



**global witness**

## **Report from the 4<sup>th</sup> Policy Board meeting of the UN-REDD Programme**

*Global Witness*

*24 May 2010*

### **Summary**

The 4<sup>th</sup> Policy Board meeting (PB4) of the UN-REDD Programme was held on 18-19 March in Nairobi, Kenya. The main points on the agenda were:

- 1) an update of progress since the last meeting
- 2) review of the draft Programme Strategy for 2010-15 and consideration of ways to increase coordination with other REDD initiatives, notably the World Bank's FCPF
- 3) review of National Programme documents (NPDs, also referred to as Joint Programme Documents or JPDs) from Bolivia and Zambia, and the Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) for the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).

The complete documentation from the meeting, including presentations, has now been posted on the UN-REDD website at:

<http://un-redd.org/PolicyBoard/4thPolicyBoard/tabid/3390/language/en-US/Default.aspx>

There was a general consensus among Policy Board members and observers at PB4 about the need to improve coordination with other REDD initiatives, notably the World Bank's FCPF, while maintaining the integrity of the Programme. Several decisions were taken that will improve the transparency and clarity of the review and approval process for NPDs. The allocation of funds for the three National Programmes under consideration was approved pending some revisions to the NPDs. This means full National Programmes for all pilot countries except Papua New Guinea (PNG) and Paraguay have been approved, although so far only Indonesia, Tanzania, and Vietnam have signed grant agreements and begun receiving funds for full programmes.

<b>Acronyms</b>	
CSO - Civil Society Organization	NPD – National Programme Document
DRC - Democratic Republic of the Congo	PB - Policy Board (UN-REDD)
FAO - United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization	PB4 – 4 <sup>TH</sup> meeting of the Policy Board
FCPF - Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (World Bank)	PC - Participants Committee (FCPF)
FMT - Facility Management Team (FCPF)	PNG - Papua New Guinea
FPIC - Free, Prior and Informed Consent	REDD – Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
IP – Indigenous Peoples	R-PP - Readiness Preparation Proposal (FCPF)
LAC - Latin America and the Caribbean	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
MDTF - Multi-donor Trust Fund	UNEP - United Nations Environment Programme
MRV - Measurement, Reporting and Verification	UNFCCC - United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
NGO - Non-Governmental Organization	UNFPII - United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

There were some encouraging changes to the process for reviewing, revising and approving National Programmes documents going forward, although there is still much room for improvement. During discussions, donor countries and the Secretariat were responsive to the need for greater clarity and transparency in the processes of NPD review, revision and approval and some decisions were made to improve the process. Denmark, in particular, referred several times to the need for clearer benchmarks for reviewing country progress, not just during the formulation of National Programmes but also during their implementation. This has yet to result in a clear commitment to a process for developing and assessing such benchmarks. Norway also supported greater transparency in how comments on NPDs are incorporated prior to the signing of grant agreements and disbursement of funds. Some of these suggestions were adopted as decisions (see *Key decisions* below). Generally the process of arriving at and drafting PB decisions could be improved to provide greater clarity. Ideally, decisions would be drafted during the PB meeting so that language can be clarified and the decisions published promptly following the meeting. As it stands, the drafting of language for decisions is done by the Secretariat, with input from members of the Policy Board on the exact wording of decisions only when the Secretariat requests it. As a result, the exact nature of decision being taken was not always clear during PB4.

The donor countries and Secretariat were receptive to the need for stronger measures to address governance and law enforcement in National Programmes, as called for by the assessment of NPDs and R-PPs circulated by Global Witness during the meeting (posted at the UN-REDD website given above). Norway highlighted the need for improvements in all programmes with respect to governance, particularly addressing law enforcement and anti-corruption (signalling an important shift in priorities). This resulted in governance taking a central role in the discussions on National Programmes and a decision to include consideration of governance in formal assessments of NPDs going forward. There was also acknowledgement of the need for non-carbon monitoring provisions in National Programmes although it was not specified how this would be encouraged or required in the design of future National Programmes. However, Denmark called for terms of reference (or guidance) to be developed. The three NPDs approved at PB4 will need to be revised to improve their provisions on non-carbon monitoring, although it is not clear whether this will be required prior to signing of grant agreements, or as part of Action Plans that must be drafted and approved prior to grant signing, but can be implemented afterward during the readiness preparations (see *Key decisions* below).

