



Semi-Annual Report UN-REDD Programme Indonesia

30 June 2011

Semi-Annual Report Template for the National Programmes

The *Semi-Annual Report* for the National Programmes, for each six months period ending 31 June (1 January-31 June), should be submitted to the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat no later than one month (31 July) after the end of the applicable reporting period. Prior to submitting the report to the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat (un-redd@un-redd.org), the report should be co-signed by the selected focal point for each participating UN organization, as well as the Government Counterpart. For more background information, roles and responsibilities please refer to the *UN-REDD Planning, Monitoring and Reporting Framework Document*.

The National Programme semi-annual report draws information from your usual management tools (financial and technical) at the programme and national level to minimize the workload for programme teams. The report is divided into three sections: 1) National Programme Status, 2) National Programme Progress and 3) Government Counterpart Information.

1. National Programme Status

1.1 National Programme Identification

Please identify the National Programme by completing the information requested below. The Government Counterpart and the designated National Programme focal points of the participating UN organisations will also provide their electronic signature below, prior to submission to the UN-REDD Secretariat.

Date of submission: Submitted by:	Country: Indonesia Title of programme: Indonesia UN-REDD National Joint Programme
Implementing partners¹: Ministry of Forestry, Republic of Indonesia FAO UNDP UNEP	Reporting period: 1 January 2011 – 30 June 2011 Programme duration: 20 months (Oct 2009 – May 2011); extended to June 2012 with no additional cost ² . Official starting date³: 23 November 2009

The financial information reported should include overhead, M&E and other associated costs.

Financial summary	
Budget	
Total approved National Programme budget⁴ <i>(This information is available on the MDTF Office GATEWAY www.mdtf.undp.org)</i>	FAO: US\$ 1,498,000 UNDP: US\$ 2,996,000 UNEP: US\$ 1,150,250 Total: US\$ 5,644,250
Total amount transferred to date <i>(This information is available on the MDTF Office GATEWAY www.mdtf.undp.org)</i>	FAO: US\$ 1,498,000 UNDP: US\$ 2,996,000 UNEP: US\$ 1,150,250 Total: US\$ 5,644,250
Expenditure	
Commitment to date/encumbrance <i>(Amount for which legally binding contracts have been signed, including multi-year commitments which may be disbursed in future years)</i>	FAO: US\$ 17,490 UNDP: US\$ N/A UNEP: US\$ 527,935 Total: US\$ 545,425
Disbursement to date <i>(Amount paid to a vendor or entity for goods received, work completed, and/or services rendered (does not include un-liquidated obligations))</i>	FAO: US\$ 279,997 UNDP: US\$ 1,695,314 UNEP: US\$ 200,628 Total: US\$ 2,175,938

Electronic signatures by the designated UN organization focal points ⁵			Electronic signature by the Government Counterpart
FAO	UNDP	UNEP	
[Redacted]			

¹ Please list all the partners working on implementing the National Programme

² Letter to the UN-REDD Secretariat requesting no-cost extension of the National Programme was sent 21 March 2011.

³ Date of first transfer of funds from the MDTF Office to the National Programme

⁴ Total budget for entire duration of the Programme, as specified in the signed National Programme Document

1.2 Monitoring Framework

In the table below, please report on progress to date based on the Monitoring Framework included in the signed National Programme Document. Please input cumulative data and input quantitative/qualitative values for the indicators. If indicators or other data was modified, please explain in the comments column. If there is no data to be reported in the reporting period, please mark N/A. Please add additional rows as needed.

Expected Results (Outcomes)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall National Programme Expected Target	Achievement of Target to Date	Means of Verification	Responsibilities	Risks and Assumptions	Comments
From Results Framework	From Results Framework	Baselines are a measure of the indicator at the start of the National Programme <u>Baseline for all indicators:</u>	The desired level of improvement to be reached at the end of the National Programme	The actual level of performance reached at the end of the reporting period. Please provide a substantive assessment of the achievement of target to date, no more than 300 words per outcome.	From identified data and information sources	Specific responsibilities of participating UN organizations (including in case of shared results)	Summary of assumptions and risks for each result	
Outcome 1: Strengthen multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national and provincial level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Components of REDD architecture and policies in place • REDD pilots running 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few policies, but not operational yet • Pilots in early stage • Delays in investments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By end 2010 policy hurdle for REDD demonstration removed • By end 2011 new and effective policies endorsed 	<p>UN-REDD has focused on building consensus on the national REDD+ Readiness architecture components through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-stakeholder consultation process for the first National REDD+ Strategy developed by the National Planning and Development Agency (Bappenas) • Facilitation of early process to prepare for REDD+ Institution/Agency • Development of FPIC Policy Recommendation in collaboration with the National Forestry Council (DKN). (The recommendation was formally submitted to the government 	Policy documents issued; interviews with key government officials and national NGOs	UNDP, UNEP	<p>The REDD+ policy development is not dramatically interrupted by election and possible change in administration</p> <p>Government and local partner agencies cooperate effectively</p>	UN-REDD has specifically supported the REDD+ Task Force, the National Planning and Development Agency (Bappenas) and the National Forestry Council (DKN), the National Climate

				<p>(the former REDD+ Task Force) for further process and implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitation and technical support to the development of the Forestry Development Roadmap under Ministry of Forestry. Support to set up Provincial multi-stakeholder REDD+ Working Groups in Central Sulawesi, the UN-REDD pilot province. The Working Groups were formally established by the provincial government. 				<p>Change Council (DNPI), the Climate Change working group in Ministry of Forestry as well as religious leaders to create consensus for REDD+ policies and forest protection at national level.</p>
<p>Output 1.1: Consensus on key issues for national REDD policy</p>	<p>1.1.1 UNREDD Programme operational</p> <p>1.1.2 National and sub-national consultations on key-issues organized</p> <p>1.1.3 Key issues analyzed</p> <p>1.1.4 Inter-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DNPI and MoFor have established REDD related working groups. Mandates and responsibility of MoFor and DNPI working groups have not been detailed and 	<p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>1.1.1 UNREDD Programme operational</p> <p>1.1.2 Two national consultation on 2 key-issues organized</p> <p><u>December 2011</u></p> <p>1.1.2 Two national and 4 sub-national consultations on 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By mid 2011, a PMU secretariat and office was established and programme activities under coordination of FAO, UNDP and UNEP were implemented. Some key REDD+ related national issues (<i>see full information above</i>) have been the main focus of UN-REDD Indonesia. UN-REDD applied nationwide multi-stakeholder consultations in developing the above key policy issues, including inter-ministerial roundtable discussion, sub-national and national consultations. Representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports MoM Workshop proceedings Publications Policy recommendations 	<p>UNDP; MoFor/Gol</p>	<p>Single agencies dominate the process</p> <p>Elections may change the political landscape on REDD</p> <p>Commitment from all partners</p> <p>Institutional relationships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LoA and PCA have been signed, first disbursement has been transferred. The FPIC Policy Recommendation has been launched.

