



**UNITED NATIONS
DEVELOPMENT GROUP**



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Consolidated Annual Report of the Administrative Agent of the REDD+ Joint Programme Partnership Support for the period 1 January to 31 December 2013

**Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office
Bureau of Management
United Nations Development Programme
[GATEWAY: http://mptf.undp.org](http://mptf.undp.org)**

31 May 2014

REDD+ Partnership Secretariat Services
MPTF OFFICE GENERIC ANNUAL PROGRAMME¹ NARRATIVE PROGRESS REPORT
REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2013

<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Programme Title & Project Number</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Title: The REDD+ Partnership Secretariat Services Programme Number <i>(if applicable)</i> MPTF Office Project Reference Number:³ 77921. </td> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Participating Organization(s)</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme</p> <p>Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN United Nations Development Programme United Nations Environment Programme</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Programme/Project Cost (US\$)</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Total approved budget as per project document:</td> <td style="width: 10%;">FAO:</td> <td style="width: 60%;">US\$ 1,078,244</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MPTF /JP Contribution⁴:</td> <td>UNDP:</td> <td>US\$ 311,699</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>UNEP:</td> <td>US\$ 1,388,609</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Agency Contribution <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i> <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i> <p>TOTAL: US \$2,683,603</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Assessment/Review - if applicable <i>please attach</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Mid-Term Evaluation Report – <i>if applicable please attach</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> </td> </tr> </table>	Programme Title & Project Number	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Title: The REDD+ Partnership Secretariat Services Programme Number <i>(if applicable)</i> MPTF Office Project Reference Number:³ 77921. 	Participating Organization(s)	<p>Organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme</p> <p>Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN United Nations Development Programme United Nations Environment Programme</p>	Programme/Project Cost (US\$)	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Total approved budget as per project document:</td> <td style="width: 10%;">FAO:</td> <td style="width: 60%;">US\$ 1,078,244</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MPTF /JP Contribution⁴:</td> <td>UNDP:</td> <td>US\$ 311,699</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>UNEP:</td> <td>US\$ 1,388,609</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Agency Contribution <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i> <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i> <p>TOTAL: US \$2,683,603</p>	Total approved budget as per project document:	FAO:	US\$ 1,078,244	MPTF /JP Contribution ⁴ :	UNDP:	US\$ 311,699		UNEP:	US\$ 1,388,609	Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.	<p>Assessment/Review - if applicable <i>please attach</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Mid-Term Evaluation Report – <i>if applicable please attach</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results²</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>75 REDD+ Partnership Countries</p> <p>Forests and Climate Change</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Implementing Partners</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations (Donors – the European Commission) <p>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility – the World Bank</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Programme Duration</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Overall Duration:</td> <td style="width: 40%;">33 months</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Start Date⁵</td> <td>15 March 2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End Date (or Revised End Date)⁶</td> <td>31 December 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Closure Date⁷</td> <td>31 March 2015</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Report Submitted By</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Name: Thais Juvenal Linhares Title: Senior Programme Officer Participating Organization; FAO Email address: Thais.Juvenal@un-redd.org</p> </td> </tr> </table>	Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results ²	<p>75 REDD+ Partnership Countries</p> <p>Forests and Climate Change</p>	Implementing Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations (Donors – the European Commission) <p>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility – the World Bank</p>	Programme Duration	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Overall Duration:</td> <td style="width: 40%;">33 months</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Start Date⁵</td> <td>15 March 2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End Date (or Revised End Date)⁶</td> <td>31 December 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Closure Date⁷</td> <td>31 March 2015</td> </tr> </table>	Overall Duration:	33 months	Start Date ⁵	15 March 2011	End Date (or Revised End Date) ⁶	31 December 2014	Operational Closure Date ⁷	31 March 2015	Report Submitted By	<p>Name: Thais Juvenal Linhares Title: Senior Programme Officer Participating Organization; FAO Email address: Thais.Juvenal@un-redd.org</p>
Programme Title & Project Number																																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Title: The REDD+ Partnership Secretariat Services Programme Number <i>(if applicable)</i> MPTF Office Project Reference Number:³ 77921. 																																		
Participating Organization(s)																																		
<p>Organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme</p> <p>Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN United Nations Development Programme United Nations Environment Programme</p>																																		
Programme/Project Cost (US\$)																																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Total approved budget as per project document:</td> <td style="width: 10%;">FAO:</td> <td style="width: 60%;">US\$ 1,078,244</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MPTF /JP Contribution⁴:</td> <td>UNDP:</td> <td>US\$ 311,699</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>UNEP:</td> <td>US\$ 1,388,609</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Agency Contribution <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i> <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i> Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i> <p>TOTAL: US \$2,683,603</p>	Total approved budget as per project document:	FAO:	US\$ 1,078,244	MPTF /JP Contribution ⁴ :	UNDP:	US\$ 311,699		UNEP:	US\$ 1,388,609																									
Total approved budget as per project document:	FAO:	US\$ 1,078,244																																
MPTF /JP Contribution ⁴ :	UNDP:	US\$ 311,699																																
	UNEP:	US\$ 1,388,609																																
Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.																																		
<p>Assessment/Review - if applicable <i>please attach</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Mid-Term Evaluation Report – <i>if applicable please attach</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>																																		
Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results ²																																		
<p>75 REDD+ Partnership Countries</p> <p>Forests and Climate Change</p>																																		
Implementing Partners																																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations (Donors – the European Commission) <p>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility – the World Bank</p>																																		
Programme Duration																																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Overall Duration:</td> <td style="width: 40%;">33 months</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Start Date⁵</td> <td>15 March 2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>End Date (or Revised End Date)⁶</td> <td>31 December 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Closure Date⁷</td> <td>31 March 2015</td> </tr> </table>	Overall Duration:	33 months	Start Date ⁵	15 March 2011	End Date (or Revised End Date) ⁶	31 December 2014	Operational Closure Date ⁷	31 March 2015																										
Overall Duration:	33 months																																	
Start Date ⁵	15 March 2011																																	
End Date (or Revised End Date) ⁶	31 December 2014																																	
Operational Closure Date ⁷	31 March 2015																																	
Report Submitted By																																		
<p>Name: Thais Juvenal Linhares Title: Senior Programme Officer Participating Organization; FAO Email address: Thais.Juvenal@un-redd.org</p>																																		

¹ The term “programme” is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

² Strategic Results, as formulated in the Strategic UN Planning Framework (e.g. UNDAF) or project document;

³ The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to as “Project ID” on the project’s factsheet page the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁴ The MPTF or JP Contribution, refers to the amount transferred to the Participating UN Organizations, which is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁵ The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent.

⁶ As per the MoU between the MPTF and Participating Organizations

⁷ The current date all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF programme have been completed.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS



Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)



United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)



United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

CONTRIBUTORS



CANADA



FINLAND



JAPAN



NORWAY



SWEDEN



SWITZERLAND

DEFINITIONS

Allocation

Amount approved by the Steering Committee for a project/programme.

Approved Project/Programme

A project/programme including budget, etc., that is approved by the Steering Committee for fund allocation purposes.

Contributor Commitment

Amount(s) committed by a donor to a Fund in a signed Standard Administrative Arrangement with the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office), in its capacity as the Administrative Agent. A commitment may be paid or pending payment.

Contributor Deposit

Cash deposit received by the MPTF Office for the Fund from a contributor in accordance with a signed Standard Administrative Arrangement.

Delivery Rate

The percentage of funds that have been utilized, calculated by comparing expenditures reported by a Participating Organization against the 'net funded amount'.

Indirect Support Costs

A general cost that cannot be directly related to any particular programme or activity of the Participating Organizations. UNDG policy establishes a fixed indirect cost rate of 7% of programmable costs.

Net Funded Amount

Amount transferred to a Participating Organization less any refunds transferred back to the MPTF Office by a Participating Organization.

Participating Organization

A UN Organization or other inter-governmental Organization that is an implementing partner in a Fund, as represented by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the MPTF Office for a particular Fund.

Project Expenditure

The sum of expenses and/or expenditure reported by all Participating Organizations for a Fund irrespective of which basis of accounting each Participating Organization follows for donor reporting.

Project Financial Closure

A project or programme is considered financially closed when all financial obligations of an operationally completed project or programme have been settled, and no further financial charges may be incurred.

Project Operational Closure

A project or programme is considered operationally closed when all programmatic activities for which Participating Organization(s) received funding have been completed.

Project Start Date

Date of transfer of first instalment from the MPTF Office to the Participating Organization.

Total Approved Budget

This represents the cumulative amount of allocations approved by the Steering Committee.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	6
Part I – Annual Narrative Programmatic Progress Report	7
I. Purpose	7
II. Results	8
III. Other Assessments or Evaluations	16
IV. Programmatic Revisions	16
V. Resources	16
Part II – Financial Performance	18
I. Sources and Uses of Funds	18
II. Partner Contributions	19
III. Interest Earned	20
IV. Transfer of Funds	21
V. Expenditure and Financial Delivery Rates	22
VI. Cost Recovery	26
VII. Accountability and Transparency	26
Annex 1: Partnerships meetings and workshops	27
Annex 2: Work Programme of the REDD+ Partnership 2013-2014	44

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The REDD+ Partnership is an initiative currently involving seventy five countries which serves as an interim platform for scaling up actions and finance for initiatives to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) in developing countries (see www.reddpluspartnership.org).

The achievements of the REDD+ Partnership include the Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD). The database now holds information submitted by a total of 16 funder countries, 39 REDD+ countries and 15 institutions.

The total number of arrangements held in the database has increased, from 1278 arrangements in 2012, to 1685 arrangements at the end of the 2013 reporting round and eight countries were first-time reporters during the 2013 reporting round. The Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD) is a key provider of information to the global community on REDD+ financing, actions and results. It aims to improve effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and coordination of REDD+ initiatives, and to support efforts to identify and analyze gaps and overlaps in REDD+ financing. The VRD relies solely on data voluntarily submitted by countries and institutions.

The Partnership brings together donor countries, institutions and stakeholders together to discuss REDD+ in an informal and neutral setting. It serves as an inclusive, transparent, open and constructive discussion platform, and has in some instances helped to build trust among, Partners, civil society representatives, and other relevant REDD+ stakeholders. Concrete and practical country-based experiences, as well as lessons learned by countries as they prepare for REDD+ or are in the implementation phase, are shared. Debate is stimulated on technical topics such as financing instruments, demonstration activities and the manner in which REDD+ funding has contributed to changes in policies, institutions, laws and regulation.

This Consolidated Annual Progress Report covers the period from 1 January to 31 December, 2013. This report is in fulfillment of the reporting requirements set out in the Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA) concluded with the Donor. In line with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by Participating UN Organizations, the Annual Progress Report is consolidated based on information, data and financial statements submitted by Participating Organizations. It is neither an evaluation of the Joint Programme nor an assessment of the performance of the Participating Organizations. The report provides the Steering Committee with a comprehensive overview of achievements and challenges associated with the Joint Programme, enabling it to make strategic decisions and take corrective measures, where applicable.

PART I: NARRATIVE REPORT

I. Purpose

The main objective and outcomes of this programme are to provide support to the REDD+ Partnership through provision of secretariat services. The REDD+ Partnership is an initiative currently involving seventy five countries which serves as an interim platform for scaling up actions and finance for initiatives to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) in developing countries (see www.reddpluspartnership.org). The Partnership, established at the Oslo Climate and Forest Conference in 2010, aims to take immediate action, including improving the effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and coordination of REDD+ initiatives and financial instruments, to facilitate among other things knowledge transfer, capacity enhancement, mitigation actions and technology development and transfer.

The secretariat services are provided to the REDD+ Partnership by the Programme Team of the UN-REDD Programme (PT) which comprises three participating UN Organizations, namely the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The secretariat services to the Partnership are provided in conjunction with the World Bank's Forest Carbon Facility Programme (Facility Management Team).

The Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the Administrative Agent (AA) of the REDD+ Partnership Fund (hereafter the "Fund"). As of 16 December 2010, it has concluded a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the above noted three Participating Organizations and a Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA) with six donors enabling the Participating Organizations to receive funding through the Fund. An extension of this agreement was signed to extend the terms and conditions of the MoU to December 2014.

This report presents the activities delivered by the PT to the REDD+ Partnership, according to five outcomes identified in the Joint Programme Document:

1. Voluntary REDD+ database,
2. Lessons learned on REDD+ initiatives,
3. Website to exchange views and share information,
4. Support to Partnership meetings, and
5. Coordination of the secretariat services

These outcomes are reflected in the Work Programme of the REDD+ Partnership agreed to by the Partnership for the period 2013-2014.

Implementation Arrangements

The [REDD+ Partnership Document](#) expresses the intent of the governments (referred to as "Partners") present at the Oslo Climate and Forest Conference on 27 May 2010, to provide a voluntary, non-legally binding framework for the interim REDD+ Partnership, within which the Partners may develop and implement collaborative REDD+ efforts. Any country willing to contribute to REDD+ actions or support is welcomed to the Partnership. The core objective of the Partnership is to contribute to the global mitigation of climate change by serving as an interim platform for the Partners to scale up REDD+ actions and finance, and to that end to take immediate action, including improving the effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and coordination of REDD+ initiatives and financial instruments, to facilitate among other things knowledge transfer, capacity enhancement, mitigation actions and technology development and transfer. A work plan for the reporting period was jointly developed under the auspices of the REDD+ Partnership Document.

The REDD+ Partnership is supported by a Secretariat made up of the Facility Management Team (FMT) of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and the UN-REDD Programme Team (PT), under oversight of the Co-Chairs, on behalf of the Partner countries.