The Secretariat has made clear its intentions to provide additional support for civil society and IP members of the PB. The Global Programme has budgeted money in 2010 for this, which will include, based on discussions between CSO/IPs and the Secretariat prior to and during PB4, supporting improved coordination between CSO/IP Board members and civil society and IPs in pilot countries, and to continue to provide funding for developing country CSO/IP Board members to participate in relevant international processes.

### **Key decisions:**

- The Policy Board requested that the Secretariat work with the FCPF Facility Management Team (FMT) to consider how to integrate UN-REDD Policy Board and FCPF Participants Committee meetings, with the possibility of a day or more of joint meetings to improve coordination and information sharing. The Secretariat is to report back on an intersessional basis for guidance from the PB on coordination with the FMT. The PB further requested that the Secretariat look into options for coordination of delivery between the UN and World Bank and report back to the Policy Board (no timeframe specified) on:

- Objective and targets of joint delivery services for countries
- Exploring joint fiduciary and operational arrangements
- Using single National Readiness formats and procedures when requested by countries
- A decision was made that once a funding allocation for a National Programme is approved by the Policy Board, countries have six months to address issues raised during the NPD review process and sign their grant agreement. After six months, countries must ask the Policy Board for an extension and provide justification for the delay.
- A decision was made requiring countries to propose to the Policy Board an Action Plan describing how larger issues that are not addressed prior to the signing of a grant agreement will be dealt with, including a proposed timeline and benchmarks of progress. It is not clear how it will be decided which issues raised during the review of NPDs can be addressed in the Action Plan and which need to be addressed prior to the signing of the grant.
- An assessment of how governance issues are addressed in NPDs will be added to the review section of the NPD Submission Form.
- As per procedure, some of the issues raised during the NPD review process will need to be addressed prior to grant signing and dispersal of funds, although there is a lack of clarity about which of the comments made by the Secretariat, the Independent Technical Reviewer, and the Policy Board will need to be addressed prior to signing (the signed NPD Submission Forms can be found on the UN-REDD website on the country pages and contain summaries of these comments).
- The UN-REDD Secretariat agreed to report back to the Policy Board on how countries address the comments and recommendations made by the Secretariat, the Independent Technical Reviewer, and the Policy Board during the process of reviewing the NPD.
- Funding for the National Programmes in Bolivia, DRC and Zambia was allocated by the Policy Board (\$14.7 million in total) as follows:
  - Bolivia: \$4.7 million
  - DRC: \$5.5 million
  - Zambia: \$4.5 million
- The funding and work plan for the Global Programme for an additional six months starting in June 2010 was approved (\$3.8 million in total). Some comments made by the Policy Board on the work plan will be addressed.

### **Other significant developments:**

- It was suggested that non-carbon monitoring be included in the design of National Programmes.
- In response to our request, the full “independent technical reviews” are now posted on the external website for Bolivia, DRC and Zambia (at the webpage given at the beginning of this report). The full technical reviews for other countries have not been posted to our knowledge.
- A clarification of the status of PNG’s initial programme was requested by the CSO Asia/Pacific civil society representative, Kenn Mondiai of the PNG Eco-forestry Forum. The response by the PNG representative was unclear and attempted to shift the blame to the FAO, which has not signed the grant agreement. The FAO made it clear that they were ready to sign but had been asked by the government of PNG to hold off on signing. Norway made a strong intervention as a result, asking the MDTF representative what the process for reallocation of funds was in the event that a country did not use them. A six

month time limit for signing grant agreements, which applies going forward from PB4, was decided later in the meeting. This apparently gives PNG another six months to have its grant signed.