	<p>ministerial round table discussions organized</p> <p>1.1.5 Policy recommendations on at least 2 key-issues prepared</p> <p>1.1.5 Roadmap for issuing policies on key-issues developed</p>	<p>harmonized yet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •IFCA analysis need further actions/studies. •Few policies, but not operational yet. •Some demonstration initiatives are on going. Status of demonstration projects has not been reported yet. •REDDI Strategy Roadmap to REDD implementation has not been developed. 	<p>key-issues organized</p> <p>1.1.3 Two key issues analyzed</p> <p>1.1.4 At least 6 inter-ministerial round table discussions on 2 key issues</p> <p>1.1.5 Policy recommendations on at least 2 key-issues prepared</p>	<p>from governments, private sector, CSOs/NGOs, local communities and Indigenous Peoples, academic groups and experts were involved.</p>			<p>strengthened</p>	<p>However, UN-REDD still needs to ensure that the policy recommendation will be used by REDD+ Task Force or others when they develop FPIC guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important technical issues are: area assurance, land tenure, silviculture system, forest protection technology, sustainable industry, valid and consistent data, existence of KPH
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---------------------	--

								(FMU), regulation revision emphasized on giving high proportion for community forest relative to industry. Another issue is how to mainstream these issues with regards to REDD+ and climate change.
1.2. REDD lessons learnt	1.2.1 National knowledge & learning network established 1.2.2 Mechanism established to cooperate with local initiatives 1.2.3 Joint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some NGOs have developed REDD related initiatives. Others are willing to do so but have constraints on funding. Private sector intends to participate 	<p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>1.2.1 Framework for a national knowledge & learning network proposed</p> <p>1.2.2 Terms of Reference for mechanism to cooperate with local initiatives developed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lessons Learned on National REDD+ Strategy process produced in Indonesian and in English. Activities to develop a framework for a national knowledge and learning network have started (Terms of Reference on national REDD+ knowledge management developed). Lessons Learned with regards to Demonstration Activities (DAs) in Indonesia were shared with multi-stakeholders through a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website Workshop proceedings Progress reports Publications Lessons learned disseminated at at COP15 Lessons learned disseminated at at COP16 	UNDP; MoFor/Gol	REDD implementers are unwilling to share experiences/technologies due to commercial or political interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation and Lessons Learned from the processes is can be valuable for other initiatives. There is room for

	workshops organized 1.2.4 A publication on lessons learned prepared 1.2.4 A publication on lessons learned disseminated	in REDD related activities. •Bilateral REDD initiatives are ongoing. •Experience and lessons of local communities and CSOs are not widely disseminated	<u>December 2011</u> 1.2.1 National knowledge & learning network established 1.2.2 Mechanism to cooperative with local initiatives operational 1.2.2 Cooperation with 5 local initiatives confirmed 1.2.3 Six joint workshops organized 1.2.4 One publication on lessons learned prepared 1.2.4 One publication on lessons learned disseminated	joint workshop with FORDA and Center for Environment Standardization, as well as through publication. • Lessons Learned on how to develop criteria to select Pilot Province and Districts used in the selection of Central Sulawesi were shared with the REDD+ Task Force to facilitate selection of Pilot Province for the Norway-Indonesia Letter of Intent agreement. • Supported the National Climate Change Council (DNPI) in organizing two events; the Indonesia Carbon Update, and the First Asia Carbon Update. • Shared lesson learned (including dissemination of publications and video) at the Cancun Conference side event. Also briefed Indonesia's diplomats (Ambassadors, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) about REDD+, and with RECOFTC partners at Bangkok meeting. • Disseminated the Cancun Conference's results (particularly REDD+ issues) to high rank decision makers in the Ministry of Forestry. • Member of Indonesia's delegation team for COP15 and 16, AWG-LCA 14 and 34 th SBSTA UNFCCC climate conference in	▪ Letter of Agreements with local initiatives			more cooperation with the private sector. • It is important to improve capacities of Parliament members on REDD+ issues.
--	---	--	---	---	---	--	--	---

				<p>Bonn June 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published and distributed UN-REDD Lesson Learned, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results from the Cancun Conference The National REDD+ Strategy coordinated by Bappenas A Lessons Learned report explaining the process of developing the above Strategy UN-REDD brochures and leaflets Annual Report 2010. 10 'fast facts' (fact sheets) developed and distributed at Forestry conference 				
1.3 Communications Programme	<p>Communications strategy and impact monitoring system developed to include:</p> <p>1.3.1 Agreement on target messages reached</p> <p>1.3.1 Target groups identified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness on REDD remains limited to few key agencies at central government level. Various policies endanger prospect and sustainability of REDD, like 	<p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>1.3.1 Agreement on target messages reached</p> <p>1.3.1 Target groups identified</p> <p>1.3.2 Awareness impact monitoring system designed</p> <p>1.3.2 Awareness baseline established</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target groups and messages for each stakeholder group have been identified. Preliminary draft of Communication Strategy has been prepared. Joint workshop with RECOFTC on capacity building for journalists on REDD+ issues in Indonesia, collaborated with the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group on Media Gathering to raise awareness about REDD+ issues in Central Sulawesi. Supported focus group discussion among key REDD+ stakeholders which led to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness baseline study results Midterm assessment End-of-project assessment Media reports IEC materials Communication strategy developed and guiding communication 	UNEP; MoFor/Gol	<p>Government supports targeting controversial forestry issues, like oil palm expansion, mining and illegal logging</p> <p>Diverse approaches and products can be developed that effectively raise awareness of a</p>	Delays for the development of the Communication Strategy noted.