The Secretariat provides effective coordination, organization and support for the Partnership's work which includes the organization of meetings, production and coordination of all documentation for the Partnership, management of the website and communications, and overall planning and management of the budget and Partnership workplan to enable the delivery of the outcomes decided on by the Partnership. The PT also liaises with the REDD+ Partnership Secretariat Team composed of FAO,

UNDP, UNEP and the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat, and FMT on delivery of the multiple technical and operational aspects of the REDD+ Partnership Secretariat's workplan. The PT provides written outputs into sections of reports and studies that contribute to knowledge sharing and exchange of experiences between Partners and Stakeholders of the REDD+ Partnership.

These services are independent of the normal functioning of the FCPF and UN- REDD programme and of their respective organizations. Specific tasks could also be undertaken by particular countries and other organizations if agreed by the Partnership.

The Secretariat to the REDD+ Partnership, closely follow the substantive Operational Measures included in Appendix II of the [REDD+ Partnership document](#). The Secretariat works to implement with guidance of the Partners and Co-Chairs, the current [Work Programme 2013-2014](#) which build on existing achievements and tools already developed by the REDD+ Partnership and other REDD+ initiatives and activities. This programme of work maps to the activities in the joint programme document. The areas of work in the 2013-2014 period are:

1. Facilitating readiness activities
2. Facilitating demonstration activities
3. Facilitating results based actions
4. Facilitating the scaling up of finance and actions
5. Promoting transparency and communication

II. Results

i) Narrative Reporting on Results

The Programme Team of the UN-REDD, based on the comparative advantages and competencies of the three UN Agencies – in coordination with other Partners, has provided the secretariat services in a variety of ways: technical and scientific support in terms of reviews, report and analysis related to REDD+, knowledge management, and organization and facilitation of REDD+ Partnership meetings. They have followed a workplan as agreed in the Joint Programme Document which was based on the request of the REDD+ Partnership to the UN-REDD Programme Team to provide the secretariat services as well as to share experiences with the UN-REDD Programme.

Outcome 1: A [Voluntary REDD+ Database](#) (VRD) is developed and maintained, and provides data and information on REDD+ financing and actions.

The Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD) is a key provider of information to the global community on REDD+ financing, actions and results. It aims to improve effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and coordination of REDD+ initiatives, and to support efforts to identify and analyze gaps and overlaps in REDD+ financing. The VRD relies solely on data voluntarily submitted by countries and institutions.

The members of the Partnership and affiliated stakeholder organisations are involved directly in the database as providers or information and participants in training events to provide data to the VRD. The VRD provides statistics, maps and graphs on the financing flows, allowing users to compare values reported. The VRD has been recognized by the REDD+ Partnership Partners and Stakeholders as a useful tool for increasing knowledge and transparency on REDD+ related financing.

The database now holds information reported by 55 Partners (73% of the Partnership) and 15 stakeholder institutions, including all of the main intergovernmental (IGO) and multilateral institutions involved in funding REDD+ readiness, as well as other international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs). No submissions from the private sector have been received to date. Results show that funder countries have reported a total of almost US\$6.91 billion in funding for REDD+ between 2006 and 2018. The majority of this financing is in the form of bilateral grants which cover a large geographical range (86 REDD+ countries).

The database has been designed to allow both funders and recipients to report on the same arrangement. Because the VRD Team does not itself verify the authenticity of an arrangement reported, comparing reports by both parties has been the most practical way of verifying reports. Where significant differences exist between funders and recipients, the VRD Team liaises with both parties to clarify differences. In many instances, this has led to revisions on the specific arrangements. These comparisons are not always possible for many arrangements in the database. Some of the reasons for this are:

- Following the launch of the 2013 questionnaire to all Partners and stakeholders, 27 users, representing 22 countries and institutions, accepted the invitation and are now users of the system. The database now has 91 individuals representing 62 countries and institutions.
- Higher response rates from funder countries and institutions than from REDD+ countries. For example, 94% of Partners which are funders have reported to the database whereas only 67% of Partners which are REDD+ countries have reported to the database to date. This discrepancy is even larger when one considers that funders reported arrangements with countries and institutions that are not part of the Partnership and thus have no incentive to report.
- Funders reporting arrangements as “internal with benefit to REDD+ countries”. These are funds reported as being used within a funder’s agencies but with the result benefiting REDD+ countries.
- In a number of cases, funders did not specify the recipients of the funds though full descriptions and amounts were reported.
- Also, reporting of REDD+ related actions by parties is not consistent owing to the absence of a clear agreement on what constitutes REDD+ finance, and as a result some of the data in the VRD can be and is contested.

The above notwithstanding, the dataset is interesting for this very reason, and in itself provides a platform for discussion around key issues on the delivery of REDD+ by both funder and REDD+ countries.

Outputs for 2013 as per Programme Document

1.2 Content Development

Online 2013 questionnaire

- The 2013 questionnaire was developed, finalised, and launched to REDD+ Partnership Partners and stakeholders in August 2013.
- The 2013 questionnaire is available online, and in Excel format
- Following feedback from Partners in 2012, French and Spanish versions of the online questionnaire were developed in addition to the English version, to assist partners in reporting to the database

New and/or updated data from Partners and institutions on REDD+ financing

- Following the launch of the 2013 questionnaire to all Partners and stakeholders, 27 users, representing 22 countries and institutions, accepted the invitation and are now users of the system. The database now has a total of 91 individuals representing 62 countries and institutions who are users of the system.
- As of 31 December 2013, the VRD has received 28 submissions from 9 funder countries, 9 REDD+ countries and 10 institutions. Given that the 2013 reporting rate was lower than that in 2012, the Partnership agreed to extend the deadline of the 2013 reporting round until the end of January 2014. 19 additional questionnaire responses were submitted during this time, bringing the total number of data submissions to 47, including from 13 funder countries, 24 REDD+ countries and 10 institutions.
- All 47 submissions received for the 2013 reporting round have been processed, finalised and entered into the database.
- The database now holds information submitted by a total of 16 funder countries, 39 REDD+ countries and 15 institutions.
- The total number of arrangements held in the database has increased, from 1278 arrangements in 2012, to 1685 arrangements at the end of the 2013 reporting round.
- Eight countries were first-time reporters during the 2013 reporting round
- Through the 2013 Questionnaire submissions, the VRD Team has also undertaken work with countries to address discrepancies between funder and recipient reports of REDD+ financing. A separate quality assurance process has also been started, to address and resolve the 10 largest discrepancies between funder and recipient reports in the database. The VRD Team will be in communication with relevant parties in the coming months to attempt to resolve these large reporting discrepancies.

1.3 Interface Development

An improved interface incorporating better design, graphical analysis elements, and user interaction

Some improvements to the existing 2012 website have been made, including addressing outstanding bugs, and updating the VRD website with text in several sections clarifying that reporters ultimately retain responsibility for what they report as arrangements, including what “counts” as REDD+ finance. A disclaimer was also added on each arrangement page.

1.4 Events and Communication

VRD progress reports to the Partnership:

- Oral progress report outlining main activities and achievements in the first half of 2013 was presented to the REDD+ Partnership at its meeting in Bonn in June 2013, where a budget for activities for the VRD from July 2013 - July 2014 was also presented and approved including the Analytic report for 2013. (see below).
- Participation in Partnership workshop in Palangka Raya, Indonesia, and an oral progress report during Partnership meeting that followed on main activities since June 2013.
- Oral progress report outlining main activities and achievements since the Palangka Raya meeting, and plans for early 2014 were presented to the REDD+ Partnership at its meeting in Warsaw in November 2013.

Communication materials on the VRD:

- A VRD information brochure has been developed for the Partnership and wider public, outlining the history of the VRD, the approach to data collection, and how to interpret the data in the database.

Communication of data: Analytic reports

- In November 2012, a draft analytic report representing the first in-depth analysis of data in the VRD was presented to the Partnership. Following feedback received from Partners in early 2013, the report was finalised and published on the VRD website in June 2013.
- A 2013 analytic report is currently being drafted, and will be presented to the Partnership in the coming months. Its structure is similar to the 2012 analytic report, but additional features include: recipient reports being integrated into the analysis, a case study on key multilateral flows of finance, and a special section on fast-start finance.

Communications/collaboration with other finance initiatives:

In September 2013 the VRD Team formalised a collaboration with Forest Trends (another REDD+ finance tracking initiative). Activities have included:

- Dialogue with Forest trends on ways to ensure data reported through the two initiatives is comparable and complementary
- Collaboration with Forest Trends on strengthening in-country capacity to report on REDD+ finance. Several REDD+ government focal points working with Forest Trends have expressed interest in reporting data collected under the Forest Trends initiative to the VRD. Forest Trends are now providing support to some of these countries' VRD focal points to collect and report this data to the VRD.
- Exploring opportunities for joint publications, events and analyses.

Capacity Building workshops

In order to enhance both the number and quality of reports submitted to the database by REDD+ countries, the Partnership decided, in December 2012, that the VRD Team organize regional level capacity building workshops. The first such meeting took place in Chad and was attended by focal points and stakeholders from Congo Basin countries. Following a request from Partners

that the next workshop focus on English-speaking African countries, a second workshop was scheduled for April 2014. Countries invited to this workshop include Angola, Cote D'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Madagascar, Mozambique Nigeria, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Togo, Tanzania, Uganda, Zimbabwe,

Outcome 2: Lessons are shared on REDD+ initiatives, best practices are shared and cooperation amongst Partners is promoted and facilitated.

This outcome was mainly achieved through Partnership meetings. Four meetings were held in 2013 which provided a forum for Partners and Stakeholders to share information, best practices and strategies.

The meeting in Bonn resulted in a Partnership Work Programme discussed and agreed to by Partners. This entailed a long period of consultation between Partners to arrive at consensus. The meeting in Dominican Republic included a field visit to learn more about demonstration sites and pilot projects for REDD+ as well as the institutional framework around these efforts. The meeting in Palangka Raya allowed in depth sharing of best practices and lessons learnt on country needs assessments, REDD+ approaches, nested level approaches, challenges for policy, laws and regulations and progress made in countries, integration of REDD+ into national planning processes and the green economy. The meeting also included a day of field sites and a bazaar where REDD+ initiatives were exhibited and Partners could get information about substantive issues around REDD+ as well as seek information on potential sources of financing. The final meeting in Warsaw focused on fast start financing and the lessons learnt from this period as well as the Voluntary REDD+ Database. [Annex 1](#) provides the description and content of each Partnership meeting (where official business of the Partnership is conducted and where decisions are noted) and workshops where Partners discuss and share issues relating to REDD+ finance and actions.

Outcome 3: REDD+ Partnership website updated and maintained.

The Partnership website is developed and maintained by FAO (system management) and the Partnership Secretariat (content management). It provides a tool to exchange information and views and stores records of the Partnership work.

All the documents and meeting records as well as progress updates pertaining to the work of the Partnership are available on the [website](#).

An update was carried out of the Website to incorporate the 2013 workshop programme and planning. Partners requested that the website become more interactive and improve its potential to become a useful tool which adds value to the REDD+ community in the next period. Mechanisms to enable this to take place have been included in the 2013 and 2014 workplan but no actions have been decided by partners so far.

Outcome 4: REDD+ Partnership meetings are organized in a timely and professional manner through logistics and other services to the participants.

Meetings are Co-Chaired by one developing and one developed country Partner representative, both selected for non-renewable 6-month terms through an inclusive and transparent selection process. All meetings had good representation from Partners with an average of 70% of Partners attending except for the Indonesia meeting where the rate was 50%. The number of stakeholders was between 10 and 30 per meeting depending on the topic and whether the meeting was held back to back with UNFCCC or other REDD+ relevant events. The Co-Chairs for the January to June period were Ghana and Spain and from July to December, the Co-Chairs were from Norway and Indonesia.

The Co-Chairs report to the Partnership and are responsible for soliciting and communicating Partner views, tasking secretariat services based on guidance from the Partnership, and proposing meeting agendas to the Partners for approval. Incumbent Co-Chairs draw on support from the former and upcoming Co-Chairs.

Four Partnership meetings took place. Four international and regional meetings took place in Bonn, Germany 15-16 June, 2013; Palangka Raya, Indonesia, October 8-11 2013; Warsaw, Poland, 10 November 2013, and in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 13-14 August 2013.

These meetings brought together the REDD+ community and enabled regular engagement of senior officials at the political level to discuss REDD+ implementation and finance vis a vis the UNFCCC discussions, as well as the exchange of information on national

activities pertaining to REDD+ in Partner countries, with technical level meetings to address specific topics as appropriate, such as finance, results based actions and demonstration activities. Feedback from Partners with respect to these semester's meetings was positive, especially from the perspective of the engagement of technical personnel in the field trips during the meetings in Santo Domingo and Palangka Raya. A bazaar during the Indonesia meeting was also popular enabling Partners to seek more information on activities and financing for REDD+ based on their country needs. As is the practice, Co-Chairs reports were prepared after each meeting and made available to all participants. Presentations from the meetings and all reports are available [online](#).

Outcome 5: The secretariat services are effectively coordinated among the participating UN agencies; FAO, UNDP and UNEP and with the World Bank.

Effective coordination between the agencies and with the World Bank has been achieved through the establishment of a working team within the Programme Team of the UN-REDD Programme. This included the management of all communications between partners, Co-Chairs, secretariat staff, and stakeholders. Meetings were also effectively planned by both the FMT and PT teams working well in together to deliver the outputs. The Programme Team undertook the following activities.

a) Effective support provided for meetings and workshops, in collaboration with the Team Leader (UN-REDD Programme Team - PT) of the Secretariat Services, with the Facility Management Team of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility- World Bank (FMT) and with the Co-Chairs of the REDD+ Partnership Secretariat.