### **Summary of the agenda:**

1. Update of developments since the last Policy Board meeting (29-30 October 2009)
2. Discussion of draft UN-REDD Programme strategy for 2010-15 (including the issue of coordination with other REDD initiatives)
3. Presentation from the Independent Advisory Group on Rights, Forests, and Climate Change
4. Review of NPDs from Bolivia, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Zambia
5. Review of 2010 work plan and budget for Global Programme

### **Participants:**

The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Vincent Seya Makonga Kasulu, Director of Sustainable Development, Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism, DRC, and Ms. Veerle Vandeweerd, Director, Environment and Energy Group, Bureau for Development Policy, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Eight new observer countries were accepted intersessionally prior to the meeting (Republic of Congo, Costa Rica, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, the Philippines, Solomon Islands and Sudan) and a number of other observers were present (Finland, Japan, Commission des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale (COMIFAC), Congo Basin Forest Fund (CBFF), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) Secretariat). The complete participants list is available on the UN-REDD website.

### **Meeting notes:**

#### **1. Opening**

Opening remarks were given by Mr. Achim Steiner, Executive Director of UNEP, in which he emphasized among other things the need to consider REDD+ in the context of development objectives, the importance of coordination between REDD initiatives, and the role of civil society in the process.

#### **2. Sharing information and progress**

This session consisted of a summary of developments in the UN-REDD Programme given by the Secretariat and an update on the Interim Progress Report for 2009 and the funding framework, including a demonstration of how disbursement of funds can be monitored on the website, which was given by the Multi-donor Trust Fund (MDTF). Eight new observer countries were welcomed (see the list under "participants" above) and the pledge of \$22 million by Spain was acknowledged. Funds have now been disbursed to DRC (for its quick start programme), Indonesia, Tanzania, and Vietnam. The presentations are available on the UN-REDD website.

**Norway** announced that it will contribute an additional ~\$30 million to UN-REDD for FY2010 and asked that the financial contributions of pilot countries and the UN agencies also be reported on.

The **FCPF** announced that the Participants Committee (PC) would be considering at its meeting the following week a note drafted by the FMT on options for partnering with other organizations to assist with the implementation of the readiness process.

### 3. Strategic Issues

#### **Presentation of draft UN-REDD Programme Strategy for 2010-15:**

The Secretariat presented an overview of the draft strategy, available on the website. After incorporating feedback from the PB, the intent is to finalize the strategy by the end of May. The strategy aims to increase the number of countries receiving “quick start” funding for developing national REDD strategies, with the goal of supporting 40 countries in this way while supporting a more limited number in achieving full readiness; to support the objectives of the UNFCCC and link REDD+ to national development strategies; and to increase coordination with the World Bank and other REDD initiatives. The three main aims of the readiness process are to establish institutional and technical infrastructure, design policies and build capacity to enable forest sector transformations, and develop systems for countries to receive performance-based payments and benefit from other investment flows. Proposed work areas include:

- MRV and Monitoring; National REDD-plus Governance Structures
- Engagement of Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities and Other Relevant Stakeholders
- Equitable Benefit Sharing; Contributing to Sector Transformation; Ecosystem Multiple Benefits

#### **Update on the “Paris-Oslo” process:**

The **Chair from DRC** gave a brief overview of what was discussed at the Paris meeting on March 12-13. The three objectives discussed at the meeting were early financing, efficient and coordinated delivery, and the creation of a ‘light’ secretariat. A steering committee open to interested countries includes Australia, Brazil, DRC, France, Norway and PNG. **Norway** described its aim of supporting rapid implementation of REDD that is in line with and ultimately subservient to the UNFCCC process, and an open and inclusive dialogue that includes Civil Society, IPs and multi-lateral organizations leading up to the Oslo meeting in late May.