	<p>1.3.2 Awareness impact monitoring system designed</p> <p>1.3.2 Baseline established</p> <p>1.3.2 Impact assessed (at completion)</p> <p>National communication campaign and training for local REDD+ actors developed, including:</p> <p>1.3.3 Social marketing campaign designed</p> <p>1.3.4 REDD information, education and communication materials (IEC) developed</p> <p>1.3.5 National</p>	<p>expansion palm oil on peat and allowing the use of timber from natural forests for pulp and paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on REDD related to sub-national levels are limited. • E-data at MoFor, DNPI, UN are not well updated. • No strategic approach in communications and no monitoring systems for assessing impact of awareness raising 	<p>1.3.3 Framework for social marketing campaign drafted</p> <p>1.3.4 Outline of REDD information, education and communication (IEC) materials prepared</p> <p>1.3.6 Training needs on REDD for local level actors identified</p> <p><u>December 2011</u></p> <p>1.3.2 Impact of communication campaign assessed</p> <p>1.3.3 Social marketing campaign designed</p> <p>1.3.4 REDD information, education and communication materials developed</p>	<p>decision to establish a network among communication officers from REDD+ related DAs in Indonesia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Started UN-REDD outreach to other websites to establish links, such as the FORDA-CIFOR webpage. • UN-REDD website development in progress. 	<p>ns at the PMU Monitoring system developed and level of awareness assessed and reported</p> <p>Communication products</p>		<p>heterogeneous audience</p>	
--	---	---	---	--	---	--	-------------------------------	--

	<p>communications campaign conducted</p> <p>1.3.5 high-level GoI - UN conference or panel discussion organized</p> <p>1.3.6 Training on REDD for local level actors conducted</p>		<p>1.3.5 National communications campaign conducted</p> <p>1.3.5 One high-level GoI - UN conference or panel discussion organized</p> <p>1.3.6 Training on REDD for local level actors conducted</p>					
<p>Outcome 2: Successful demonstration of establishing a REL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the national REDD architecture</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On province has improved MRV system supporting NCAS Provisional REL successfully demonstrated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently there are no provincial MRV system but it is requirement for sub national implementation NFI (1989-1997) FRA (2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By the end of 2010 of provisional REL completed for a province By 10/2010 NFI system redesigned and MRV demonstrated at the provincial level 	<p>Amongst the key achievements for outcome 2, a recommendation for a National REDD+ Information, Monitoring & MRV Action Plan has been provided to the REDD+ Task Force and other government institutions. There has also been progress on drafting a Forestry MRV Roadmap through collaboration with Ministry of Forestry. Capacity building on basic remote sensing has taken place on provincial level, and work to map out existing funding system, payment mechanism and benefit distribution, in Indonesia and abroad has been carried out.</p>	<p>Progress reports; Regulations and other documentation; System design documents;</p>	<p>FAO, UNDP, UNEP</p>	<p>Capital investments and training are delivered in a timely fashion</p> <p>Institutional coordination is effective</p> <p>Flexibility of LoA to be adjusted based on the field situation.</p>	<p>Execution of this outcome is categorized slow. An acceleration is needed to catch up with the dynamic situation of REDD+ in Indonesia.</p>

2.1 Improved capacity and methodology design for forest carbon inventory within a Monitoring, Assessment, Reporting and Verification System (MRV), including sub-national pilot implementation	<p>2.1.1 Existing standards and methodologies in MRV reviewed</p> <p>2.1.2 Measurement protocols and sampling design for a national forest carbon inventory developed</p> <p>2.1.3 Forest carbon inventory in pilot provinces implemented</p> <p>2.1.4 Methods for Reporting and Verification developed</p> <p>2.1.5 Reporting and Verification in pilot provinces</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFI (1989-1997) are outdated and need to be further developed • Baseline for socioeconomic data in NFI does not exist 	<p>December 2010</p> <p>2.1.1 Review of existing standards and methodologies in MRV published</p> <p>2.1.2 Outline for measurement protocols and sampling design for a national forest carbon inventory prepared</p> <p>2.1.3 Terms of Reference for forest carbon inventory in pilot provinces prepared</p> <p>2.1.4 Outline for methods for Reporting and Verification prepared</p> <p>2.1.6 Workshop on MRV Training methodology</p>	<p>Achievements during the last six months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked with UN-REDD Global programme (FAO) on a recommendation for a National REDD+ Information, Monitoring & MRV Action Plan to the REDD+ Task Force and other government institutions (includes review of existing standards and methodologies). • Draft of Forestry MRV Roadmap through collaboration with Ministry of Forestry. • Trained 33 participants in Basic Remote Sensing in the province (provincial government, forestry province, NGOs, CSOs, Universities,) in relation to the MRV system. • Published and disseminated publication about general MRV system. • Conducted study on land use classification based on Spot 4 image for Central Sulawesi province. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Regulations • Training materials • Workshop proceedings • Publications 	FAO; MoFor/Gol	<p>Sufficient staff, equipment and other resources are dedicated to the task</p> <p>Adequate methodology selected for demonstration of MRV</p> <p>There is a need for a clear data management and data sharing policy among information providers and users</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO is categorized slow in implementing this activity. • The search for an international consultant to develop NFI design took very long and was eventually abandoned and a national consultant was selected. • There are many DAs developing MRV methodology in their area. A lead agency is

	implemented 2.1.6 Workshop on MRV Training methodology organized		organized <u>December 2011</u> 2.1.2 Measurement protocols and sampling design for a national forest carbon inventory developed 2.1.3 forest carbon inventory in pilot provinces implemented 2.1.4 Methods for Reporting and Verification released 2.1.5 Reporting and Verification in pilot provinces implemented					needed to coordinate and decide what MRV methodolo gy should be implem ented for Indonesia. • Lack of clarity about responsibil ities for MRV in Indonesia due the planned establishm ent of an MRV Institution. The details of Who and What this MRV institution is, are still unknown.
2.2 Reference emissions level (REL) proposed at the provincial level	2.2.1 REL methodologie s reviewed 2.2.2 Methodologic	•Some data analysis exist within DGPLAN but incomplete • No Baseline	<u>December 2010</u> 2.2.1 Review of REL methodologies published	• Initial historical emission levels for LULUCF for Central Sulawesi developed.	•Progress reports • Technical reports •Publications •Workshop	FAO; MoFor/Gol	Basic information is available (satellite images, reference data)	• FAO has been slow in implem ting activities