Related Actions for Meetings organised

- Budget development and monitoring for each meeting. Logistical arrangements made including the procurement of conference venue, simultaneous interpretation and related services.
- Facilitation of translation of materials, and circulation of meeting documentation.
- Preparation of Co-Chair draft reports, and uploading of all documentation pertaining to meetings on the website.
- Monitor decisions of meetings and follow-up action items designated to the Secretariat

b) Coordinated the Programme Team's (PT) inputs into the Partnership's Work Programme and Budget 2013-2014, with oversight from the Team Leader of the PT, and in collaboration with the FMT, Co-Chairs and Partners.

Related Actions for Development of Work Programme

- Finalisation of the REDD+ Partnership work programme and budget for 2013-2014 thorough drafting and incorporation of comments by Partners;
- Regular information and reports provided on the status of activities and budgets to Co-Chairs and Partners.
- Conference calls and consultations arranged in order to facilitate decision making and action towards implementation of the work programme for 2013 and 2014

c) Coordinated the workplan and budget of the provision of Secretariat services to the REDD+ Partnership by the PT and facilitate the PT relations with REDD+ Co-chairs, the UN-REDD Programme agencies and donors.

Related Actions of provision of Secretariat services

- Joint Working Document extension document for the UN-REDD Programme Team in the REDD+ Partnership with the UN-REDD Programme agencies and the Co-Chairs produced in June 2013.
- Financial and technical reports to the European Commission and the Multi Partners Trust Fund in April 2013 and June 2013.
- Support to the VRD team to communicate VRD progress to Co-Chairs regularly and partners at three meetings and updates on the website.

d) Liaise with the REDD+ Partnership Secretariat Team composed of FAO, UNDP, UNEP and the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat, and FMT on delivery of the multiple operational aspects of the REDD+ Partnership Secretariat's workplan.

Related Actions

- Management of the REDD+ Partnership email box and correspondence in a timely way.
- REDD+ Partnership website updated.

Challenges and Opportunities

In 2013, the Partners took a decision based on a request by stakeholders to fund the participation of Indigenous Peoples and Civil Society Organisations. The decision was that one person from each Region (Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean) from an IP or CSO are to be self-selected and can attend Partnership meetings. The Partnership will therefore fund 6 persons to the next partnership meeting in Bonn in June, 2014. The Partnership remains open to stakeholders accredited to the UNFCCC who can bear the costs of travel and living expenses for during Partnership meetings as per the rules of procedure designated when the Partnership began.

The Co-Chairs for the first semester of the Partnership in 2013 were Ghana and Spain and the second semester's Co-Chairs were Indonesia and Norway allowing different countries to take lead roles in the Partnership. The Co-Chairs in 2014, will be Dominica and Switzerland. Switzerland and Togo were interested in Co-Chairing together but a resolution was reached to have Dominica and Switzerland. Togo was appointed as a special advisor for the arrangements of the Africa regional meeting to be held in 2014. This indicated the Partners willingness to arrive at special arrangements that would take cater to Partners' requests. In the Warsaw meeting the procedures to appoint co-Chairs was revisited and clarified.

The REDD+ Partnership has achieved its ambition to share and exchange information and knowledge around REDD+ finance and actions through discussion, interactions, expert presentation, reports, workshops and events for REDD+ Partners and Stakeholders. The Voluntary REDD+ Database provides a sound start to the availability of transparent financial information on REDD+ finances and there are plans to augment this in 2014. Open for stakeholders, the setting constitutes a positive environment that welcomes and allows for the active support of stakeholders who play important roles as countries shape REDD+ on the ground.

In 2013, Partners also took an important decision invite and finance three IP representatives and three CSO representatives to international REDD+ Partnership meetings and two IP representatives and two CSO representatives to Regional meetings. This was at the behest of the IP and CSO participants at Partnership meetings. Even though the Partnership is open to all CSOs and IPs accredited to the UNFCCC, it was agreed that this additional action would further help to enhance stakeholder participation. The Partnership agreed to use the UN-REDD Programme's method and modality of identifying and funding participation of these groups to Partnership meetings. This will be implemented from the first meeting in 2014.

The Partnership succeeded in facilitating an open exchange between the Partners in a non-negotiation setting that allows for in-depth discussions, the sharing of experiences and practices in a workshop format. Most importantly, the representatives of the Partners speak much more freely on the pertinent issues at and are less forced to keep in mind tactical issues or issues that emanate from the need to communicate country positions in order to advance the international consensus building on the eventual REDD+ mechanism under the UNFCCC. A good outcome for REDD+ was achieved through the Warsaw Package agreed by countries at the end of 2013.

The REDD+ Partnership allows sharing of innovative answers and approaches to crucial, but yet open questions on REDD+ in practice. Last but not least, the Partnership continuously demonstrates and underlines the strong political will for making REDD+ a reality and in light of the status of negotiations at the UNFCCC, helping to maintain trust between Partners. As Partners have indicated, an evaluation of the Partnership will take place in 2014 and this will help to inform Partners on the way forward for the Partnership. Funding from the European Commission will end in December 2014, as will all other funds to the Programme Team (UN-REDD) of the REDD+ Partnership Secretariat.

Regarding the Voluntary REDD+ Database, Partners raised questions on the adopted definition of contents and on its costs. A VRD working group was proposed to be set up to discuss various issues around the VRD, including its costs, definitions as to what constitutes REDD+ finance and discrepancies among data reported by developing and developed countries. The following countries indicated their interest to participate. These are Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Germany, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Republic of Congo, Papua New Guinea, Spain, Uganda, USA, as well as the European Commission and the VRD team. Germany and Mexico have kindly agreed to act as co-facilitators of the Working Group which will begin its work in February 2014. The objectives of the working group are to:

- Explore the role(s) of the Voluntary REDD Database (VRD) in tracking finance, actions and results in the coming years;

- Assess the management, functionality and user-friendliness of the database and suggest possible improvements to the database; and
- Explore alternative arrangements to the VRD and/or options for collaboration with other initiatives.

The proposed outputs will be;

- A short report with recommendations of the working group with regards to objectives 1, 2 and 3 above: and A presentation of the report's recommendations at the first global Partnership

ii) Indicator Based Performance Assessment

Outputs	Indicators / Targets	Achieved Indicator Targets	Reasons for Variance with Planned target	Source of Verification
Outcome 1				
1.1. System development	Questionnaire updated and new online version developed and launched.	100%	Further system development carried out in the first half of 2013 and database was fully functional for launch of new 2013 questionnaire in August 2013	Voluntary REDD+ Database (http://reddplusdatabase.org/)
1.2. Content development	Number of countries with data on REDD+ financing inserted in the database	The VRD has received 47 submissions from 13 funder countries, including the EC, 24 REDD+ countries, and 10 institutions, as a result of the 2013 reporting round	The database now contains information from 55 Partner countries (73% of the Partnership, compared to 61% in 2012)	http://reddplusdatabase.org/
1.3. Interface development	Public website updated	100%	Improvements to the existing 2012 website include text in several sections clarifying that reporters ultimately retain responsibility for what they report as arrangements, including what "counts" as REDD+ finance. A disclaimer was also added on each arrangement page.	http://reddplusdatabase.org/
1.4. Events and communication	VRD work presented at Partnership meetings.	100%	VRD work presented at three meetings	
1.5 Capacity Development	2 regional workshops to improve data collection and monitoring	50%	One regional workshop was held in Chad. The second was postponed to April 2014	http://reddplusdatabase.org/
Outcome 2				
2.1 Content of Workshops delivered	Number of participants in the workshop and feedback.	Achieved	60% of Partners on average have attended workshops and feedback has been mostly positive though REDD+ countries maintain that scaling up of finance is a key issue that has not been resolved.	REDD+ Partnership website http://reddpluspartnership.org/73943/en/

Outcome 3				
3.1. System and content development and management	Website is fully functioning and regularly updated /	60%	Information for 2013 still needs to be fully updated.	http://reddpluspartnership.org/73943/en/
Outcome 4				
4.1 Logistics arranged and material prepared for the Partnership meetings	Partnership meeting organized with conference services, interpretation, documents translated and reports produced.	>100%	4 REDD+ Partnership meetings were held. Reports were produced	http://reddpluspartnership.org/73943/en/
Outcome 5				
5.1. Coordination of the Support Team	Support team effectively coordinated with regular communications and a joint email address / /Target: Coordination enhanced	100%		Regular email messages between Partners, Co-Chairs, FMT/PT and Stakeholders in the REDD+ Partnership email account

III. Other Assessments or Evaluations

Regarding monitoring and evaluation, meetings which bring together the Partnership countries along with stakeholders accredited to the REDD+ Partnership are presently held every three to six months, and provide a mechanism for evaluation. These meetings are held to conduct the business of the Partnership. The work plan of the Partnership is presented and evaluated by the Partner countries and changes and recommendations incorporated in real time. The Partnership meetings serve to address logistical and administrative issues that might emerge.

The Partnership's mandate has been given till December 2014 as per the high level decision by Partners in Doha in 2012. Partners will make an assessment as to whether the Partnership will continue beyond December 2014. This will include an assessment study conducted by two independent consultants and Partners' deliberations on the topic in the third quarter of 2014.

IV. Programmatic Revisions

Two outputs in the work programme may not be undertaken in 2014 as Partners have not considered this a priority. These are a small consultancy (USD 5,000) to identify possible lines of access to technology support for REDD+ activities by Partners through the Technology Mechanism of the Convention and other institutions working on technology access and finance and a consultancy to look at technical solutions for monitoring of emissions through engagement of stakeholders (USD 45,000). In addition, Output 5.3 in the work programme which reads 'Increase the visibility of the Partnership and explore ad hoc outreach to national institutions and other stakeholders with a strong influence on REDD+, and improve communication to promote main findings and follow up data base information' with the output detailing a 'Dissemination strategy to publicize and promote the tools and results of the Partnership (VRD, web page, reports,...) and multiply the interaction of the REDD+ Partnership with the public in general, REDD+ community in particular' will also need to be discussed with the Partners in 2014, to see if this activity can be undertaken. In addition budget re-allocations will also need to be discussed accordingly.

In December 2012, Partners expressed the intent to continue the voluntary interim Partnership and to mandate a period of work through 2015. A work programme has been approved till the end of December 2014 (see Annex 2). In the third quarter of 2014, there will be an assessment of the results of the Partnership, with a view to providing recommendations on the need for further work beyond 2014.

The Programme Team of the UN-REDD Programme will continue to serve the REDD+ Partnership in accordance to with Partners guidance and decisions, working closely with the Co-Chairs who act on behalf of the Partner and the Facility Management Team. The Programme Team now has less funding and will only be able to cover the costs of the regional meeting in Accra in May 2014. Other activities planned are two studies on the lessons on fast start financing pertaining to REDD+ and experiences in public private partnerships relating to REDD+. A meeting in Bonn, scheduled for June 2014 will be one forum where these reports are launched and discussed.

V. Resources

- *Financial Resources:*

(The Financial Report at the end of the report, provides financial information provided by the MPTF Office in its capacity as Administrative Agent)

The total funding pledged to the REDD+ Partnership is \$5,546,800 from various donors to the different implementing Partners. The workplan therefore draws its budget from several sources managed by the different implementing Partners. These include the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and UNEP.

In kind contributions

Other in-kind resources which contributed to the REDD+ Partnership Secretariat Services are from the UN-REDD Programme's staff in the UN-REDD Secretariat. A senior programme officer in the UN-REDD Secretariat contributed guidance and inputs into technical activities in collaboration with the Co-Chairs, provided input into Partnership meeting agenda topics, made presentations and provided oversight to consultancy work and other activities requested by Partners under the guidance of Co-Chairs. Finance and administration work was conducted by UN-REDD Secretariat staff, especially in regards to the arrangement of Partnership meetings. Finally, the project also counts on the staff in UNEP and FAO who track and report on budgets and expenditures.

The funds were managed by the three agencies in accordance with their financial management procedures and processes. The work on the voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD) was shared between FAO and UNEP-WCMC; the secretariat work and website managed by UNEP and FAO; and financial management of meetings by UNEP.

- *Human Resources*

International Staff: In 2013, one full time international staff member was hired to work on all aspects pertaining to the work of the Secretariat. FAO have provided periodic support (the information technology department) to help to update and manage the REDD+ Partnership website content.

As part of the work on the voluntary REDD+ Database, a separate team at the FAO and UNEP-WCMC are hired to carry out the work on this specific output. Funds are provided separately for this activity. (See outcome 1)

- *Procurement*

Procurement follows standard procedures designated by the UN. Each Participating UN Organization established a separate ledger fund account under its financial regulation and rules for the receipt and administration of funds disbursed to it by the Administrative agent.

PART II: FINANCIAL REPORT AS OF 31 DECEMBER 2013

2013 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

This chapter presents financial data and analysis of the REDD+ JP Partnership Support using the pass-through funding modality as of 31 December 2013. Financial information for this Fund is also available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY, at the following address: <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/CCJ00>.

I. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

As of 31 December 2013, 6 contributors have deposited US\$ 1,726,540 in contributions and US\$ 5,358 has been earned in interest,

bringing the cumulative source of funds to US\$ 1,731,898 see respectively Table 2 and 3.

Of this amount, US\$ 1,713,498 has been transferred to 3 Participating Organizations, of which US\$ 1,316,204 has been reported as expenditure. The Administrative Agent fee has been charged at the approved rate of 1% on deposits and amounts to US\$ 17,265. Table 1 provides an overview of the overall sources, uses, and balance of the REDD+ JP Partnership Support as of 31 December 2013.