#### **Discussion:**

**Norway** stressed that UN-REDD should further develop in areas where the agencies have strengths, such as governance, multiple benefits, and consultations. The UN-REDD Programme needs to be flexible enough to attract and coordinate with additional donors and partners, including the FCPF, while maintaining the integrity of the programme. **CSO Developed Countries** described the need to strengthen engagement and build capacity to help local civil society and IPs link into international processes, the importance of maintaining the highest standards during the process of coordinating REDD activities, and the need for full participation of civil society in the Paris-Oslo process. The **Secretariat** asked for feedback from the PB on how to select additional countries once more funding becomes available. **A number of countries** supported the idea of increasing coordination with the FCPF and other initiatives. **UNDP** expressed its

willingness to partner with FCPF on implementation if the PB approves this. The **FCPF** reiterated that this would first require approval by the Participants Committee.

#### 4. Presentation from the Independent Advisory Group on Rights, Forests and Climate Change

The presentation, available on the UN-REDD website provided above, described how the objectives of different stakeholders in the REDD process (developing countries, developed countries, IPs and local communities, civil society, and the private sector) were all served by good governance and minimum standards and safeguards that can be clearly defined and monitored.

In the discussion that followed, which was cut off prematurely by the Chair from DRC, the **Philippines** felt that progress should be benchmarked and the results published and assessed to allow for learning from the process; **Norway** reiterated that the Paris-Oslo process would be subsumed by the UNFCCC and involve representation by civil society and IPs; **CSO Developed Countries** stressed the importance of engaging the enforcement community, the **FCPF** defended the SESA against accusations that it had no teeth, and **UNDP** defended the UN-REDD operational guidelines for engagement with IPs as having been operationalised.

#### 5. Review of NPDs

The Chair and countries on the Policy Board seemed to have already decided that the NPDs would be approved before the discussions began. The donor countries and UN agencies were, however, responsive to concerns raised by civil society Board members, showing the importance of civil society having a voting position on the PB. Many of the comments from civil society were included in the signed NPD Submission Forms and will need to be addressed either prior to grant signing or during the readiness process, although this process remains poorly defined.

The descriptions below are not meant to be comprehensive representations of the discussions, but instead to summarise some of the interventions that may be of particular interest to civil society.

##### **Bolivia**

It was noted in Bolivia's presentation (available in Spanish on the UN-REDD website) that the preparation of an R-PP is in the advanced stages and is expected to be submitted this year. A civil society validation meeting was held in January and minutes from the meeting are included in the documentation for PB4, although they do not contain a detailed set of recommendations from civil society participants as does the minutes from the Zambia validation meeting (see below). Some key points from the discussion:

- The **Secretariat** felt that there needed to be more description about how other stakeholders such as municipal and local governments will be involved and clarification on how UN-REDD funds would be used in incremental financing of larger projects and the role of civil society in independent MRV, while emphasising that not all issues need to be addressed prior to grant signing.
- **CSO Developed Countries** referenced its analysis of enforcement and non-carbon monitoring elements in the proposals and pointed out that NPDs do not include a non-carbon monitoring component as the R-PPs do. The analysis

found that measures to address illegality and non-carbon monitoring are not clear in Bolivia's proposal. How the monitoring system feeds back into design of the REDD strategy and the role of civil society need to be further elaborated.