	<p>al options to establish REL at national and sub-national scale developed</p> <p>2.2.3 Data to support development of REL compiled</p> <p>2.2.4 Provisional REL in the pilot province assessed</p> <p>2.2.5 Provisional REL scientifically peer reviewed</p> <p>2.2.6 Stakeholder consultations on REL methodological approach and provincial provisional REL organized</p> <p>2.2.7 REL</p>	<p>for Carbon Emission at the national and sub-national level exists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing NFI data not calculated for REDD No scenario exists 	<p>2.2.2 Outline for methodological options to establish REL at national and sub-national scale prepared</p> <p>2.2.3 Data to support development of REL compiled</p> <p><u>December 2011</u></p> <p>2.2.2 Methodological options to establish REL at national and sub-national scale released</p> <p>2.2.4 Provisional REL in the pilot province released</p> <p>2.2.5 Peer review of Provisional REL completed</p> <p>2.2.6 At least 4 stakeholder consultations on REL methodological approach and</p>		proceedings		<p>Authorities are willing to co-operate</p> <p>Implementing partners are capable to allocate skillful staff</p>	<p>under this output.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned to be implemented later. Need to be completed and improved using more recent data and information. There is no international guidance yet on how Reference Emission Levels are to be developed. UNFCCC process has not yet led to a decision on this issue. Since FAO recommends to
--	--	---	---	--	-------------	--	--	---

	methodological approach and provincial provisional REL scientifically peer reviewed		provincial provisional REL organized 2.2.7 Peer review of REL methodological approach and provincial provisional REL completed					follow UNFCCC decisions, this activity has not started, however, the thinking has changed and it will be implemented now even without UNFCCC guidance.
2.3. Harmonized fair and equitable payment mechanism at provincial level	2.3.1 Existing payment systems compiled 2.3.2 Benefits and constraints of existing systems analyzed and reviewed 2.3.3 Options for modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No REDD payment distributions systems for all types of credits Role of district government unclear 	December 2010 2.3.1 Information about existing payment systems compiled 2.3.2 Outline for a review on benefits and constraints of existing systems prepared 2.3.3 Terms of Reference for developing	Achievements during the last six months: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compiled information on existing funding system, payment mechanism and benefit distribution, particularly payment for environmental services (PES) in Indonesia and abroad. Mapping of funding mechanism in Indonesia from national to sub-national level also included. Preparation for analysis of the compiled information showing benefits and constraints of existing PES projects and their possibilities to be relevant for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports Publications Workshop proceedings MoM ToRs 	UNDP; MoFor/Gol	<p>No national legislation enabling the payment system(s)</p> <p>Lack up-front payments impacting local commitments</p>	

	<p>to meet requirements of a REDD payment system developed</p> <p>2.3.4 Stakeholder consultations organized</p> <p>2.3.5 A REDD payment system created</p> <p>2.3.6 Local institutions trained</p>		<p>options for modifications to meet requirements of a REDD payment system prepared</p> <p>2.3.4 One stakeholder consultations organized</p> <p><u>December 2011</u></p> <p>2.3.2 Analytical report on benefits and constraints of existing systems published</p> <p>2.3.3 Options for modifications to meet requirements of a REDD payment system developed</p> <p>2.3.4 Three stakeholder consultations organized</p> <p>2.3.5 A REDD payment system created</p> <p>2.3.6 Local</p>	<p>REDD+ (TORs developed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in international events on REDD+ payment mechanism. 				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

			institutions trained					
2.4 Toolkit for priority setting towards maximizing potential Carbon-benefits and incorporating co-benefits, at the provincial level	<p>2.4.1 Agreement on agencies, data sources, GIS development and site selection criteria reached</p> <p>2.4.2 The Priority Setting Toolkit (including short manual) developed</p> <p>2.4.3 Below- & above-ground carbon, inside and outside the Forest Estate mapped</p> <p>2.4.4 Co-benefits (minimally: biodiversity, water resources, pockets of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No national nor provincial site selection process, IFCA provides guidelines only • No DSS to make feasible investment decisions Draft criteria for site selection indicated in IFCA (2007) 	<p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>2.4.1 Agreement on agencies, data sources, GIS development and site selection criteria reached</p> <p>2.4.2 Outline for the Priority Setting Toolkit developed</p> <p>2.4.3 Terms of reference for mapping below- & above-ground carbon, inside and outside the Forest Estate prepared</p> <p>2.4.4 Outline for mapping co-benefits (minimally: biodiversity, water resources, pockets of poverty, others) prepared</p> <p><u>December 2011</u></p>	<p>Achievements during the last six months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNEP-WCMC visited Indonesia and met with potential partners to discuss collaborative work in March 2011. • The first step in producing the priority-setting toolkit is in progress (UNEP-WCMC trained Indonesian colleagues from MoFor, BPKH Palu, Central Sulawesi Forest Service and Tadulako University). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project reports ▪ Manual of Toolkit translated in Bahasa Indonesia ▪ Maps ▪ MoM Work plan developed in collaboration with partners <p>Series of map overlays</p> <p>Priority-setting toolkit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Skills in using toolkit developed during training session 	<p>UNEP; MoFor/Gol (UNEP-WCMC, leading the development of the output)</p>	<p>Relevant data are available for producing map overlays</p> <p>Remote sensing coverage pilot province not available or not in time for analysis</p> <p>MoFor departments unwilling to exchange data sets, and share with FORDA</p> <p>Climate Change impacts lead to significant changes in forest ecology.</p> <p>Relevant data are available for producing map overlays</p>	<p>Progress of the output was delayed due to a lengthy selection process of participants for the training on priority-setting toolkit.</p>