Table 1. Financial Overview, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

	Annual 2012	Annual 2013	Cumulative
Sources of Funds			
Gross Contributions	447,332	-	1,726,540
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	1,864	1,112	4,399
Interest Income received from Participating Organizations	959	-	959
Refunds by Administrative Agent to Contributors	-	-	-
Fund balance transferred to another MDTF	-	-	-
Other Revenues	-	-	-
Total: Sources of Funds	450,155	1,112	1,731,898
Use of Funds			
Transfers to Participating Organizations	280,406	338,449	1,713,498
Refunds received from Participating Organizations	-	-	-
Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations	280,406	338,449	1,713,498
Administrative Agent Fees	4,473	-	17,265
Direct Costs: (Steering Committee, Secretariat...etc.)	-	-	-
Bank Charges	11	22	43
Other Expenditures	-	-	-
Total: Uses of Funds	284,891	338,471	1,730,806
Change in Fund cash balance with Administrative Agent	165,264	(337,358)	1,091
Opening Fund balance (1 January)	173,185	338,449	-
Closing Fund balance (31 December)	338,449	1,091	1,091
Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations	280,406	338,449	1,713,498
Participating Organizations' Expenditure	374,908	208,499	1,316,204
Balance of Funds with Participating Organizations			397,295

* Due to rounding of numbers, totals may not add up. This applies to all numbers in this report.

II. PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS

Table 2 provides information on cumulative contributions received from all contributors to this Fund as of 31 December 2013.

Table 2. Contributors' Deposits, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Contributors	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total
CANADA	42,629	-	42,629
FINLAND	267,600	-	267,600
JAPAN	200,000	-	200,000
NORWAY	811,400	-	811,400
SWEDEN	188,067	-	188,067
SWITZERLAND	216,844	-	216,844
Grand Total	1,726,540	-	1,726,540

III. INTEREST EARNED

Interest income is earned in two ways: 1) on the balance of funds held by the Administrative Agent ('Fund earned interest'), and 2) on the balance of funds held by the Participating Organizations ('Agency earned interest') where their Financial Regulations and Rules allow return of interest

to the AA. As of 31 December 2013, Fund earned interest amounts to US\$ 4,399 and interest received from Participating Organizations amounts to US\$ 959, bringing the cumulative interest received to US\$ 5,358. Details are provided in the table below.

Table 3. Sources of Interest and Investment Income, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Interest Earned	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total
Administrative Agent			
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	3,286	1,112	4,399
Total: Fund Earned Interest	3,286	1,112	4,399
Participating Organization			
UNDP	959		959
Total: Agency earned interest	959		959
Grand Total	4,245	1,112	5,358

IV. TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Allocations to Participating Organizations are approved by the Steering Committee and disbursed by the Administrative Agent. As of 31 December 2013, the AA has transferred US\$ 1,713,498 to three Participating Organizations (see list below).

Table 4 provides additional information on the refunds received by the MPTF Office, and the net funded amount for each of the Participating Organizations.

Table 4. Transfer, Refund, and Net Funded Amount by Participating Organization, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Participating Organization	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012			Current Year Jan-Dec-2013			Total		
	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded
FAO	751,905		751,905	247,500		247,500	999,405		999,405
UNDP	137,250		137,250				137,250		137,250
UNEP	485,894		485,894	90,949		90,949	576,843		576,843
Grand Total	1,375,049		1,375,049	338,449		338,449	1,713,498		1,713,498

V. EXPENDITURE AND FINANCIAL DELIVERY RATES

All final expenditures reported for the year 2013 were submitted by the Headquarters of the Participating Organizations. These were consolidated by the MPTF Office.

V.I EXPENDITURE REPORTED BY PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATION

As shown in the table below, the cumulative net funded amount is US\$ 1,713,498 and cumulative expenditures reported by the Participating Organizations amount to US\$ 1,316,204. This equates to an overall Fund expenditure delivery rate of 77%.

Table 5. Net Funded Amount, Reported Expenditure, and Financial Delivery by Participating Organization, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Participating Organization	Approved Amount	Net Funded Amount	Expenditure			Delivery Rate %
			Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Cumulative	
FAO	1,078,244	999,405	614,318	213,271	827,589	82.81
UNDP	216,750	137,250	51,525		51,525	37.54
UNEP	576,843	576,843	441,862	(4,772)	437,090	75.77
Grand Total	1,871,837	1,713,498	1,107,705	208,499	1,316,204	76.81

V.II EXPENDITURE BY PROJECT

Table 6 displays the net funded amounts, expenditures reported and the financial delivery rates by Participating Organization.

Table 6. Expenditure by Project, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)

Sector / Project No.and Project Title		Participating Organization	Total Approved Amount	Net Funded Amount	Total Expenditure	Delivery Rate %
REDD+ JP Partnership Support						
00077921	REDD+ Partnership Secretariat	FAO	1,078,244	999,405	827,589	82.81
		UNDP	216,750	137,250	51,525	37.54
		UNEP	576,843	576,843	437,090	75.77
REDD+ JP Partnership Support: Total			1,871,837	1,713,498	1,316,204	76.81
Grand Total			1,871,837	1,713,498	1,316,204	76.81

5.III EXPENDITURE REPORTED BY CATEGORY

Project expenditures are incurred and monitored by each Participating Organization and are reported as per the agreed categories for inter-agency harmonized reporting. In 2006 the UN Development Group (UNDG) established six categories against which UN entities must report inter-agency project expenditures. Effective 1 January 2012, the UN Chief Executive Board (CEB) modified these categories as a result of IPSAS adoption to comprise eight categories. All expenditures incurred prior to 1 January 2012 have been reported in the old categories; post 1 January 2012 all expenditures are reported in the new eight categories. The old and new categories are noted to the right.

Table 6 reflects expenditure reported in the UNDG expense categories. Where the Fund has been operational pre and post 1 January 2012, the expenditures are reported using both categories. Where a Fund became operational post 1 January 2012, only the new categories are used.

Up to 2013, the highest percentage of expenditure was on Staff and Personnel Costs 68% (based on the old and new categories) followed by Contracts 22% (based on old and new categories).

2012 CEB Expense Categories

1. Staff and personnel costs
2. Supplies, commodities and materials
3. Equipment, vehicles, furniture and depreciation
4. Contractual services
5. Travel
6. Transfers and grants
7. General operating expenses
8. Indirect costs

2006 UNDG Expense Categories

1. Supplies, commodities, equipment & transport
2. Personnel
3. Training counterparts
4. Contracts
5. Other direct costs
6. Indirect costs

Table 7. Expenditure by UNDG Budget Category, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)*

Category	Expenditure			Percentage of Total Programme Cost
	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total	
Supplies, Commodities, Equipment and Transport (Old)	4,025	-	4,025	0.33
Personnel (Old)	359,404	-	359,404	29.22
Training of Counterparts (Old)	39,591	-	39,591	3.22
Contracts (Old)	273,500	-	273,500	22.23
Other direct costs (Old)	11,487	-	11,487	0.93
Staff & Personnel Cost (New)	289,526	191,513	481,039	39.11
Suppl, Comm, Materials (New)	54	-	54	0.00
Equipment, Vehicle, Furniture, Depreciation (New)	528	-	528	0.04
Contractual Services (New)	4,800	-	4,800	0.39
Travel (New)	39,481	3,349	42,829	3.48
Transfers and Grants (New)	-	-	-	
General Operating (New)	12,842	(3)	12,840	1.04
Programme Costs Total	1,035,239	194,859	1,230,098	100.00
Indirect Support Costs Total	72,466	13,640	86,106	7.00
Total	1,107,705	208,499	1,316,204	

Indirect Support Costs: The timing of when Indirect Support Costs are charged to a project depends on each Participating Organization's financial regulations, rules or policies. These Support Costs can be deducted upfront on receipt of a transfer based on the approved programmatic amount, or a later stage during implementation.

Therefore, the Indirect Support Costs percentage may appear to exceed the agreed upon rate of 7% for on-going projects, whereas when all projects are financially closed, this number is not to exceed 7%.

VI. COST RECOVERY

Cost recovery policies for the Fund are guided by the applicable provisions of the Terms of Reference, the MOU concluded between the Administrative Agent and Participating Organizations, and the SAAs concluded between the Administrative Agent and Contributors, based on rates approved by UNDG.

The policies in place, as of 31 December 2013, were as follows:

- **The Administrative Agent (AA) fee:** 1% is charged at the time of contributor deposit and covers services provided on that contribution for the entire duration of the Fund. As of 31 December 2013, US\$ 17,265 has been charged in AA-fees.
- **Indirect Costs of Participating Organizations:** Participating Organizations may charge 7% indirect costs. In the current reporting period US\$ 13,640 was deducted in indirect costs by Participating Organizations. Cumulatively, indirect costs amount to US\$ 86,106 as of 31 December 2013.

VII. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

In order to effectively provide fund administration services and facilitate monitoring and reporting to the UN system and its partners, the MPTF Office has developed a public website, the MPTF Office Gateway (<http://mptf.undp.org>). Refreshed in real time every two hours from an internal enterprise resource planning system, the MPTF Office Gateway has become a standard setter for providing transparent and accountable trust fund administration services.

The Gateway provides financial information including: contributor commitments and deposits, approved programme budgets, transfers to and expenditures reported by Participating Organizations, interest income and other expenses. In addition, the Gateway provides an overview of the MPTF Office portfolio and extensive information on individual Funds, including their purpose, governance structure and key documents. By providing easy access to the growing number of narrative and financial reports, as well as related project documents, the Gateway collects and preserves important institutional knowledge and facilitates knowledge sharing and management among UN Organizations and their development partners, thereby contributing to UN coherence and development effectiveness.

ANNEX 1: PARTNERSHIP MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

OUTCOME 2

2.1 Global Workshop and Meeting, Bonn, June 2013

The REDD+ Partnership met on 15 and 16 June 2013 in Bonn, Germany. Ghana – represented by Robert K. Bamfo – and Spain – represented by Christina Garcia Diaz – Co-Chaired the meeting. 67 Partner representatives from 44 countries including the European Commission and 19 stakeholders participated. All materials from the event are available online at <http://reddpluspartnership.org/73943/en/>. The Partnership meeting was opened by Co-Chair Robert Bamfo, who gave an overview of the draft agenda. It was highlighted that the agenda had already gone through a series of revisions, based on feedback from Partners.

Presentation of the Work Programme and Budget for 2013 and 2014

The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss and approve the 2013-2014 Work Programme and Budget as Partners requested for a face-to-face meeting to finalise the work programme.

A first draft was sent to Partners on February 15, 2013 for review and comment. A second draft was sent on March 15th incorporating comments from 15 Partners, with the next set of comments received until April 5th. The final version, which included the views of 16 Partners and a group of stakeholders, presented in the meeting, was distributed to Partners on April 23rd. A final work programme was sent to Partners after the meeting on July 15 2014.

Financial situation of the REDD+ Partnership

Total pledged contributions over the past three years amount to US\$6.54 million, of which US\$5.84 million has been paid. The remaining US\$600,000 has been pledged by the European Commission (which has indicated the expected payment in the near future). The 2010-2012 approved budgets amounted to US\$3.84 million, leaving US\$2.6 million available from payments and pledges. The 2013-2014 Work Programme budget, as presented, was US\$3.1 million. This included US\$990,000 for two years of management for the Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD). Approval of the budget would result in a short-fall of \$0.5 million. The budget would be revised after the discussions on the work programme and adjusted accordingly to the conclusions and agreements reached.

Discussion of Work Programme Components 1-7

Recognizing the budget's dependence on the specifics of the Work Programme, the Co-Chairs invited comments on the draft Work Programme's Components 1 through 7. Several Partners recognized the synergies of Components 1, 2, and 3, and proposed they be combined. The Chairs posed the question of what to do with the remaining components, which was met with a variety of views, including:

- The Partnership's mandate only covers Components 1 through 5, so Component 6 should be deleted and component 7 should be integrated in component 5.
- One workshop and one report could cover the first three components.
- Component 4 was the core activity of the Partnership and should be emphasized.

Recognizing the broad agreement to combine activities under Components 1, 2, and 3, the Chairs requested that those Components and their actions should be addressed in detail. The Partners responded with a wide breadth of suggested modifications and identification of priorities.

Taking the discussions into account, the Co-Chairs proposed a next workshop be held for Components 1, 2, and 3 in a REDD+ country. The workshop will include facilitation of the assessment of country needs for the implementation of REDD+, and will contain the following modules:

- Provision of information by UN-REDD and FCPF on the Country Needs Assessment already conducted, in the workshop.

- Countries grouped according to where they are in REDD+ readiness and implementation continuum, and a discussion be held, based on those groupings to recommend a framework on how to conduct their own needs' assessments.
- A field component on a demonstration activity (sharing national processes and their results).
- A half day field trip on Results Based Actions and Finance.
- Prior work to understand where countries are in terms of REDD+ readiness and implementation and what are their information needs (for example half a day workshop on how to access funding from UN-REDD, FPCF, GEF, FIP etc.).
- Related submissions from countries on lessons-learned.

It was also agreed that regional, on-the-ground and south-south exchanges would be arranged back-to-back with relevant regional meetings on REDD+ (for example, Latin America and Caribbean regional workshop in August in the Dominican Republic). Locations and dates for the other regions (Asia and Africa) are to be decided in the future. The workshops will better enable countries to provide information on their needs and financing gaps, which can in turn be fed into subsequent workshops on how these gaps can be addressed.