- **Republic of Congo** recommended that the Programme assist countries from an early stage in drafting their documents to ensure they are headed in the right direction. A number of REDD countries echoed this request and asked for more assistance in preparing their readiness strategies and addressing issues being raised.
- **UNDP** pointed out that Bolivia is the first country where the agencies are pooling funds, with the exception of some technical work by the FAO, in an effort to reduce transaction costs, and assured that the agencies would help countries incorporate comments to ensure NPDs are of a high quality before being finalized.
- **Denmark** supported the earlier intervention from Republic of Congo about the need for more assistance in formulating proposals, and wanted a plan for how recommendations would be followed up and benchmarks established. Given the lack of experience in non-carbon monitoring, Denmark advocated the development of draft TOR or guidance on how to do it. Countries should identify the technical assistance they need and it should be provided by the Programme. Denmark also emphasised the need for genuine independence in the reviews that will ensure that stakeholders are able to provide input.
- **Norway** made general comments that it stated were valid for all three proposed programmes. All three documents could and should be improved in follow-up, particularly with respect to governance, and particularly addressing law enforcement and anti-corruption measures. All three documents could have been strengthened by going beyond the forest sector. Given the experience of the UN agencies with governance issues, they are expected to provide support to countries on these issues. Consideration of gender issues and links with national development objectives could be improved. Norway noted that many of the remarks and concerns expressed by Global Witness are valid and important and requested that the draft assessment of NPDs and R-PPs prepared by Global Witness be included as an annex to the output of the meeting (note that it was instead referenced in the meeting report and posted on the UN-REDD website).
- **CSO Africa** asked for clarification on what indicators would be used to assess the involvement of civil society and IPs (this question was not answered by Bolivia but came up again during discussion of the Zambia NPD and was included in the comments).
- **CSO LAC** explained that they had had insufficient advance notice about developments in Bolivia and had not been able to follow up with civil society in Bolivia prior to the meeting. One civil society member who had signed off at the validation meeting said he was not sure what he had signed. CSO LAC recommended less use of foreign consultants and more involvement of local civil society to increase ownership and capacity. The Secretariat needs to help coordinate between civil society members of the Policy Board and organizations in-country.
- **Norway** asked that a draft decision of the results of the discussion be tabled for approval. The **Secretariat** said they have not done this in the past but would add points (comments) to the Submission Form based on the discussion and report back on how they are addressed before signing of the grant. **Norway** asked for the development of an action plan describing how the comments would be

addressed and the Secretariat offered to support the development of the plan during NPD revision.

## **Zambia**

The validation meeting was held in February and the output was an organized set of recommendations that the government claims it will address. A legislative and policy review was recently completed as was an integrated land-use assessment (ILUA), both of which will inform the design of the REDD strategy. Some key points from the discussion:

- The **Secretariat** pointed out that Zambia is not a member of the FCPF so there has been no harmonization process. There needs to be more clarity on level of government involvement and the roles of various actors at different stages in the process. The risk management section should be strengthened.
- **IP Africa** pointed out that IPs are not mentioned but was encouraged by the effort put into the consultation process. **Zambia** later responded that the government is pushing a “One Zambia” policy of not designating any of its 72 ethnic groups as “indigenous” but local communities are being consulted.
- **CSO Developed Countries** welcomed the references to enforcement and addressing illegality, including in timber concessions, but noted the marked omission of consideration of the role of the Lusaka Agreement on cooperative law enforcement, particularly considering Zambia is a party and founding country. The absence of non-carbon monitoring highlights the need for guidance (or draft terms of reference) on this issue, as suggested by Denmark. The absence of detail on carbon monitoring, or the role of civil society, or provision for independent monitoring was noted. The reference to Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative in relation to benefit sharing was welcomed, although it is mistakenly attributed to the World Bank.
- **Norway** appreciated the inclusion of gender issues and strong stakeholder consultation process, but asked that the guidance provided in the validation meeting be taken into account before the grant is signed. Regulatory and legal issues will need to be addressed, including designing a benefit sharing provision. Tanzania and Zambia could share experience. The REDD process should support coordination rather than create a parallel process. The land-use assessment, for example, was funded by a UN agency and other donors and should be linked to the present initiative.
- **Zambia** responded that it was planning to address issues raised in the validation meeting, that the role of civil society in the monitoring program would be addressed, that improving coordination and policy frameworks would be key, and that they would address the omission of the Lusaka Agreement.