	<p>poverty, others) mapped</p> <p>2.4.4 Co-benefits maps analyzed</p> <p>2.4.5 Provincial staff trained in the use of Priority Setting Tool</p> <p>2.4.6 Workshop organized on co-benefits, local spatial planning, and national REDD policy</p>		<p>2.4.2 The Priority Setting Toolkit (including short manual) developed and published</p> <p>2.4.3 Below- & above-ground carbon, inside and outside the Forest Estate mapped</p> <p>2.4.4 Co-benefits (minimally: biodiversity, water resources, pockets of poverty, others) mapped</p> <p>2.4.4 Co-benefits maps analyzed and published</p> <p>2.4.5 Provincial staff trained in the use of Priority Setting Tool</p> <p>2.4.6 Workshop organized on co-benefits, local spatial planning, and national</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			REDD policy					
Outcome 3: Capacity established to implement REDD at decentralized levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local government programs and policies on REDD Awareness level on REDD with decision makers # of districts REDD ready 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak awareness and understanding pro-contra of REDD No integrated approach to carbon stock management at district level Limited understanding on how REDD impacts on local supply level requires A/R investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By end of 2011 district spatial plan endorsed by DPRD for 2-3 districts Awareness levels One district is REDD ready 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment and increased level of understanding on REDD+ issues for provincial Working Group in Central Sulawesi. An outline of REDD+ provincial strategy has been developed. 	<p>Capacity and awareness impact surveys</p> <p>Spatial plan ready + implementation plan</p>	UNDP; MoFor/Gol	<p>Bupati/DPRD willing to make changes in forest use and status</p> <p>REDD commitment is not dependent on Bupati only but based on stakeholder wide Commitment.</p> <p>Over expectation of local stakeholders, particularly IP/CSO, in Central Sulawesi on UN-REDD support</p>	
3.1 Capacity for spatial socio-economic planning incorporating REDD at the district level	<p>3.1.1 a comprehensive baseline dataset developed</p> <p>3.1.1 Areas of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing conflicts TGHK with process RTRD Few district spatial plans 	<p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>3.1.1 a comprehensive baseline dataset developed</p> <p>3.1.1 Areas of</p>	<p>Achievements during the last six months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoFor staff understanding improved after attending an opportunity costs training in Bangkok. TORs for opportunity cost analysis developed and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports Minutes of consultations Maps draft spatial plan 	UNDP; MoFor/Gol	<p>Forestry authorities willing to participate and go for consensus</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance is a significant selection criteria as it reflects commitment

	REDD-eligible forest identified	endorsed at national level	REDD-eligible forest identified <u>December 2011</u>	announced.				Priority setting tool ready and applied	nt of the local government • A number of activities for pilot district selection are planned for end of July and August, and the selected districts are expected to be announced in August.
	3.1.2 Opportunity costs of alternative land uses analyzed		3.1.2 Opportunity costs of alternative land uses analyzed and published						
	3.1.3 Potential socio-economic impacts of REDD on communities analyzed		3.1.3 Potential socio-economic impacts of REDD on communities analyzed and published						
	3.1.4 REDD integrated in existing spatial planning and forest utilization planning		3.1.4 REDD integrated in existing spatial planning and forest utilization planning						
	3.1.5 District based consensus on land – and forest use allocation reached		3.1.5 District based consensus on land – and forest use allocation reached						
	3.1.6 The		3.1.6 The REDD mainstreamed spatial plan approved						

	REDD mainstreamed spatial plan approved							
3.2 Empowered local stakeholders are able to benefit from REDD	<p>3.2.1 Capacity needs assessment made</p> <p>3.2.2 Capacity building & training modules developed</p> <p>3.2.3 Trainers have been trained</p> <p>3.2.4 Training and other capacity building activities have been implemented</p> <p>3.2.5 Follow-up activities required to improve and sustain capacity have been assessed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low awareness and high level of misconception on REDD at village and district level • All REDD proposals driven by foreign agencies 	<p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>3.2.1 Capacity needs assessment made</p> <p>3.2.2 Outline for capacity building & training modules prepared</p> <p><u>December 2011</u></p> <p>3.2.2 Capacity building & training modules developed</p> <p>3.2.3 Trainers have been trained</p> <p>3.2.4 Training and other capacity building activities have been implemented</p> <p>3.2.5 Follow-up activities required to improve and sustain capacity have been assessed</p>	<p>Achievements during the last six months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of information on climate change and REDD+ issues to Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group. • In collaboration with Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, Central Sulawesi Media Gathering to judge the level of understanding on REDD+ and climate change issues at public level. • Collaboration with local REDD+ networks. • Local participation in regional discussion on post-Cancun organized by RECOFTC and FAO. • Participation of with Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group members at a Training of Trainers event organized by Conservation International and University of Indonesia on CC and REDD+. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Progress reports ▪ Publications ▪ Awareness & capacity impact studies at mid- and end-term 	UNDP; MoFor/Gol	Baseline established at inception	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media needs information and updates on CC and REDD+ issues in order to play a more strategic role for successful REDD+ readiness and implementation. • Asia-Pacific countries need to consolidate to have a strong voice in upcoming UNFCCC COPs.

<p>3.3 Multi-stakeholder-endorsed District plans for REDD implementation</p>	<p>3.3.1 Five districts in which REDD is most feasible identified</p> <p>3.3.2 REDD socialized to these districts</p> <p>3.3.3 Districts developed proposals to implement REDD</p> <p>3.3.3 Districts show political commitment to implement REDD</p> <p>3.3.4 For at least one district, agreement on an implementation framework for REDD reached</p>	<p>Few district spatial plans endorsed at national level</p>	<p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>3.3.1 Five districts in which REDD is most feasible identified</p> <p><u>December 2011</u></p> <p>3.3.2 REDD socialized to 5 districts</p> <p>3.3.3 Five districts have developed proposals to implement REDD</p> <p>3.3.3 Districts show political commitment to implement REDD</p> <p>3.3.4 For at least one district, agreement on an implementation framework for REDD reached</p>	<p>Achievements during the last six months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In collaboration with the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, UN-REDD conducted group discussions on developing criteria to select five pilot districts for UN-REDD activities. The criteria reflect the REDD-eligible forest and socio-economic aspects. • Involvement of district stakeholders through decision to establish Central Sulawesi Working Group (in February) and inauguration (in March). • MoFor staff understanding improved after attending an opportunity costs training in Bangkok. TORs for opportunity cost analysis developed and announced. 	<p><u>December 2009</u></p> <p>3.3.1 Five districts in which REDD is most feasible identified</p> <p><u>December 2010</u></p> <p>3.3.2 REDD socialized to 5 districts</p> <p>3.3.3 Five districts have developed proposals to implement REDD</p> <p>3.3.3 Districts show political commitment to implement REDD</p> <p>3.3.4 For at least one district, agreement on an implementation framework for REDD reached</p>	<p>UNDP; MoFor/Goi</p>	<p>DPRD approves district based spatial plans,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of districts have been delayed due to long selection process. • Representatives from NGOs/CSO and IPs are represented in the Working Group. • Each sub-Working Group has specific tasks and functions. • Need a synergy among sub-Working Groups.
--	---	--	---	---	---	------------------------	--	--

Cross-cutting issues:

Gender:

- Training on gender issues conducted to mainstream gender into the National Programme (training facilitated by UN Women)
- Gender specific indicators and relevant activities developed and have been integrated in the work plan.