Noting that Component 6 was to be deleted, the Co-Chairs also asked Partners to look at the remaining Components in detail. As before, there was a rich dialogue with a breadth of opinions expressed. Based on these interventions, it was concluded that a second workshop will take place for Component 4 on the scaling-up of finance, which builds on the first workshop under Components 1, 2, and 3. This workshop will include:

- Discussions on how to deal with capacity and financing gaps, based on the activities from the prior workshop.
- A fast start financing activity.
- REDD+ delivery and financing institutions to be invited to the workshop to discuss the delivery of REDD+ which would take further the discussion on effectiveness and build on the effectiveness report already conducted, as per Action 4.1.
- Public Private Partnership module.

On Component 5, a variety of views were shared, especially related to the VRD. The VRD team gave a presentation on its achievements to-date, recommendations for future work according to the draft of the work programme, and the related budget implications. A copy of this presentation is available on the website.

Following the presentation and Partners' discussions, the Partnership decided:

- Approval of a one year budget to July 2014 for the VRD (see Annex 2 – The budget for the Work Programme), for activities in support of the current work programme (on-going data collection and improvement, continued improvements to functionality, the launch of the 2013 questionnaire and analysis of the data);
- Capacity building activities in Africa (venue to be decided by next Co-Chairs, in consultation with Partners);
- Formation of a Working Group on the VRD (incoming Co-Chairs will circulate ToRs to Partners for approval on a no-objection basis; see discussion below).

Following this discussion on Component 5, it was concluded that Component 7 would be adopted as it was, but folded into Component 5 as Action 5.4.

Regarding Work Programme Section C (Secretariat Services), it was requested that the Secretariat re-analyze the FMT/PT costs and if possible present ways to reduce them.

Presentation from Indonesia and Norway, next Co-Chairs of the REDD+ Partnership

Following adoption of the Work Programme, with the amendments to be included in accordance with agreements reached at the meeting, the incoming Co-Chairs, Indonesia – represented by Pak Heru Prasetyo – and Norway – represented by Eirik Brun Sørliie on behalf of Per Fredrik Ilsaas Pharo – were invited to present on their programme of work for the coming semester. A description of Day 2's agenda followed, including the remaining Item on stakeholder representation in the Partnership.

Stakeholder Representation in the Partnership (local communities and Indigenous Peoples' representatives)

Indigenous Peoples' representative explained that the IP Caucus would submit an official request for representatives to receive funding to attend REDD+ Partnership Meetings in an official capacity. The representatives expressed their desire to participate in the process and cited their experience with other related international processes. They indicated that the formal request was already approved by the Caucus, and would be submitted to the incoming Co-Chairs for consideration shortly.

After discussions in which Partners supported the participation of Civil Society, Indigenous peoples, and local communities, but expressed the need to have more information on implications and self-selection processes, the Chairs proposed that the requests for participation should be further refined to indicate the extent of representation being requested and how representatives would be selected. Partners also asked that UN-REDD and FCPF share in detail how their respective organizations deal with participation. It was decided that a decision would be taken at the next Partnership Meeting, pending the receipt of the requested information.

Revised Budget

Following the presentation of the agreements reached on the Work Programme, the Secretariat presented a revised budget, based on the amendments to the 2013-2014 Work Programme. Co-Chairs noted that an amended work programme and budget would be sent out to Partners on a no-objection basis.

Informal discussions on June 16

The Partnership Meeting held an informal exchange of views on the ToRs for the VRD Working Group, including the future role of the database itself. The Co-Chairs closed the meeting and thanked Partners, Stakeholders, and the Secretariat for the work done to approve the REDD+ Partnership 2013-2014 Work Programme.

2.2 Regional Workshop – Dominican Republic (Dominican Republic) August 2013

A first of its kind, regional workshop of the REDD+ Partnership was held in Dominican Republic during August 13-14 2013. The workshop was coordinated and facilitated by the Secretariat of the REDD+ Partnership and Co-Chaired by Iwan Wibisono (on behalf of the Co-Chairs of the Partnership, and by the Government of Dominican Republic (Pedro García Brito, Director de Cambio Climático y MDL on behalf of S. E. Dr. Bautista Rojas Gómez, Ministro de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales). There were 30 participants including 12 LAC countries representatives, 4 stakeholders, 12 local participants including DR government staff and forest landowners, and 2 members of the FMT/PT Secretariat.

The event started with a field visit to a REDD+ demonstration activity for results based payments in Jarabacoa, DR. The field visit was of great interest to visitors as it enable them to see the key components of a REDD+ activity, including a benefit sharing mechanism at the sub-regional level, a participatory decision making mechanism for REDD+, a payment for environmental services funded by users, forest management including timber harvesting and agro-systems with coffee plantations, political will of the three levels of government, required for a results based payment programme and a simple but effective MRV system. All participants, especially Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, DR and Guyana commended DR for the learning experience and field trip. Workshop participants recommended to Co-Chairs of the REDD+ Partnership the need to organize similar field visits in the venues of the upcoming workshops of the REDD+ Partnership, to promote sharing of experiences on demonstration sites, as was experienced in Jarabacoa, Dominican Republic.

During the workshop, LAC countries shared experiences and lessons learned from multilateral and bilateral partnerships, including presentations on the conclusions of the joint UN-REDD-FCPF country needs assessment conducted in 22 countries as well as UN-REDD in-depth needs assessment conducted in six countries (Cambodia, Colombia, Ecuador, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Papua New Guinea and Tanzania). The FCPF also presented guidelines to consider a 34 criteria framework to assess the preparation for REDD+ at country level. Additional topics of general interest were also discussed by country representatives, including the process of grant disbursement by multilateral institutions and the need to reactive finance for REDD+.

From the discussion has emerged that, given the different needs and different states of progress of each country, the needs assessment should identify individual needs for each country through their own processes in order to identify what funds were needed to implement REDD+ in Phases 1 and 2. LAC countries attending the workshop therefore wish to conduct a needs assessment in preparation for REDD+, based on their own context and self-determination. The assessment shall be based on evaluation approaches and frameworks created by UN-REDD, FCPF and others available tools and lessons learned in order to avoid duplicating or reinventing methodological frameworks. Country Focal Points said repeatedly that the REDD + Partnership should promote and channel financial and technical assistance so that each country will implement own needs assessment. The REDD+ Partnership could also help in the process of accelerating disbursements by multilateral institutions and mentioned that many of those involved in the discussions of the REDD+ Partnership, also take part in the discussions of the UNFCCC and that this situation should be exploited for the REDD+ Partnership to influence these discussions.

2.3.1 Regional Workshop October 8-10 Palangkaraya

The REDD+ Partnership met on October 8-10, 2013 in Palangka Raya, Indonesia for a workshop dedicated to address three of the five components of the Partnership's work programme for 2013-14, i.e. on a) Facilitating readiness activities, b) Facilitating demonstration activities, c) Facilitating results based actions. The agenda of the workshop can be accessed [here](#). The objective of the workshop was to engage in a comprehensive knowledge and awareness discussion on country needs, national capacities and the role of the REDD+ Partnership to promote knowledge, scale-up finance and actions for REDD+. The workshop and meeting were Co-Chaired by Indonesia – represented by **Heru Prasetyo**, and by Norway – represented by **Eirik Brun Sorlie**. 32 Partner representatives from 28 countries and 31 stakeholders participated in the workshop.

Day 1 of Workshop (Tuesday, October 8, 2013)

Opening Session

The **Co-Chairs** welcomed the participants of the workshop and set in motion the official ceremonies. The workshop was launched with beautiful music and dances from the Dayak people, a prayer and the Indonesian National Anthem. A short film on REDD+ in Indonesia explained the national goal of cutting emissions by 26% until 2020, the strong financial support of Norway, the establishment of the REDD+ task force that started the one-map initiative, support by the Indigenous People's alliance, training on fire management, and emphasis on local communities participation in REDD+ in creating alternative incomes to continue the protection of the forest.

In their opening address, Co-Chairs pointed out the province of Central Kalimantan has been declared a first REDD+ pilot province of the Indonesian-Norwegian agreement. The objective of the REDD+ Partnership is to serve as entry point for partners, as well as scaling-up finance, transparency and coordination to improve REDD+ implementation. Indonesia noted that this workshop provided a great opportunity to increase Partners' experience with how REDD+ works on the ground in Palangka Raya as here the REDD+ commitment at the national, provincial and district levels can be seen. This is where the policy layers meet the land and where the experience in the pilot province can help to take the global agenda forward. Co-Chairs thanked the Governor of Kalimantan, UNORCID and UKP4 for their help in organizing the event.

The workshop was the officially opened by the **Governor of Central Kalimantan Province, his H.E. Agustin Teras Narang**, who presented a keynote address. Central Kalimantan Province has an area of 15.6 Mha, which is 1.5 times the size of Java, and a population of 2.3 M or 14 persons/km². With 2.46 Mha of forests and 3 Mha of peat land, preserving up to 6.3 Gt of carbon, it has a huge potential for REDD+ activities. The province aims to move towards a low carbon economy. To this end, a legal framework has been implemented, including Provincial and local regulations to acknowledge and strengthen customary land and rights. It is important that local people benefit from REDD+ and that the resilience of the provincial economy and livelihoods are increased. A new provincial road map (5/2011) recognizes strategies for sustainable plantations, where for instance companies should only invest in and obtain permits in degraded land areas. It is also stipulated designated forest areas without actual forest cover should be swapped against non-forest areas that are actually covered by forests. Oil palm production can increase productivity without increasing their area, with a larger involvement of small holders. A two-year moratorium on peat land deforestation is also in place.

Districts need reliable spatial data for degraded land. A proper registration and monitoring system to transparently monitor compliance is being put in place. Strategies to increase productivity in Dayak Smallholder plantations are in place. Palm oil sourcing will be sustainable in this 'green district' – this transition has started. There are commitments from buyers to buy the palm oil from smallholders and Dayak communities as well as provision of technical and financial support. 20% of Palm Oil should come from community plantations.

The deforestation rate in the years 2009-2011 was **58% lower** than in the period 2006-2009. The Governor noted how climate change presents a serious threat to communities which is why climate resilience and strategies to reduce emissions, for which the province provides a good example, are very important.

Plenary sessions - All plenary session presentations can be found [here](#).

Presentation by Dr. Ravi Prabhu Deputy Director General of the World Agroforestry Center -

Lessons from failure to address complex systems (e.g. Millennium villages), oversimplification by state organizations) teach us to include historical, geographical and social issues into the consideration of solutions and strategies. Complex systems have a mind of their own. People behave differently – led by emotions rather than only logic. A variety of overlapping policies at city, subnational, national and international levels are more likely to succeed than are single overarching binding agreements (Elinor Ostrom).

Food and agriculture are the drivers of most changes in the landscape. Any country need assessment must include food and nutrition objectives. Instead of only a focus on forest, the entire landscape has to be seen including addressing tradeoffs for competing land-use systems. Do the country needs assessments take into account the motivation of the actors living there? Unless we understand the dynamics across all landscapes, policies on forestry are going to be doomed. Any sectorial approach is not going to work. Indonesia has recognized this and REDD+ goes beyond carbon.

Important questions to ask are ‘who are the actors’? ‘What is their motivation’? REDD+ responds to the price of carbon, which is different from the value of carbon – even charcoal is worth more than the price of carbon. The private sector is important but missing in this room. Cleanstar Mozambique is a private company that engages in producing ethanol with cassava grown by farmers to be sold on the urban market as fuel for cooking stoves, replacing charcoal and a major driver for forest destruction. Regarding the REDD+ Partnership, please be guided by the value of the vision, rather than the clarity of its implementing path (Donnella Meadows of the Club of Rome).

Discussion: External food prices as drivers of development need to be taken into account. Any solution bound to REDD+ not linked to agriculture will fail though the landscape approach adds another layer of complexity.

It was noted that there are two layers of intervention, one which assesses policy change and one which one which looks at implementation needs.

Social safeguards need to be interlinked with a landscape approach. For a country need assessment, complexity can be addressed on a step-by -step basis. This workshop is an opportunity to reassess what might be missing, look at the big picture, break things down, and integrate once again.

After the discussions, the Co-Chairs presented the Workshop Agenda and the organizers made a series of house- keeping announcements.

Presentation of Brazil (Leticia Gontijo Souza) on Facilitating Country Needs Assessments (CNA)

Brazil is not part of the FCPF nor of UN-REDD, but has a nationally driven REDD+ programme. It started in 2004, focusing first on the Amazon region, but now includes all biomes. The Presidential Cabinet took REDD+ on the agenda with annual investments of USD200 M. Regarding CNA, it is important to determine what the priority areas are and how much money is available. In Brazil, so far the most cost effective investment was command and control of illegal activities that worked well to reduce deforestation on a large scale. The small-scale deforestation and forest degradation is associated with social and economic issues where territorial planning becomes more important. A much broader area of investment is the agriculture low carbon plan, as REDD+ cannot solve all problems of the land sector. A national REDD+ agenda has the advantage to be independent from the policy instability of foreign investors. Thereafter an update (2c) from the regional meeting in the Dominican Republic was presented.

There was a strong call that CNA needs to serve the national needs not the project needs. The challenge is how to integrate CNA into the National REDD+ design. CNA was seen as a good starting point to get appropriate support for countries that are starting REDD+.

Discussion: The CNA matrix is complex and should be simplified. However, it may be important to look beyond the narrow definition of REDD+ forward toward a Green Economy. The CNA report suggests that everything was needed, without designating priorities. Some awareness building is missing. Transaction costs need to be low. The CNA matrix can also be used as office exercise to make it simple. It is important to think about all land sectors in the mitigation strategy and to use the CNA matrix to build communication. So the process with which we fill the matrix is equally important.