## **Democratic Republic of Congo**

The DRC submitted its Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) to the Policy Board for consideration, although the contents were used to create a short summary NPD, which was also submitted. Note that the same R-PP was submitted to and approved by the FCPF Participants Committee the following week. The presentation, in French, followed closely the content of the R-PP. The country intends to have a draft REDD strategy in June of this year that describes in more detail the proposals for national monitoring and pilot projects. The R-PP was generally well-received, although Norway thought it may be unrealistic in its ambition and civil society felt that stronger measures to address law

enforcement were needed and that civil society and IPs should play a greater role in monitoring and MRV. Some key points from the discussion:

- The **Secretariat** thought the DRC proposal showed strong government ownership and evidence of participation by civil society, but thought civil society should play a greater role in MRV.
- **CSO Developed Countries** pointed out that the recent cancellation of the majority of logging concessions for lack of legal compliance exemplifies the extent of governance challenges in DRC, and that while the proposal acknowledges the issues of corruption and illegality, it needs to go further in addressing these issues at the national and international level, in particular by joining and ratifying the Lusaka Agreement on cooperative enforcement operations to tackle illegal cross-border trade, not merely to include it as a policy option.
- **CSO Africa** stressed the need to involve civil society and IPs in monitoring. In an earlier intervention, CSO Africa pointed out that there was strong opposition within civil society in DRC to expanding logging concessions as proposed in one of the strategic options of the DRC proposal.
- **UNDP** pointed to support by UN agencies for post-conflict governance building and the \$390 million programme on governance running through to 2012, , requesting that stronger links be made between this programme and the REDD strategy. They welcomed the assessment by Global Witness and noted that they are working with Chatham House on draft guidance that could assist the development of systems for monitoring of governance.
- **Norway** commended the ambition of the plan while questioning whether some of the targets could be reached in the proposed timeframe, and recommended including in the work-plan how activities would be prioritized in the event that there is insufficient funding or time to complete all the proposed activities. Norway also requested that more attention be given in the R-PP to how traditional land rights will be considered and how work will be coordinated with the World Bank's PNFoCo programme and the activities of COMIFAC.
- **Indonesia** stated that civil society should only be engaged where they have skills to contribute and this would be in a country specific way according to national policies.

#### **Additional general discussion regarding NPDs:**

A discussion ensued about how long countries should have to incorporate comments and how this would be reported on. Many parties felt that countries should not have to do anything too costly or time-consuming prior to the signing of the grant. It was decided that countries should have up to six months to address specific comments that need to be incorporated into their proposal prior to signing of the grant agreement, but that more significant issues should be addressed through the formulation of an action plan. The plan would be required for the grant to be signed but would be implemented during the readiness process. It was not clarified during this discussion how it would be decided which comments could be part of the action plan and which need to be addressed before the grant agreement is signed. The Secretariat drafted a set of comments based on the PB discussion and incorporated them into the Submission Forms for each country prior to their signing by the chairs. While these comments do reflect the main issues raised by the PB, some of them are not clear as to what specific action they are requiring. Further, it is not clear which of them should be addressed in the action plan and which prior to

signing of grant agreements. The PB comments on each NPD as they appear in the final UN-REDD report from PB4 are included in Annex 1.

We compared the comments included by the Secretariat in the signed Submission Forms with what was discussed by the Policy Board and found that while they include the key requests made by members of the Policy Board they are sometimes vaguely-worded. This may lead to confusion as countries try to address them and the Secretariat and Policy Board attempt to evaluate progress.

