries spent a great deal of time preparing detailed R-PPs.</p> <p>For example, we had imagined that information REDD+ country needs would be collected from R-PPs, UN-REDD program documents, and perhaps quick telephone or web surveys of focal points. To assess what others are doing on capacity building and technical assistance could be collected by the desk study and telephone or web survey donor countries, multilaterals, and other stakeholders such as NGOs as referenced in the proposal. This information together could be used to create a gap analysis or similar exercise to further inform all actors.</p> <p>We see the value of beginning the desk study and surveys immediately, perhaps to be prepared for the meeting Paraguay. However, we believe it would be best to allow Participants a greater chance to discuss the further-reaching and longer-term field studies, and associated costs, at the Paraguay meeting.</p> <p>“Recognizing the importance of scaling up the efforts to support the REDD Country Participants for effective implementation of REDD+ readiness processes, instructs the FMT to present a detailed proposal and budget estimate for analytical work, knowledge management, and centrally sourced activities, including South-South exchange and linkages between REDD+ and FLEGT, by PC12. Such a proposal shall be based on a quick assessment of the REDD countries' readiness needs and take into account similar existing or planned activities undertaken by other initiatives, including the Forest Investment Programme (FIP) and UN-REDD Programme. This analysis should also take into account the FMT's capacity to support the proposed activities.”</p>
9.	Vietnam	<p>Vietnam has highly appreciated and complimented the proposal on conducting a joint assessment of REDD+ country needs.</p> <p>The ToR and proposed method/timeline are fine. By selecting 9 countries which are now in different steps of the REDD+ implementation and 8 of them are common for both FCPF and UN-REDD are sufficient to bring a good picture on the needs from the REDD+ countries. As knowledge and understanding on the REDD+</p>

		has changed substantially since COP13. It is expected that the assessment could be very useful and supplemented to previous studies on the needs, costs and required time for the REDD+ preparation and implementation.
--	--	---