UN-REDD and FCPF Global Needs Assessment

Thais Juvenal Linhares (UN-REDD Programme) presented the UN-REDD/FCPF Global Country Needs Assessment method, study and outcomes.

Partners found the CNA approach very useful and the presentation informed the break out groups' discussion. The matrix is robust on one hand, but lacks the depth of information that is required. For example there needs to be more emphasis on governance and land tenure. The other complex area is awareness raising and the issues relating to the multi stakeholder approach which is a very big area and requires substantive resources and funding.

Breakout groups on Country Needs Assessment

Four groups were formed, one of them in French and one of them in Spanish. All groups discussed the following questions:

1. How far have your country progressed on the REDD+ continuum from phase 1 to 3?
2. Using the 6 components of the CNA matrix as a guide, what are the gaps?
 - a. Institutional aspects
 - b. Land use planning
 - c. Consultation, benefit sharing
3. How the matrix can be useful for the countries?
4. What role should the REDD+ Partnership have in the CNA?

Day 2 (9 October 2013)

Field excursions

- Trip 1: Sebangau National Park for REDD+ rewetting project (WWF).
- Trip 2: Fire prevention, livelihood, rewetting projects in Bukit Tunggal and Tanjung Taruna. Discussion of 5 projects at the Climate Communications Facilitation Centre, Buntoi.
- Trip 3: Fire prevention, agricultural innovation, and livelihood projects in Pilang and Jabiren. Discussion of 5 projects at the Climate Communications Facilitation Centre, Buntoi.

For the field trip, participants were asked to consider the following REDD+ related questions.

1. Did the sites address issues that you face in your country? Which ones?
2. Did the sites help you in your future work while conducting country needs assessments?
3. What capacities are required for the issues you have to face in your country? And do these capacities exist?

Before going to the field, all three groups had a visit to the **Provincial REDD+ Training Center** in Palangka Raya, next to UNORCID Office. The center is equipped with an operation room, a video conference room, and has built a knowledge management database, in promotion of the "Single Map Initiative". The objective of this Centre is to build capacity of local government and will eventually be fully transferred to the local government.

In Central Kalimantan, out of the total of 2.46 Mha of forests 2.4 Mha is High Conservation Value (HCV) forest, taking into account biodiversity and social criteria and a cultural-economic importance for local people. The area covered by licenses (forest, plantations and mining) is 12 Mha (78% of province). In the Decision Letter No. 10 (12.5.2012) the Governor of Central Kalimantan, as Head of KOMDA REDD+ (REDD+ Local Commission) declared and led the socialization and public consultation of the local strategy and action plan for REDD+ in Central Kalimantan (STRADA REDD+). The goals are:

- a) Protecting forests
- b) Restore historically destroyed forests (a 30 year effort, facing corporations, as 78% of land is licensed)

Day 3 (10 October 2013)

Group 1 Sebangau National Park for REDD+ Rewetting Project by WWF: Presentation by Shabaz Khan (UNESCO)

The part of the National Park that was visited was formerly covered by forests, which were logged until the mid-1990s followed by illegal logging until 2006. The project area is 60,000 ha of the 500,000 ha large national park. The park is part of a 734,700 ha large peat dome, containing a total of 2.3 Gt of peat soil carbon. An extended hierarchal system of over 1000 bigger and smaller water canals were formerly established by the logging companies and local people to increase transportation and access to the area. According to a graph shown, carbon dioxide emissions are steeply increasing with a sinking ground water level, due to the mineralization process. Test wells (plastic tubes) were used to indicate the actual water table level over the area. In the dry

organic soils above and below ground fires are frequent, started by self-ignition or human activities. Though the area's 2000-4000 mm/year rainfall is fairly high, frequent El Nino events are causing prolonged dry seasons. Evapotranspiration is very high with 1500 mm/year. Annually, 1 mm of peat is accumulated (net figure). The project involves systematic water blocking with small dams to raise the water level again. This is done in coordination with local people, mostly fishermen who are dependent on the Sebangau river and canals. The project has received a USD1.3 M financing through the German Post and German Beer Company Krombacher and will generate carbon credits and to this end holds a VCS standard certification. The elevated water table stops fires and provides more waterways with a higher fish population. A groundwater early warning system is needed, to alert when the water level falls too low.

Group 2: Fire Prevention, Livelihood and Rewetting Project in Bukit Tunqaal and Tanjung Taruna by Joaquim Macuacua (Mozambique)

The group met with the leaders of communities. People started producing rice and established a drainage system, occupying abandoned lands that were frequently burnt. The Bukit Tunggul Climate Communication Center provided information on mining, land cover changes and hot spots (underground fires). In Bukit Tunggul, discussions were held with fire fighters who are a small team but manage to prevent or control fires. There are penalties for people in the community who do not prevent or who cause fires. In Tanjung Taruna the group spoke with community leaders. The community had been wholly dependent on fishing and is now looking to diversify with rice production.

Group 3: Fire prevention, Agricultural Innovation, and Livelihood Projects in Pilang and Jabiren

The field trip demonstrated an impressive connection of REDD+ with livelihood aspects and commitment of communities and on-the-ground actions. This was a good learning experience, as, e.g. South Africa has not yet implemented any demonstration projects.

Discussion: The following points were raised:

The national strategy is connected with provincial and district strategy and projects running on national funds needs to be coordinated with these strategies. This requires a sophisticated data base. The target is the basic-map approach, i.e. to make sure to get 1:50,000 scale maps for national government and 1:25,000 scale set of basic maps at the district level with 65 layers of information, including frequently inconsistent information on concession areas. The 1:50,000 set of maps exist already. Project work needs to be acknowledged / reflected on these maps.

Different agencies presented in the Centre and UN organisations are coordinated at UNORCID. The United Nations Office for REDD+ Coordination in Indonesia (UNORCID) is the focal point for REDD+ activities of the UN system in Indonesia. UNORCID provides the REDD+ transition team, its counterparts from UN agencies, funds and programmes and all stakeholders with coordination and information regarding the latest REDD+ developments in Indonesia. Through assessing needs and assisting policy formulation as requested, UNORCID offers strategic support to Indonesia's pioneering REDD+ Programme.

The strategy is zero-burning agriculture in the former Mega Rice project area. FAO is managing a restoration project there involving the implementation by communities. This project may or may not be done entirely through REDD+ activities, and other elements of deforestation were connected to the master plan of peat land rehabilitation of the province (Provincial agency). This falls under the e National Strategy, where all elements need to hang. Is the sustainability in danger – what happens if FAO leaves? To ensure sustainability, REDD+ and local development must always go together. It was impressive to see the up-scaling of the project from 75 to over 100,000 ha. This can be reached if the national, provincial and district strategies are all connected.

A sustainable trajectory for local communities can be reached with REDD+. Carbon credits can be the “carrot that makes the horse moving forward”, but when the cart is moving many environmental and social issues become visible along the way and these necessarily need to be addressed.

For more information see ‘Introduction to Field Trips’ found here [here](#)

Panel discussion with representatives from Cameroun, Norway, Ecuador, Australia and PNG on “Emerging lessons and best practices in implementing demonstration and results-based action for REDD+”

Zongang Ngogang (Cameroun): What are the determining factors for the success of a demonstration activity in Cameroun? Institutional framework is important. We need support from the highest political level, and have a programmatic approach to REDD+, a framework to guide the activities, and to track progress and obstacles. Cameroun was advanced in forest management

but now the economic vision for 2030 gives emphasis to agricultural projects, dams and mining, many of these happening in forest areas.

REDD+ must be an economic development tool, allowing for additional funds to boost development. The task is how to integrate REDD+ in all these projects. It is difficult to integrate the local communities and to give rights to people. We have not got to Phase 3 and the expectations of local communities are raised. Integrated solutions are better to communicate, e.g. explain the framework of sustainable agriculture and integrate REDD+, then acceptance will be a lot faster. Instead of making people believe, that one day someone will come like Santa Claus to give them money because they protected forests. We have a program based approach, a few initiatives, but without coordination. The question of carbon property is difficult: The forest law has been renewed. All natural trees belong to the state, except when planted by people. REDD+ should also include forestation projects where there is no forest.

Marthe Hotvedt (Norway): How to prepare results based payments? Norway is committed to a series of institution and policy based reforms to get to a point where we start results-based payments. Norway's REDD+ Partnership with Indonesia has referred to a series of phases:

Phase 1. Preparation phase. Completing a strategy, creation of an agency, MRV, designing a funding instrument, selecting pilot areas (all core activities).

Phase 2: Transformation phase. Capacity building, legal reform and law enforcements, pilots.

Phase 3: National agency to verify emissions established.

Results so far: Gains have made since the signing of the Letter of Intent. Recognition of indigenous rights (verdict 35) is a key achievement.

Main lessons learned: Incentives structure good even before results-based payments. This has contributed to the broad engagements of all levels of government, research institutions and communities. REDD+ is about institutional changes. Inclusive process is important. Indonesia has taken the time to lead a thorough multi-stakeholder process. The results-based phase again will take time until the funds are flowing, therefore managing expectations is needed, as is effective monitoring, verification, and managing funds on the ground.

Ariel Silva (UN-REDD Programme in Ecuador): How are results based payments fostering participatory village payments? The first presentation in Buntoi emphasized that today we face the inconvenience of climate change and poor resource management. Through REDD+ the focus is on the monetary benefits of carbon but what is needed, is rather to address the challenges to achieve better livelihoods such as secure tenure. This is the overall focus and we need to be careful about peoples' expectation to a price of carbon.

Nick Mawdsley (Australia/Kalimantan Forest and Climate Partnership): I live in central Kalimantan. Although KFCP is about carbon, peoples' interest on the ground is not carbon. REDD+ should be translated into needs of people at the local level on the ground. The provincial REDD+ strategy in Kalteng was a process of translating REDD+ on the ground. KFCP focuses primarily on livelihoods, but within the context of a low carbon framework and by restoring degrading peat. Local agendas have priority. The goal is a community development inside a low carbon development. In terms of benefits: communities which can manage finance transparently can own and manage projects. This gives them a huge potential to take the lead in development. We helped the communities to map their land and secure their land rights. Much of this is related to water management.

Gwen Sissou (PNG): PNG's strategy began with a top down scan of the entire country. Our institutional and governance landscape is difficult to adapt to new concepts and policies and that has been the focus of change since 2010. Two sites were identified by the national REDD+ agency and two sites by NGOs and civil societies. Currently the focus is on FPIC, to make the process transparent and stakeholder arrangements and livelihood options as over 90% of land is owned by tribes. Ascertaining rights and responsibilities and social mapping are costly exercises.

We have to look at REDD+ in the context of our development priorities. PNG's forest agency manages forest areas. One question is how to integrate carbon inside existing timber concession areas. Challenges are working with investors and getting the landowners to organize. Priority is given to the provincial administration and land tenure. There is no link between the national to provincial level government and this point needs to be addressed. REDD+ has to compete with oil and gas interests as well as with cocoa and oil palm. Our message is that REDD+ can help improve policy and institutional structures and land use planning and introduce land use strategies. We should work with already existing success stories.

Comments: Relevant language to translate REDD+ to the local level is useful. Operations and demonstration activities need to be transparently set up with communities. This helps to manage expectations. Land tenure needs to be understood in each location, both within and outside the forest. Sometimes REDD+ can go against the national development strategy.

Discussion in break out groups

Questions for the groups:

- 1) What needs to be considered when preparing for the planning and management of demonstration activities?
- 2) What are the key prerequisites and facilitation needed to move to results based payments?
- 3) What role can the REDD+ Partnership take to help its members on this matters?

Bazaar

REDD+ delivery and financial institutions and agencies were invited to provide information on access to funding, technical tools and approaches on REDD+, as well as information exchange and provide information on technical tools and approaches. Partners have requested this type of interaction for some time now in order to further the objective of the Partnership to scale up finance and actions towards REDD+.

A marketplace of presenters featuring REDD+ countries, international organizations, bilateral donors, NGOs and other bodies that are working with countries on REDD+ activities was took place during the last half day of the meeting, in form of numerous stands. Participants moved over 2.5 hours from stand to stand to ask questions, engage in discussions or listen to brief presentations to familiarize themselves with the work, practices and requirements of different donors and agencies, as well as opportunities for support of different kinds to allow the scaling-up of financing for REDD+ activities.

The following 21 stands were present: AusAid /KFCP (Australia), Belgium, Canada, FAO, France, Clinton Climate Initiative, GIZ (Germany), ILO, ITTO, Japan, Norway, Rainforest Foundation, The Orangutan Project, The World Bank/FCPF, RHOI, UNDP, UNESCO, UNORCID, USA, Switzerland, Zoological Society of London.

At the end of the Bazaar, the Co-Chairs thanked everyone and closed the workshop.

2.3.2 Regional Workshop October 8-10 Palangkaraya

The REDD+ Partnership met on 11 October 2013 in Palangka Raya, for a one day meeting to discuss official business of the Partnership. **Indonesia**— represented by **Heru Prasetyo**, and **Norway** – represented by **Eirik Brun Sorlie** – Co-Chaired the meeting. 32 Partner representatives from 29 countries and 31 stakeholders participated. All materials from the event are available online at <http://reddpluspartnership.org/73943/en/>. The Partnership meeting was opened by the Co-Chairs and the agenda presented.

