

## Minutes of First Conference Call of the Readiness Package Drafting Group – August 10, 2011

### Participants:

Alexander Lotsch, André Aquino and Leonel Iglesias (FCPF FMT), Bruno Guay (DRC), Josefina Braña (Mexico), Keshav Prasad Khanal (Nepal , disconnected during the call), Pham Manh Cuong (Vietnam), Andrea Guerrero (Colombia , disconnected during the call), Michael Bukki (European Union), Patrick Wylie (Canada), John Verdieck (US), Anne Bursche (Germany), Jürgen Blaser (Switzerland), Joshua Lichtenstein (Bank Information Center), Kate Horner (Friends of the Earth)

### Discussion Summary

The call included the following main discussion points:

- **Time Line.** A draft Readiness Package (R-Package) outline is to be produced by PC 10 in Berlin. A total of 3 phone calls is planned prior to PC10 to receive input and feedback from FCPF participants. A first draft outline is to be presented at PC10 to seek feedback from a wider audience, including the PC and observers. An advanced draft along with a review and assessment process is to be produced by PC 11 and an interactive process is to be facilitated by the FMT to solicit and incorporate further feedback leading-up to PC11. The discussion at the first phone call was centered on the core elements of the R-Package and the definition of milestones for REDD Readiness.
- **Main elements of the R-Package.** The FMT went over the key points of the presentation on the Readiness Package (R-Package) delivered at PC 9, in Oslo. This included a brief discussion of the five main elements proposed to make up the Readiness Package: Strategy, Implementation Framework, MRV, REL / RFL and Safeguards. Participants generally considered these to be suitable broad categories, and the suggestion was made to more explicitly emphasize the monitoring of co-benefits.
- **Consistency with UNFCCC negotiations.** It was generally noted that the R-Package needs to be consistent with the emerging guidance from the UNFCCC (notably the phased approach). At the same time, several participants noted that the FCPF should be ‘pushing the envelope’ and help define the scope of and activities associated with REDD readiness.
- **R-Package purpose.** The Package should not be only a list of check-boxes, but rather an instrument to foster a dialogue with REDD+ countries on REDD+ Readiness.
- **Defining milestones of REDD Readiness.** It was discussed that, following the experience with international social and environmental standards for REDD+, the R-Package could be organized around principles, criteria and indicators. The exact meaning of each of these terms should be clarified to all participants at the outset. Indicators are likely to be quantitative and qualitative. Vietnam suggested the inclusion of an element on Demonstration Activities.
- **Indicators.** Indicators should measure progress, feasibility, relevance and consistency of activities during the readiness phase. They need to be built in a flexible\_manner to reflect

country-specific circumstances (countries may advance at different pace on work related to the different components).

- **Assessment of REDD Strategy.** In addition to assessing the core elements of the national strategy and the process leading to its preparation, some participants argued that the R-Package should also allow for the assessment of the implementation of the strategy. An important element of the REDD strategy is the extent to which other sectors (agriculture, infrastructure, energy, etc.) are effectively integrated. Also, the extent to which the strategy is the result of stakeholder consultations and dialogue should be taken into account. The strategy should clarify how land tenure issues will be addressed.
- **Implementation Framework.** The participants briefly discussed questions related to the implementation framework, including: how advanced do the activities on the implementation framework need to be? Should laws or decrees be already adopted or only designed or prepared? Should a benefit sharing mechanism be under implementation or designed? Further, the effective functioning of the REDD+ Readiness structures, such as national REDD+ Committees, should also be assessed. The participation of local governments (in those countries where decentralization is a reality) should be taken into account. Some REDD+ countries insisted that flexibility on these aspects is necessary at this stage, since there is uncertainty at national and international level around REDD+.
- **MRV.** The monitoring of non carbon variables is essential. The suggestion was made to focus on national forest monitoring systems which are not the same as MRV. Other countries also suggested to combine REL/RFL with MRV, as the respective activities performed under these components are closely related.
- **Safeguards.** There should be a reference to the Grievance Mechanism.
- **Process for assessing REDD Readiness.** There is agreement that the TAP should play a role in providing an independent evaluation of the R-Package.
- **Timing.** There were questions as to when a country is expected to submit its R-Package, but the call did not permit a detailed discussion of this question.

### **Next steps**

- The FMT will share the minutes for the first call.
- The FMT will revise the presentation on the R-Package according to preliminary discussions, including some comments on the organization of the components.
- Countries are encouraged to continue discussions among themselves as preparation for the second call.
- The EU volunteered to prepare a short analytical paper of the elements of the R-Package.
- A date for the next call is to be confirmed, but is tentatively planned for the week of September 19 (after deadline for submissions to SBSTA). Topics to be discussed: MRV/ REL, detailing the indicators.
- The FMT should assess existing R-PPs for the indicators proposed by countries in the monitoring framework and report back to the R-Package Drafting Group.