Governance:

- UN-REDD Indonesia collaboration to develop the Participatory Governance Assessment supported by the Global UN-REDD Programme. UN-REDD Indonesia provides in kind contribution technical support to the development of the Assessment Criteria. Central Sulawesi is one of the assessment locations, and UN-REDD Programme Indonesia is providing extra support in this province.

1.3 Financial Information

In the table below, please provide up-to-date information on activities completed based on the Results Framework included in the signed National Programme Document; as well as financial data on planned, committed and disbursed funds. The table requests information on the cumulative financial progress of the National Programme implementation at the end of the reporting period (including all cumulative yearly disbursements). Please add additional rows as needed. Definitions of financial categories:

- *Budget:* Amount transferred from the MDTF to date for the programme
- *Commitments:* Includes all amount committed⁵ to date
- *Disbursement:* Amount paid to a vendor or entity for goods received, work completed, and/or services rendered (does not include un-liquidated obligations)
- *Expenditures:* Total of commitments plus disbursements
- *Percentage delivery:* Cumulative expenditure over funds transferred to date

PROGRAMME OUTCOMES	UN ORGANISATION	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS				
		PRODOC BUDGET	CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES			DELIVERY (%)
			Commitments	Disbursements	Total Expenditures	Expenditure as percentage of the budget
Outcome 1	FAO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	UNEP	749,000.00	527,935	200,628	728,563	97

⁵ Commitment is the amount for which legally binding contracts have been signed, including multi-year commitments which may be disbursed in future years

	UNDP	963,000.00	-	1,406,796	1,406,796	146 ⁶
Outcome 2	FAO	1,498,000.00	17,490.00	279,997.00	297,487.00	20
	UNEP	401,250.00	-	-	-	
	UNDP	428,000.00		43,833	43,833	10%
Outcome 3	FAO	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	UNEP	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	UNDP	1,605,000.00	-	244,685	244,685	15%
TOTAL:		5,644,250	545,425	2,175,939	2,721,364	48

Amounts are inclusive of 7% indirect support costs

⁶ The over-expenditure under Outcome 1 is due to the fact that all operational costs were charged to this Outcome. This has had no effect on the budget available for activities. The relevant charges will be reversed back to the other Outcomes.

2. National Programme Progress

The questions in section two are intended to capture advancements and challenges that the National Programme has faced during the reporting period. It also aims to collect information on inter-agency coordination, ownership and development effectiveness, and communication. Please provide your answers after each question.

2.1 Narrative on Progress, Difficulties and Contingency Measures

The questions below ask for a brief narrative describing progress on the implementation of activities, generation of outputs and attainment of outcomes. It also asks for a description of internal and external challenges to National Programme implementation, as well as the contingency actions planned to overcome them.

2.1.1 Please provide a brief overall assessment of the extent to which the National Programme is progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs. Please provide examples if relevant (600 words).

In overall, up to mid-2011, the programme showed good progress to achieve its targets, particularly for outcome 1: 'Strengthened multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national and provincial level'. UN-REDD's multi-stakeholder consensus based approach has been well implemented and has been recognized by REDD+ stakeholders in Indonesia, including national and sub-national government, CSOs, NGOs, private sector, universities and individual experts. Processes to develop the National REDD+ Strategy and the FPIC Policy Recommendation are examples of how the approach was well implemented. A number of Lessons Learned from programme activities have been shared with key REDD+ stakeholders to enhance national and sub-national consensus and the Programme has been able to act as the bridge between various institutions such as DKN, DNPI, Bappenas, and the Ministry of Forestry, as well as internally in the Ministry of Forestry. Other important issues at national level include the National Forestry Roadmap, national Information, Monitoring and MRV Action Plan recommendation and National Forestry MRV Roadmap for the Ministry of Forestry. The programme is also progressing with the work related to national funding mechanism and payment distribution.

Progress has been slower for the development and implementation of the Communication Strategy, and for outcome 2: 'Successful demonstration of establishing a REL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the national REDD architecture', and outcome 3: 'Capacity established to implemented REDD at decentralized levels'. This is (for outcome 2) partly because of the late signing of the implementation agreements between UNEP and the Ministry of Forestry and FAO and the Ministry of Forestry, and, for both outcomes, partly due to the prioritized focus on national policy level activities in 2010.

An additional reason for the slow progress of outcome 3 activities is UN-REDD's approach in implementing activities at sub-national level (province, district and community) which is very democratic and requires lengthy stakeholder consultations. The UN-REDD Programme focused on strengthening provincial multi-stakeholders through strengthening the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group before implementing its activities at province, district, and community levels. The reason for applying this approach is to allow the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group to be the driving force for REDD+ implementation in the province. Strong ownership of the REDD+ programme in Central Sulawesi by the Working Group will ensure the sustainability of the REDD+ work in the province. The UN-REDD Programme has however taken action to ensure timely progress also under outcome 3. As such, the Programme will ensure the selection of pilot districts within the month of August. This will enable activities at district level to go forward.