Status of the Work Programme and Way Forward

In the workshop the first three work programme elements agreed in Partnership meeting in Bonn last June, were discussed and activities were achieved:

1. Facilitating readiness activities. This element was followed-up by promoting and facilitating knowledge exchange and regional initiatives, in the Partnerships workshops and meetings including the Regional workshop in Latin America & Caribbean in the Dominican Republic, creating regional REDD+ networks.
2. Facilitating demonstration activities. This element was followed-up by the exchange of knowledge and lessons learned in the third day of the workshop preceding this meeting, identifying conditions to attract investment and needs for governance.
3. Facilitating results based actions. This element was followed-up by discussions in this workshop and the field trips.

The remaining work programme elements will be carried out in Partnership meetings in 2014.

Discussion:

Partners requested for an Asian regional Partnership workshop and one workshop in Africa.

At the Regional workshop in the Dominican Republic, partners noted how useful it was to learn about a demonstration activity based at the national level. There were also concerns with regards to the CNA progress and the amount of time it is taking for countries to source resources for implementing REDD+ activities for Phase 1 and 2. There was a clear demand for more performance based experiences to be shared. There is still a challenge to access funds from some of the donors – large developing countries can access such funds, but some small countries are left out.

The REDD+ Partnership has achieved excellent results in promoting the exchange of information. Important now to include discussion how to help those countries that were not able so far to receive support for a REDD+ program.

Partners requested a longer briefing of the Regional partnership meeting in Dominican Republic. This will be provided at the next Partnership meeting in Warsaw.

Next steps: Facilitate regional workshops in Africa and Asia, and provide updates on the results of the workshops in Santo Domingo and Palangka Raya at the Warsaw meeting.

Indigenous Peoples and Civil Society Organizations Participation in Partnership Meetings

Co-Chair: In Bonn there were requests from representatives of indigenous people's organizations to facilitate the participation of representatives in REDD+ Partnership meetings, especially those not held at the margins of UNFCCC meetings. The REDD+ Partnership is open to all observers accredited at the UNFCCC and stakeholders have hence attended meetings.

Stakeholders noted that it is important to have IP and CSO representatives in the meetings. FPIC, community participation and safeguards are success elements for REDD+. As there had been some anti-REDD sentiment over the past years, the participation of IPs and CSOs would help with capacity building and enrich discussions. The Partnership can learn much from these constituencies and lessons on the ground through their field experience.

Partners wished to know the funding modalities and how selection can take place. Partners noted that organisations that attended would have to provide feedback to others CSO/IP networks and organisations especially at the regional level. It was also noted that the private sector should also be invited to meetings.

The Secretariat was asked to provide an overview of how CSO/local communities and IPs participated in FCPF and UN-REDD governing body meetings.

Co-Chairs: There is a common understanding that IPs and CSO participation is positive and we need to discuss now how it needs to be implemented. The following key points need to be considered:

- Different mandates for REDD+ Partnership, UN-REDD and FCPF
- Mandate of Partnership until end of 2014 (about 5 meetings)
- Responsibilities of the participating IP/CSO representatives
- Cost implications
- Number of representatives to be invited
- How to have a fast self-selection process to allow their participation at the next meeting

Thematic participation of IPs/CSOs will be requested, rather than have a permanent representation. Therefore participation will be varied. The theme of the meeting is defined by the Partnership and the selection of IPs/CSO will follow accordingly.

Partners discussed the options and approved the following;

- In International Meetings to finance three IP representatives and three CSO representatives. The budget implication would be approximately six representatives x five meetings x USD 2,500 = USD 75,000
- In Regional meetings to finance two IP representatives and two CSO representatives. The approximate budget implications would be: Four representatives x two meeting x USD 1,500 = USD 12,000

Total cost about USD 90,000.

At the next meeting the Secretariat can reach out to the regional caucuses and request them to self-select by region whilst providing information on the nominee and selection process

Revision of criteria for participation of IPOs and CSOs at the last partnership meeting in 2014 can be undertaken as necessary.

Exploration of linkages and synergies with other conventions/ processes - Presentation by Belgium (Kelly Hertenweg)

Integration with CBD can have positive benefits. Forest environmental services reinforce REDD+ sustainability. This is important to the long term success of REDD+ because forest ecosystem resilience becomes higher. There were concerns that this will raise costs. Each country writes its own National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP). NBSAPs are principal instruments for implementing the CBD at national level. This is a bottom up approach that can generate additional financing for developing countries. The example of Vietnam is cited, where REDD+ was considered as a means to contribute to a number of biodiversity targets.

Comments: Partners noted the importance of integrating the non-carbon benefits and to see biodiversity incorporated into REDD+ strategies. PES strategies have been well discussed in international fora. The International Dialogue on Forests has been addressing these aspects and some Partners think it is important to push these synergies. Concerns included the diversion of funds away from climate change objectives. Other countries deal with biodiversity as part of the safeguards issues. Biodiversity is

already reflected in the safeguards using the “do no harm” approach. Synergies should happen domestically in the interest of REDD+ countries through a bottom-up approach. NBSAPS have yet to make an impact on the ground in some countries. In Indonesia, integration already happens on the ground for example through rehabilitating Orangutan habitat. At this level is where the synergies should happen as there is concern that at the international level, an unnecessary layer of complexity will be added.

The question was posed as to how can the REDD+ Partnership help those countries that want to create these synergies at the national level? There may be a way of prompting two ministries to cooperate. Concerns about labeling can be attended by making actions in the context of national biodiversity strategy and a REDD+ strategy complementary. REDD+ country strategy is done on a public consultation basis, so all biodiversity concerns must be included. If done right, synergies must inevitably happen in the process. Some countries note that reinforcing synergies between REDD+ and the CBD are useful, other countries point out that these issues are already covered through safeguards.

Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD) data collection and other activities - Presentation of Matea Osti (VRD team)

The VRD was launched in 2010 by the REDD+ Partnership. A team at UNEP- WCMC in Cambridge and FAO in Rome manage and run the database. Every year a questionnaire related to REDD+ finances are sent to the participating countries. For 2012, 68% of Partners have submitted data. US\$ 6.27 billion has been reported to date.

The 2013 Questionnaires have been launched. There are online versions in English, French and Spanish. 60% of partners indicated that they are intending to submit their data. WCMC/FAO started to collaborate with Forest Trends to improve coordination with their REDD+ finance data collection initiative, working with 14 REDD+ countries.

In February 2014 a workshop will be planned with Anglophone African countries to improve their capacity to submit data.

A draft 2013 Analytical Report will be launched at REDD+ Partnership meeting in Warsaw in November.

The VRD team will provide inputs to the planned VRD working group on request

Partner and stakeholders requested information on whether the restoration of degraded areas activities and carbon stocks are included in the data base? An idea of the process and accuracy of data collection and what capacity building activities are included for Africa to get further involved in the VRD?

VRD Team response: It is up to the countries to define and decide what is a REDD+ activity, because the VRD is entirely voluntary. Restoration of carbon stocks are included in REDD+. The online VRD form has an increased number of entry fields. Accuracy of data is monitored through the data entry form and contact with a party is made if there are questions. There are also cross checks about what others are reporting for countries and a process of dialogue to address this. Regarding data capacity building exercises, there are training events planned and an update will be provided in Warsaw.

Proposed Terms of Reference (ToRs) for VRD working group

Presentation by Co-Chair

Co-Chairs have proposed terms of reference for the Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD) that are simple and leave some flexibility to working group to decide in detail what are the fields they want to look into.

Draft TORs:

- Objectives
 - 1) Explore the possible role(s) of the VRD in tracking finance, actions, and results in the coming years
 - 2) Assess management, functionality and user-friendliness of database and suggest possible improvements to the database
 - 3) Explore alternative arrangements to the VRD and/or options for collaboration with other initiatives
- Outputs:
 - A short report with recommendations of the working group (WG) with regards to objectives 1,2, and 3 above
 - A presentation of the report’s recommendations at the first Partnership meeting in 2014
- Participation in the WG will be open to countries who volunteer to participate within the deadline given for nominations. A representative of the VRD team and the Co-Chairs may participate in the WG as observers. The WG members may carry out work by email, audio conference, and in person meetings in connection with Partnership meetings. No interpretation service will be available.
- The WG will be facilitated by two facilitators, one from developed and one from a developing country, to be nominated by Co-Chairs and approved by partners by no-objection procedure.

- Proposed timeline: 23 October 2013. Approval of TORs for WG by no-objection. Approval of facilitators by no-objection. Deadline to volunteer for the WB.
- Week of 28 October: Telephone conference with WG and VRD team.
- COP 19: In-person meeting of the WG.
- Jan-Mar 2014: Completion of report by WG, presentation of report at Partnership meeting.

Comments:

Partners felt that the ToRs were good and reflected the discussions in Bonn, but requested that the work begin after the COP. Brazil noted that it would be interested to join the VRD working group. Republic of Congo had concerns about its data. It also expressed the will to be part of the group to help the team get closer to submit correct data. It appreciates the VRD team's communications with the countries to assess the database information. Partners discussed some issues such as accuracy of the data. The VRD team noted that the data are submitted by REDD+ focal points, so in this sense they are reliable. Discrepancies are addressed with a process of dialogue. Norway carried out quite a bit of work to check funding details and came out with accurate numbers. Canada noted that the interpretation of data, not accuracy, is the issue. The data is already on the website, so it is public already. Therefore, this could also be disclosed in Warsaw. Canada had expressed interest in being in the working group and agrees with US and Brazil about postponing the convening of the working group.

Co-Chairs noted two issues; the long-term improvement of the database which will fall under the remit of the working group. The second issue is the current data collected at this point. A question was posed to Partners whether they are comfortable about VRD's data in this reporting round or have they suggestions on how this can be improved, given the limitation that 60% of partners have already reported in this given format? Partners discussed. The VRD team representative noted that the publishing could be delayed after a review had been carried out and specific queries resolved, in case where we have disputes, between funder and fundee, the data stays in the database and an explanation on the disagreement reflected in the report. Dominica noted that donors have entered funds for this country which have never arrived in Dominica. This kind of controversial data needs to be removed till it is confirmed. The Co-Chair urged Dominica to engage with the VRD working group and the team to help resolve such conflicts. This may be true for other countries and difficult to change. Countries called for a disclaimer to be added to the database. USA agreed that discrepancies are a challenge and need to be addressed and noted that there is a national definition on what constitutes REDD+ finance.

Co-Chair gave an example from Indonesia of the 'one map approach. The Ministry of Forestry and Ministry of Environment had different forest maps. The maps are reviewed and have become public, published on a website for public to dispute if need be. As a result of this participative process the map for the Moratorium was corrected from 71 Mha to 66 Mha. The licensed areas were not yet included, which prompted another reduction of 370,000 ha. Further corrections were made. It was published in order to be transparent and this has resulted in better information and coordination between the ministries. That is the soul of the VRD too.

The following proposals were therefore adopted without objection;

- A draft 2013 analytic report is presented to the Partnership at the Warsaw meeting for partners to comment
- A report is launched at first Partnership meeting in 2014 (to see if we are still on track with spirit of VRD)
- In the introduction of the report, the logic, methodology, and limitations of the report will be explained, so the reader knows the issues regarding the interpretation of data
- A clear and concise disclaimer is added to the VRD website providing information on the purpose of website and how data is collected
- Partners approve draft ToRs proposed by Co-Chairs with deliberations of WG starting after COP 19
- Partners who wish to participate in WG should email secretariat before 1 December
- Facilitators will be nominated by Co-Chairs and approved on a no-objection basis by Partners

Co-Chairs for next semester and evaluation

Co-Chairs requested Partners to think about nominations for new Co-Chairs for the next period in 2014. A final selection will be made in Warsaw. A reminder message for nominations will be sent out accordingly.

Partners filled out an evaluation form for the Workshop. The results of the evaluation are available on request.

South Africa presented a vote of thanks to Indonesia for hosting this Partnership workshop and meeting and Paraguay noted the importance of these meetings. UN-REDD noted that the meeting was a true exchange of knowledge and added value by bringing REDD+ realities to the discussion. The meeting was then closed by Co-Chairs. Partners agreed that the experience of field trips and Bazaar were creative, and should be integrated in future meetings. The Partnership is seen as second engine with an open door to bring others on board, as a discussion forum for sometimes difficult policy questions. Bazaar, panels, field trips are very important in linking policy and experience questions, which is something we should think about continuing, especially access to information and access to where resources exist. Maybe it is possible to have thematically focused bazaars in future, or panels. Burundi noted that in 2012 in Colombia we were evaluating the Partnership's actions from 2011-2012 period. We noticed a few weaknesses. Countries with low forest cover have problem to access funds and results based payments. Partnership should communicate to donor countries to give such financial access to those countries. Brazil noted a general concern regarding the CNAs. They are valuable to understanding and bridging the gaps between results providing funds to countries, but can also focus too much on format and process. Switzerland noted that CNAs are still new for some countries, hence it is important continuing work on CNA.

2.4 Partnership Meeting, Warsaw November 10

The REDD+ Partnership met on 10 November 2013 in Warsaw, Poland for a one day meeting to discuss official business of the Partnership. Indonesia – represented by Heru Prasetyo, and Norway – represented by Eirik Brun Sorlie – Co-Chaired the meeting. 55 Partner representatives from 42 countries and 30 stakeholders participated. All materials from the event are available online at <http://reddpluspartnership.org/73943/en/>.

