

# **Minutes of Second Conference Call of the Readiness Package Drafting Group – September 22, 2011**

## **Participants:**

Alexander Lotsch, Benoit Bosquet, Kenn Rapp, Ken Andrasko, Leonel Iglesias and Rajesh Koirala (FCPF FMT), Josefina Braña (Mexico), Lucio Santos (Colombia), Michael Bucki (European Union), Patrick Wylie (Canada), John Verdieck (US), Anja Bursche (Germany), Alexandra Saenz (Costa Rica), Karine Belna (France), Duncan Marsh (The Nature Conservancy), Joshua Lichtenstein (Bank Information Center), Kate Horner (Friends of the Earth)

## **Summary of Discussion:**

During the second conference call by the Readiness Package drafting group FMT presented (1) options for the R-Package structure and (2) a framework and proposed draft standards for the assessment of the R-Package. A powerpoint presentation was shared with the call participants prior to the meeting and briefly summarized to start the discussion.

### **1. R-Package structure**

Three options for the R-Package structure were discussed: (1) Strictly following the Cancun elements and sequence, (2) Cross-walking Cancun element with Readiness Preparation Proposals (R-PP) component, and (3) Building on current R-PP structure. Participants stressed the importance of capturing the REDD+ elements as they are defined in the Cancun Agreement (national strategy and action plan, national forest REL/FRL, national forest monitoring systems, system for information on safeguards) in the R-Package structure. Participants discussed and carefully evaluated the merits of the three options noting that option 2 would maintain a logical link between the UNFCCC and the FCPF Readiness process and allow FCPF country experience to be harnessed while assuring consistency with the international process.

Implementation R-PP vs. Progress on REDD+ Readiness: There was general agreement that the focus of the R-Package would be on the progress towards REDD+ readiness rather than be limited to monitoring the implementation of the R-PP. It was noted that the REDD+ country process has evolved rapidly since the endorsement of the R-PP by the PC and that there are alternative ways to reach important readiness milestones. Thus the R-Package is to be considered a measure of progress and inform a positive dialogue among REDD+ stakeholders. FMT explained that the Grant Reporting and Monitoring tool (per the operational guidelines of the World Bank as a delivery partner, similarly for other delivery partners) will

serve as the primary tool to monitor the implementation of FCPF grant activities (which typically constitute only a sub-set of the overall country activities).

Further, the discussion among the participants and explanations by FMT clarified that the R-Package serves both as requirement to sign an emissions reductions payment agreement (ERPA) with the FCPF Carbon Fund as well as accessing other sources of REDD+ revenues. That is, the R-Package is to be defined broadly enough to capture all relevant aspects of REDD+ readiness and help advance countries towards a future compliance regime.

FMT noted that safeguards are mainstreamed into the R-PP structure and contextualized in relation to REDD+ activities (e.g. including guidance on the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment), while the safeguard elements defined in the Cancun Agreement are comprehensive but provide little guidance on implementation.

Participants agreed that option 2 is the basis on which to move forward in the definition of the R-Package structure and the development of the assessment standard.

## **2. Assessment Standards**

FMT presented examples of proposed draft standards to illustrate how necessary achievements in the REDD+ readiness process could be defined. The proposal is to use a similar approach as for the R-PP review process, where countries have to meet a certain standard against which their preparation activities are assessed. FMT proposes to define and use a simple set of indicators to assess whether the desired standard is met. Participants welcomed the general approach, noting that standards (and indicators) would have to be defined in a flexible fashion that permits their application for different country contexts. Similar to the development of the standards for the R-PP review (which benefited from several rounds of feedback), the standards for the R-Package should undergo a public review and validation process. While participants agreed on the general approach using standards and considered the presented draft examples a good substantive step forward, a detailed technical discussion on individual standards was not possible during the call due to time constraints, and because validation of the proposed general approach was sought on the call as a first step.

## **3. Next Steps**

- Develop a structure for the R-Package on the basis of option 2 (Cancun/R-PP cross-walk), to present via email to the working group and for discussion at PC10
- Develop a fuller set of standards to be presented and discussed at PC10 (participants may submit early reactions and suggestions on the basis of the draft standards by email)
- Propose to the PC to continue the current working group to further refine the definition of standards and the development of indicators after PC10