## 6. Presentation of Global Programme budget and work plan for second half of 2010

A presentation by the **Secretariat** outlined the proposed budget for a six month period starting in July of 2010. The request is for \$3.8 million in total, with 1 million each for MRV and engagement with civil society and IPs, and \$1.8 million to run the Secretariat. In addition to carbon MRV, monitoring of co-benefits and safeguards will be part of the programme. On stakeholder engagement, proposed activities include finalizing the Operational Guidelines on engagement with civil society and IPs, supporting the participation of CSO/IPs in Policy Board and in the National Programmes, and better coordination amongst civil society actors, and the implementation of a recourse mechanism. More detail was given in presentations by the **FAO** on MRV and monitoring and by **UNDP** on engagement of civil society and IPs. Both presentations emphasized the need to consider how safeguards as they are currently stated in the UNFCCC and REDD negotiating text will be operationalised. The MRV presentation included reference to independent monitoring at the country level in addition to some kind of national level monitoring of governance. The main objectives for engagement of CSO/IPs include supporting implementation and assessment of engagement, better coordination and communication between stakeholders, and capacity building at the national and international level.

### Discussion:

- **Norway** requested a more detailed work plan for the coming year and suggested that governance should be a major area of support and that additional funding for this could be approved intersessionally if necessary. The planned evaluation of the Programme is important – the Norwegian Climate and Forest Initiative and the FCPF are doing the same – but review should be efficient.
- **Denmark** supported use of funds to include IPs in monitoring and would like to see a results-based reporting system for the Global Programme.
- The **UNFCCC** pointed out that the IPCC Good Practice Guide does not have a section on remote sensing but this was in the works and could result in a technical sourcebook of some kind. Developing countries need to tell donors what they need assistance with.
- **Argentina** encouraged support for south-south cooperation on MRV by the Programme, and stressed the need to be clear about how traditional knowledge is defined.
- **CSO Asia** expressed the need for more support in communications with CSO/IPs at the national level to allow for better representation at the international level.

## **Annex 1. Comments from the Policy Board to be addressed by country programmes from Bolivia, DRC, and Zambia.**

### **Comments on the Bolivia NPD as noted in the final UN-REDD report from PB4:**

- Further clarification of engaging IPs and CSOs in the National Programme
- Additional consideration of law enforcement and anti-corruption measures, and involving CSOs in carbon monitoring as well as making sure that the monitoring system will feedback into the REDD+ system
- Highlighting the fact that the development of the programme document is just one part of a larger process

### **Comments on the DRC NPD as noted in the final UN-REDD report from PB4:**

- Stronger implementation links with the UN agencies' Governance programmes in DRC
- Stronger measures to improve law enforcement and address illegal cross-border trade, such as by joining the Lusaka Agreement on Co-Operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora
- Request from the Civil Society and IP representatives from DRC and Africa that the MRV system in DRC's Readiness Plan be participatory, both in its design and functioning
- Ensuring that monitoring of non-carbon benefits and impacts is appropriately included during the implementation phase
- Clarification of the means to address governance issues
- Clarification of the priority actions in the work plan that will be implemented with initially available funds, pending the mobilization of additional resources to fund the full costs of DRC's National Readiness Plan
- Clarification on how traditional land rights will be addressed during the implementation of the National Readiness Plan
- Coordination with initiatives in the Congo Basin including those of COMIFAC

### **Comments on the Zambia NPD as noted in the final UN-REDD report from PB4:**

- Clarification of the complementarities with existing institutions and projects that collect and use land-use data
- Coordination with the ILUA (Integrated Land Use Assessment) project and other on-going initiatives
- Clarification concerning Zambia's approach to monitoring of non-Carbon benefits and impacts
- Clarification of how Indigenous Peoples will be engaged and the modalities for including FPIC in the process
- Addressing better the issues of governance, including law enforcement and anti-corruption measures
- Stronger measures to improve law enforcement and address illegal cross-border trade, including through strengthening the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement on Co-Operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora to which Zambia is a party.
- Inclusion of indicators for civil society engagement in implementation of the National Programme
- Linkages with national programmes and the NAMAs
- Incorporation of the recommendations of the last validation meeting