Welcome and opening remarks

The Partnership meeting was opened by the Co-Chairs who provided a brief summary of progress made so far during their term. Co-Chairs presented the agenda for the meeting which was adopted with no changes. Co-Chairs reminded Partners that they had wanted to inspire the UNFCCC negotiations and provide the opportunity to help to address blocks in the negotiations through the deliberations in Partnership meetings. The Co-Chairs reminded Partners of the decision made at the October 2013 meeting in Palangka Raya, Indonesia to begin supporting some self-selected IP and CSO representatives to participate in Partnership meetings (please see Co-Chairs' summary from that meeting for details). Co-Chair also noted that the Partnership had been open to IP and CSO representation all along and are looking forward to see continued strong IP and CSO representation in coming meetings.

The Co-Chairs invited one IP and one CSO representative to make remarks to mark the occasion. Edwin Usang (NGOCE, an African CSO representative) welcomed the Partnership's decision to support the participation of some IP and CSO representatives. Lakpa Nuri Sherpa (AIPP, an Asian IP representative) emphasized the importance of the role of IPs in participation of how the Green Climate Fund will unfold, forest monitoring systems and safeguards information systems. He noted that decisions made with regards to customary lands and forests should not interfere with the fundamental rights of indigenous peoples. He also suggested a joint Partnership workshop with Indigenous Peoples, to exchange knowledge on how mechanisms for the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples and tools like FPIC are being developed and facilitated at the country level.

Feedback from the Partnership Meetings

Feedback was provided to Partners who were not able to participate in the Palangka Raya and Dominican Republic regional meetings.

The discussion among Partners highlighted some key points:

- CNAs must reflect that each country has its own context.
- A critical problem in CNAs is country capacity building. Is there a role for the Partnership in addressing this?
- Information drawn from CNAs could be connected with the Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD), in order to also use the CNA as a tool for matching needs and funds.
- A CNA could be helpful but it is also very complex and has costs, especially when the tool becomes an end in itself. A lot of work is needed to make it more simple and country-driven.
- CNAs in general and the UN-REDD/FCPF CNA format in particular are steps towards streamlining processes, but are not relevant for all countries. It is more important to implement different aspects of the tool than discuss it.

- A CNA is a snapshot in time and needs to be updated frequently, so does not accurately represent what a country needs or is working on at a given moment. The Partnership therefore should not be a forum for developing or moving countries to a single format, but for sharing experiences in assessing needs and developing national strategies using a bottom-up approach.
- Finally it was noted that only some countries would be interested in conducting CNAs. The outcomes from Asia Pacific were different from Latin America and the Caribbean and regional perspectives might be useful to consider.

The Co-Chairs noted that they do not plan to spend more time on CNAs during their term, but encourage upcoming Co-Chairs to consult with Partners on whether or not this should be a topic for a regional or global meeting. They also suggested that the VRD Working Group, which will begin its work in December, take up the issue of whether and how to link CNAs with the VRD, and develop a proposal to Partners if relevant. Among other actions, the Partnership could potentially provide suggestions to the UN-REDD/FCPF format to sharpen the bottom-up nature of CNAs.

Planning for Regional meetings – Africa and Asia Pacific

At the Partnership's June 2013 Bonn meeting, Partners decided to have three regional workshops/meetings. One was held in Santo Domingo in August, and two remain to be held in 2014. Partners discussed the potential timing, venues and topics of these regional meetings. No decisions were made, but instead information was provided to guide next Co-Chairs in arranging these meetings. A suggestion was to have the African regional meeting in Accra in April with the following areas to be considered for discussion.

- Learning from field visits of actual implementation of REDD+;
- MRV (especially forest monitoring system to determine reference levels and national accounting, an area where much capacity building is needed); Involve COMIFAC for example in the workshop who are also working on standards and safeguards;
- REDD+ social and environmental standards;
- Benefit-sharing mechanisms and grievance and redress mechanisms;
- Cross-sectoral and landscape approaches looking at forest and non-forest land; and
- Benefits options in terms of sustainable livelihoods and community livelihoods. A landscape approach and connectivity to other sectors.

Asia regional workshop/meeting:

- The meeting could potentially be held back-to-back with an intercessional in Bangkok, though some emphasized the importance of holding the meeting in a place where Partners can visit demonstration sites and where those implementing REDD+ can participate (rather than an event held back-to-back with UNFCCC meetings). There is also a CIFOR event scheduled to take place in Jakarta in March 2014.
- Potential topics to be discussed include:
 - Sharing lessons on access to and disbursement of funds, either from Fast Start Finance or results-based payments. Addressing transaction costs and evaluating the effectiveness of funding;
 - Technical barriers to access funds and the capacity related to obtain the disbursement, institutional setting and regulatory framework;
 - How to improve the effectiveness of funds and capacity, including a look at the role of international consultants, international programs, etc.;
 - Institutional setting and regulatory frameworks;
 - Results-based issues, including visiting and learning from demonstration activities, and potentially inviting developers and institutions that are active in MRV, GIS monitoring, and disbursement payment mechanisms. We want to see how real results and action can be realized;
 - Reference levels and national monitoring systems;
 - Lessons learned from projects/programs and how they are being translated into national strategies. Bridging the bottom up and top down approach that we are struggling with; and
 - How to set up safeguards information systems.
- It was also noted that the workshop should not necessarily or only be for focal points, but for those who are active in implementing on the ground. It should also be organized back to back with ASEAN meetings.

Co-Chairs thanked all the partners for the interest and suggestions for topics which would increase knowledge and capacity and help also to inform the negotiations. These ideas will be provided to the next Co-Chairs for their action.

Co-Chairs for next semester

Three nominations were received from countries to serve as a Co-Chair for next term: Dominica, Switzerland and Togo. The three candidates introduced themselves and made brief comments on their interest in serving as a Co-Chair. REDD+ countries selected Dominica as Co-Chair. As such, Switzerland and Togo noted they may consider nominating themselves for the second semester of 2014. Developed countries therefore did not select a Co-Chair at the meeting, and will continue to consult over next week. Once developed countries select a Co-Chair, the current Co-Chairs will inform Partners. As the selection of a developed country Co-Chair is entirely the decision of the developed countries, there is no need for REDD+ countries to approve the selection.

Some Partners pointed to the need to revisit a clear procedure on the selection of Co-Chairs. The Partners were reminded that the both developing countries and developed countries consult amongst themselves and nominate their selection. Countries should not be nominated as a set, but rather as a developed country entity and a developing country entity. It was also put forward that Co-Chairs should be nominated one full term before their term begins and to have present Co-Chairs officially announce this a meeting and accordingly reflected in the Co-Chairs summary in the final meeting during the present term.

Fast Start Finance

Donna Lee presented on findings from existing studies on Fast Start Finance for REDD+, which generated active discussion on finance for REDD+ and also on how to frame the study on Fast Start Finance for REDD+ that the Partnership plans to commission. The key points from the presentation were:

- There are many organizations tracking and analyzing fast start funding. To date such studies are “top down” and have focused on: (1) the numbers (how much money is flowing, bilateral vs. multilateral, pledges vs. disbursement, etc.); (2) the origin and destination (who is providing funds, how much, and where are funds going); and to a lesser extent (3) what is being financed.
- From these studies we know that bilateral finance comprise the majority of funding, and that challenges around transparency, disbursement, coordination, comparability and flexibility exist. We also know that predictable “results-based finance” for many countries is still uncertain. Unknowns include the extent of domestic contributions from REDD+ countries, private sector finance, and future finance.
- There are also many “bottom up” studies that focus on lessons learned from REDD+ activities over the past 4-5 years. The focus of such studies on what is working well, but little has been written about what has not worked, where outcomes of finance have been low, or even counterproductive. There have also been a number of gap analyses aimed at identifying needs.
- Very little has been done to strongly connect “top down” fast start finance tracking with the “bottom up” studies, particularly at global scale and across the entire REDD+ portfolio of actions and finance to determine if, broadly speaking, money is being spent well.
- REDD+ financing decisions often appear to be made based traditional beliefs and biases—or perhaps “good intentions, inertia, hunches, partisan politics, and personal relationships”. Can this be replaced by a data-driven study of what contributes most to success? Do we have misconceptions about what really drives change? Do we tend to follow the ‘flavor of the day’ in REDD+ (e.g. opportunity cost analysis, landscape approaches, sustainable supply chains)? Can we take an honest look at where and how money has been spent and where there have been strong outcomes, but also diminishing returns?
- The mechanics of finance flows is still not well understood; no one has yet successfully “followed the money” to understand the downstream flow of finance and the many transaction costs. How and why such a small portion of funding actually reaches countries, and especially local communities.
- A global study is useful, but case studies that can dig deeper into the details of money flows may be best fit to answer such questions, i.e. what drives changes, how finance relates to outcomes, and the mechanics of money flows.
- Challenges to a fast start study include: (a) the short time horizon, i.e. we only have 3-4 years of experience with REDD+ funding; (b) early days of results-based finance, very little operational experience; (c) there is no “one size fits all” solution, every country is different; (d) there is a lack of flexibility in the system, i.e. donors have multiple rules/requirements for ODA that are difficult to change.
- Despite the challenges, a study can be valuable—the \$45,000 that the Partnership is proposing for the study translates to spending just one cent to review every \$1,000 that has been spent on REDD+.
- Finally, the study should focus on rewarding innovation and optimizing success. Recommendations should be ambitious, but realistic. They should fall within the “solution space”— recommendations are only worthwhile if acted upon. So they should be made with an understanding of the opportunities, but also the barriers.

Response from Partners:

- Strong interest in **making the connection between the top down and bottom up studies**, the need to ensure resources are used efficiently and effectively, and the need to address what will drive change, rather than simply following the ‘flavor of the day’.
- Several REDD+ countries voiced a desire to **improve knowledge of domestic funding contributions**, which are typically not reported and counted.
- A question was asked about whether there are ways to **improve the transparency of finance**.
- There was strong interest in **better understanding the mechanics of money flow**. Concerns were raised about the mismatch between how funds are spent and countries’ needs, the gap between commitment and disbursement, and why only a small proportion of the funding seems to go to impacts on the ground.
- **Direct access** was raised by several countries. What can be done to broaden and increase direct access? Do we need to increase absorptive capacity to solve this problem and facilitate direct access to funds? To what extent can direct access to funds facilitate implementation on the ground?
- It will be important to capture the work of NGOs and IPs and Communities in the study, as this has not been done before. It is important to measure and assess flows to communities.
- Several comments related to the variety of country circumstances and that countries are different and at different stages of REDD+:
 - A couple countries suggested that it would be useful if finance had **clearer and more harmonized criteria**. It is difficult to understand how selection is made.
 - At the same time, a question was raised about **what type of flexibility in the system is useful**, where can we apply “national circumstances” to REDD+ finance? How can uniformity of standards be reconciled with the need to accommodate national circumstances?
 - There was a reminder from some participants to bear in mind that we do not want a situation where a few countries receive a lot for results-based payments and other countries receive very little for readiness—and that **many countries are still in very early stages of readiness**.
- It is important to not lose sight of **the core of REDD+ which is results or performance-based**. We should not be trapped in ODA logic that applies only to readiness and not enough to results-based action.
- The pros and cons of bilateral funding versus multilateral funding should be examined; this should include a **consideration of the Green Climate Fund for future REDD+ finance**.
- A question was raised about **how UNFCCC decisions are affecting how REDD+ funds are being spent**, and conversely whether such decisions are being informed by experiences on the ground.

Following the discussion, the Co-Chairs outlined the next steps for carrying out the study on Fast Start Finance for REDD+. These were accepted by Partners:

- The Co-Chairs will draft Terms of Reference for the study based on the discussion here, and circulate them to Partners by 11 December with a deadline for comments.
- The revised Terms of Reference will be sent to Partners for approval on a non-objection basis, with a deadline of 20 December.
- Shortlisting and selection of a consultant(s) will take place by the end of January 2014.
- The consultant(s) will carry out a desk study and potentially make visit(s) to REDD+ country(ies) by mid-March.
- The 2013 Semester 2 and 2014 Semester 1 Co-Chairs (4 countries in total) will be available to provide advice to the consultant(s), as needed.
- The draft report will be circulated to Partners for comments by the end of March.
- The report will be finalized and presented in a session at the following Partnership meeting.

Voluntary REDD+ Database (VRD) Analytic Report

Matea Osti (UNEP-WCMC) presented a progress update on the VRD database. The 2013 Questionnaire was finalized and launched in August 2013, and 26 responses have so far been submitted (9 funder countries, 9 REDD+ countries, 8 institutions). The more data received, the more robust the analysis will be. As such, the VRD team is still accepting data submissions until 31 January 2014. Submissions received before then will feed into the final 2013 Analytic Report, to be launched in early 2014. The report plans to present:

- A global analysis;
- Sources of funding;

- A special section on Fast Start Finance; and
- A regional analysis of how financing is distributed across regions.

A VRD capacity building workshop is envisioned for early 2014, aimed at the VRD focal points from up to 13 countries from Anglophone Africa (a workshop in Francophone Africa was already held). The purpose of the workshop will be to increase reporting from African countries, the VRD team will work with participating countries to identify their next steps for submitting a national report to the VRD. If possible, this workshop will be held back-to-back with the Regional workshop/meeting to take place in Africa.

The VRD Working Group will begin its work in December 2013, and the VRD team will provide inputs into the Working Group's discussions. The VRD team also continues to coordinate with other REDD+ finance tracking initiatives. The Co-Chairs remarked that the VRD will be one of legacies of Partnership, and as such, requested countries to please provide inputs.

Planning for next semester of the Partnership

This session did not take place, as the developed country Co-Chair was not selected at this meeting. The Co-Chairs ended the meeting with a moment of silence for the victims of Cyclone Haiyan in the Phillipines. The Phillipines delegate thanked the Co-Chairs and appealed to the negotiators to ensure a strong outcome in Warsaw.