2.1.2 Please provide a brief overall assessment of any measures taken to ensure the sustainability of the National Programme results during the reporting period. Please provide examples if relevant. (250 words)

Sustainability of the National Programme during the reporting period tends to be good. This is because UN-REDD applies two approaches to ensure the sustainability: (a) increasing ownership by stakeholders through building multi-stakeholder consensus, and (b) by conducting collaboration with

relevant institutions officially leading the implementation of the issue. Processes of developing the National REDD+ Strategy, the national FPIC Policy Recommendation, the National REDD+ Framework and Forestry MRV Roadmap are examples of UN-REDD activities that will be sustained and continue to have an effect even after the UN-REDD National Programme is finished. A similar approach is applied also at province level. An additional approach to ensure the sustainability of the province programme is the link between national programmes and provincial programmes such as the link between the Provincial REDD+ Strategy with the National REDD+ Strategy. Also, by working with the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, which is a multi-stakeholder working group and officially established and recognized by the provincial government, UN-REDD activities at the province level will be implemented and shared by all REDD+ stakeholders in the province. This will ensure the sustainability of the programme. For this purpose, UN-REDD works to ensure that the Working Group is well informed on REDD+ dynamics at national level, as well as at international level, and aim to increase their capacity in handling REDD+ related issues in the Central Sulawesi province.

2.1.3 If there are difficulties in the implementation of the National Programme, what are the main causes of these difficulties? Please check the most suitable option.

X UN agency Coordination

Coordination with Government

X Coordination within the Government

X Administrative (Procurement, etc) /Financial (management of funds, availability, budget revision, etc)

Management: 1. Activity and output management

Management: 2. Governance/Decision making (PMC/NSC)

Accountability

Transparency

National Programme design

External to the National Programme (risks and assumptions, elections, natural disaster, social unrest)

2.1.4 If boxes are checked under 2.1.3, please briefly describe any current *internal* difficulties⁷ the National Programme is facing in relation to the implementation of the activities outlined in the National Programme Document. (200 words)

- During the first half of 2011, there were three internal difficulties confronted by the PMU:
 - (1) Late signing of the PCA by the Ministry of Forestry and UNEP caused delay in implementing activities under output 1.3 and 2.4. Output 1.3 should ideally have been implemented in the beginning of the UN-REDD National Programme. Delay in the recruitment of international consultant under output 1.3 and also slow work of the hired consultant has forced UN-REDD to take initiatives without a proper communication strategy. Similar situation also happened for output 2.4.
 - (2) Late signing of the Letter of Agreement (LoA) between FAO and the Ministry of Forestry caused delay in implementing activities under output 2.1 and 2.2. The delay was due to a disagreement on some legal aspects of the LoA, which led to an amendment in the LoA. The funds disbursed through the LoA are to be spent according to the activities mentioned in the LoA. This means that the PMU has limited flexibility to replace activities to accelerate the speed of implementing activities of outputs 2.1. and 2.2. For direct implementation modality FAO requires a submission of budget preferably two weeks but no later than 1 week in advance of the activity. The REDD+ Readiness process in Indonesia is very dynamic and quick response is often needed. However, the more strict financial administration system in FAO does not allow quick response activity in less than a week. This has led to delayed implementation of some activities.
 - (3) PMU applies project Standard Operational Procedures (SOP) for running the project. The SOP was endorsed by Project Executive Board before the LoA and PCA were signed. In implementing the SOP, FAO has a different approach to calculating eligible DSA amounts than the PMU has used so far. It was realized only after the SOP was signed that the SOP was clear on the DSA rates, but not clear on how to apply the rates. FAO for example deducts

⁷ Difficulties confronted by the team directly involved in the implementation of the National Programme

overnight stay from the DSA for a half-day meeting, whereas UNDP always applies full DSA. For UN-REDD partners outside of the UN Agencies, implementation of two different rates of payment for a component is illogical. This has created some questions while implementing activities in the field. It is hard for the PMU to explain the situation to the partners. UN-REDD is a collaborative Program, so there should be a more harmonized system for handling expenditures. There are also activities that are anticipated not to be harmonized: (1) auditing, and (2) method of fund transferred. Both FAO and UNEP have not officially followed HACT results that have been applied by UNDP for the PMU.

2.1.5 If boxes are checked under 2.1.3, please briefly describe any current *external* difficulties⁸ (not caused by the National Programme) that delay or impede the quality of implementation. (200 words)

- Progress of REDD+ negotiation at international levels has impacted on quality of implementation of UN-REDD activities in the field, such as lack of guidance with regards to REL, MRV and safeguards. Many stakeholders have difficulties in understanding how Indonesia REDD+ will be developed without clear guidance from international level.
- In May 2010 a REDD+ Partnership agreement between Norway and Indonesia (LoI) was signed, which included the establishment of a REDD+ Task Force. Due to this, many responsibilities and tasks were moved from the Ministry of Forestry to the REDD+ Task Force. The coordination between the two agencies started out quite positive, though at some point became sensitive. The UN-REDD programme has a close relationship with the implementing partner, the Ministry of Forestry, which limited UN-REDD programme's ability to be above the parties. However, the Programme still managed to play a constructive role as bridge builder between the parties. UN-REDD was for instance able to provide quality policy recommendations, however the Programme was left out of further communication with the REDD+ Task Force. This led to reduced ability to affect some of the important processes of defining REDD+ in Indonesia during this time-frame. This applies to the National REDD+ Strategy, the FPIC policy recommendation, and to some extent the MRV framework.

2.1.6 Please, briefly explain the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or manage the difficulties (internal and external referred to in question 2.1.3 and 2.1.4) described in the previous sections. (250 words)

- The partners in the UN-REDD programme have discussed the application of HACT mechanism, auditing system, and single SOP for all agencies. UNEP has agreed on the suggestion. FAO is in process to apply Cash Transfer modality as determined by the HACT assessment in the near future. A pragmatic solution to the different ways of applying the Harmonized DSA rates was found and is that FAO will avoid organizing half-day meetings, thus resulting in FAO applying the same approach to DSA as UNDP has done all along.
- Actions to manage external difficulties due to un-clear status of REDD+ mechanism have been implemented by UN-REDD such as by encouraging key stakeholders, particularly key stakeholders at sub-national level, to not think about the REDD+ mechanism, but emphasize that our activities are aimed for supporting Indonesia to be able to manage its forest in a sustainable manner. Most of our activities are in the form of increasing capacity to do a sustainable management of forests. Any incentives coming from results of our activities later such as incentives from REDD+ mechanism, will be an additional benefit.
- The UN-REDD Programme continues to try to act as a bridge builder between the various relevant institutions within the Government of Indonesia and promote inclusive processes.

2.2 Inter-Agency Coordination

The aim of the questions below is to collect relevant information on how the National Programme is contributing to inter-agency work and "Delivering as One".

2.2.1 Is the National Programme in coherence with the UN Country Programme or other donor assistance

⁸ Difficulties confronted by the team caused by factors outside of the National Programme

framework approved by the Government?

X Yes No

If not, does the National Programme fit into the national strategies?

Yes No

If not, please explain:

2.2.2 What types of coordination mechanisms and decisions have been taken to ensure joint delivery? Please reflect on the questions above and add any other relevant comments and examples if you consider it necessary:

- Quarterly Progress Report is developed by PMU using the UNDP's QWR template.
- Regular coordination meetings of PMU, FAO, UNDP, and UNEP.
- See section 2.1.4. and 2.1.6. above.

2.2.3 Is HACT being applied in the implementation of the National Programme by the three participating UN organisation?

Yes X No

If not, please explain:

Only UNDP applies HACT. FAO applies Letter of Agreement (LoA) and is in process of preparing HACT implementation. UNEP applies Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA).

2.3 Ownership⁹ and Development Effectiveness

The questions below seeks to gather relevant information on how the National Programme is putting into practice the principles of aid effectiveness through strong national ownership, alignment and harmonization of procedures and mutual accountability.

2.3.1 Do government and other national implementation partners have ownership of the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?

No Some X Yes

Please explain:

The UN-REDD programme applies a multi-stakeholder based approach for any policy related activities at national level and sub-national level. The general public has been actively involved since the beginning of the activities. By applying this approach, all stakeholders own the policy outputs. Government institutions at national and provincial have formal authority to implement the policy, including Bappenas, UKP4, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Forestry, National Climate Change Council (DNPI) and National Forestry Council (DKN). These institutions lead the activities with support of UN-REDD. UN-REDD therefore acts as driver of exchange instead of as a main actor for executing the activities.

2.3.2 Are the UN-REDD Programme's Guidelines for Stakeholder Engagement and Operational Guidance Engagement of Indigenous Peoples and Other Forest Dependent Communities been applied in the National Programme process?

No Partially X Fully

Please explain, including if level of consultation varies between non-government stakeholders:

UN-REDD Indonesia has developed a consultation process concept for all stakeholders including Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Since UN-REDD Indonesia works at national, province, district, and community levels, UN-REDD Indonesia has developed a consultation framework as follows:

- (a) Multi-stakeholder (public) consultations are applied at national, province, and in the future at district levels. Consensus by all stakeholders (government, NGOs, CSOs/local communities including Indigenous Peoples' representatives, private sector, universities, and experts) is an approach for producing public policy related outputs.
- (b) A FPIC methodology has been developed at national level and will be tested for selected activities

⁹ Ownership refers to countries exercising effective leadership over their REDD+ policies and strategies, and co-ordination of actions.

at community level in the selected districts.

These consultation concepts are disseminated to all stakeholders at various UN-REDD events to let the public fully understand how UN-REDD Indonesia works.

2.3.3 What kind of decisions and activities are non-government stakeholders involved in?

X Policy/decision making

X Management:

Budget Procurement X Service provision

Other, please specify

Please explain, including if level of involvement varies between non-government stakeholders:

NGOs/CSOs (including groups working on gender issues) have been involved since the development of the project document in the form of identifying activities that are needed for REDD+ Readiness in Indonesia. Other non-government stakeholders are involved in the following activities:

- Workshops; in the form of participants in the workshops at national and at sub-national levels.
- Developing annual work plan for the project; stakeholders/participants identified detailed activities needed for the program.
- Executing activities in cooperation with government policy/decision making; such as through developing the National REDD+ Strategy, preparation for establishment of a REDD+ Agency, national FPIC Policy Recommendation at national level, Roadmap of Forestry Development, by developing criteria for selecting the pilot province and districts, through developing the flow of FPIC implementation at province level, through developing and participating in the REDD+ Working Group set up and process at sub-national level.
- Executing workshops/seminars such as the national FPIC workshop, capacity building on REDD+ issue for journalists, conference on climate change justice, Adat (Indigenous Peoples) community consolidation in Central Sulawesi, NGOs coordination for selecting representatives in the REDD+ Working Group.
- Involvement of NGO and IP representative in the UN-REDD Programme Executive Board Meetings.

2.3.4 Based on your previous answers, briefly describe the current situation of the government and non-government stakeholders in relation to ownership and accountability¹⁰ of the National Programme. Please provide some examples.

Government and non-government actors have developed a better relationship in the ownership and execution of the UN-REDD outputs, both at national and sub-national level. The UN-REDD Programme is fully aware of the REDD+ criticism and skepticism amongst some NGOs, and have already reached out to these groups to ensure that the UN-REDD Programme's objectives are well understood and to contribute to an increased understanding of REDD+. One example of this situation was the criticism by a national NGO named HUMA on UN-REDD FPIC activities in Central Sulawesi. The UN-REDD Programme reached out to the NGO communities and explained UN-REDD's FPIC approach, which resulted in a general increase in awareness about UN-REDD's sub-national activities and FPIC methodology.

3. Government Counterpart Information

The aim of this section is to allow the Government Counterpart to provide their assessment, as well as additional and complimentary information to Section 1-3 which are filled out by the three participating UN organizations.

Comments by the Government Counterpart:

- UN-REDD is one of a kind program involving three UN-Agencies to run a single or one UN program. A

¹⁰ Accountability: Acknowledgment and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions, and policies and encompassing the obligation to report, explain and be answerable for resulting consequences.

better harmonization of administrative systems among UN-Agencies in the spirit of the One UN Programme.

- REDD+ is a country driven and it will be good to implement UN-REDD as a country driven programme too. The support that UN agencies have provided so far could be improved through continuous dialogue to ensure the relevance of support to the country need and capacity as well as country ownership. UN agencies should be clear and communicative with the National UN-REDD Programme whether they are acting under the Global UN-REDD Programme, UN-REDD National Programme or as a UN agency, if this is relevant for the UN-REDD Programme Indonesia.
- Government of Indonesia, the Ministry of Forestry, and the three UN-Agencies should all work in partnership at the same level of roles to make the UN-REDD in Indonesia to be success. This should be well maintained in the implementation of UN-REDD Activities in Indonesia.
- UN-REDD has been a key driver for REDD+ Readiness in Indonesia and bring all stakeholders together to take part in the REDD+ Readiness, by actively involving government, CSOs, NGOs, universities and private sector.