

CIF LEARNING

FIP: REDD+ Stakeholder Collaboration



Acknowledgements

We take this opportunity to express our gratitude to all colleagues involved in this learning product. Special thanks goes to Professor Hosny El-Lakany, University of British Columbia, Canada who travelled to four countries and gathered information and views from various stakeholder groups on how the Forest Investment Program has contributed to an enhanced collaboration of partners at the country level.

Special thanks to the Governments of Burkina Faso (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development), Democratic Republic of Congo (Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism; Coordination National REDD), Indonesia (Ministry of Forestry), and Peru (Ministry of Environment), and the headquarter and country office staff of the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank Group, whose assistance was invaluable to the successful planning and execution of the four country visits. Thanks also to the many stakeholders from civil society, private sector, and international development organizations, including UN-REDD Programme, FCPF, and GEF, who shared their time and experiences with the team, contributing to a rich and productive dialogue on collaboration.

We also would like to express gratitude to Ms. Pamela Stedman who edited this report.

CIF Administrative Unit

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
FINDINGS	13
Lessons Learned: FIP Participants	13
Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs)	17
Other REDD+ Initiatives, Partners, and Research Institutions	18
Indigenous Peoples Groups	20
Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)	22
The Private Sector	24
Lessons Learned: FIP Process	27
Capacity Building	29
Transformational Change	30
MOVING FORWARD	33



Executive Summary

The CIF Administrative Unit commissioned this Learning Product to record experiences and lessons learned regarding the role of the FIP in fostering collaboration among REDD+ actors at the country level during the programming process. These lessons are intended to inform the ongoing work of the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), particularly the implementation process for FIP investments, and to enhance the FIP's potential to build and support meaningful REDD+ partnerships at the country level. Lessons learned were developed on the basis of questionnaires and visits to four of the eight FIP pilot countries, as well as interviews with the MDBs, the CIF Administrative Unit, and other REDD+ agencies.

The FIP is distinguished from other REDD+ mechanisms by its focus on achieving transformational change of forest-related policies and practices in developing countries by building partnerships with public and private sector entities. With this responsibility for building partnerships, the FIP plays a key role in catalyzing collaboration among the REDD+ initiatives and in promoting consultation and cooperation on REDD+ initiatives and transformational change.

Multi-stakeholder consultative processes are essential to legitimizing complex initiatives such as REDD+. However, by definition, multi-stakeholder partnerships assemble a diverse array of societal interests, experiences and perspectives that may make consultation and collaboration difficult. For the FIP to succeed, governments and stakeholders must work together to develop a common vision for sustainable forest management, to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and to define roles within that process. The consultation and collaboration this requires should be considered not as a constraint on the FIP but as a positive outcome of the process.

To strengthen ownership and partnerships at national and local levels, FIP investment plans are being developed through a consultation process involving national, state, and local authorities, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples organizations, the private sector, and other development partners. The FIP Operational Guidelines set out the basic process for consultations, and the FIP funds a Dedicated Grant Mechanism to sup-

port the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the development of FIP investment plans, programs and projects.

This review found that the FIP has initiated a strong process of consultation and partnership building in the four countries. Extensive and inclusive consultative meetings have been held in all the countries, involving government agencies, other REDD+ initiatives, indigenous peoples groups, local communities and the private sector. Interviews confirmed that careful preparation of the consultation process—from informing participants to establishing clear mechanisms for participation and well-defined objectives, as well as providing sufficient time and resources—are all essential for success.

There are positive signs of collaboration amongst, and inclusion of, a wide variety of stakeholders at the national level, inter-ministerial collaboration is working well. Despite the multitude of REDD+ and other climate and environment initiatives, collaboration between governments and REDD+ stakeholders is also proceeding well. The MDBs are shifting to a new model of partnership that facilitates collaboration. National REDD+ processes have been inclusive of indigenous and traditional peoples groups; civil society organizations (CSOs) have been active participants; and some private sector actors have expressed strong interest. In sum, the FIP has made a substantial contribution to fostering the participatory process in support of national REDD+ efforts.

While the initial experiences were largely positive, collaboration could be improved by addressing a number of common problems through strategies to strengthen and expand meaningful participation. The following lessons summarize how FIP partners can enhance implementation through collaboration and consultation processes:

- Strong national **leadership** for coordinating REDD+ is essential for managing REDD+ relevant funding streams, fostering partnerships, and achieving successful outcomes.
- Improved **information dissemination** regarding REDD+ and FIP through the consultation processes and support for **capacity-building** related to the FIP for all stakeholders, including MDB staff in the field, government officials, CSOs, indigenous peoples groups and the private sector, is essential to ensure that stakeholders and administrators understand the goals and mechanisms of the FIP and to address common misconceptions.

- Clearly defined and relatively **simple governance mechanisms** for the consultation process, tailored to local conditions, promote participation and allow for an effective and efficient process. Transparent mechanisms or platforms for participation and clearly assigned roles and obligations for all stakeholders—government ministries, MDBs, CSOs, indigenous peoples and local communities, and the private sector—reduce friction and facilitate smoother consultation processes, which will ensure a clearer focus on the development of FIP strategies investment plans and projects. Existing multi-stakeholder forums can be utilized or strengthened to support this collaboration.
- Collaboration and consultation among REDD+ stakeholders can **avoid overlap and gaps** in REDD+ coverage, so that the multiplicity of REDD+ and other climate initiatives does not become burdensome for participants, and can insure that research supports policy and project design.
- Significant **time and financial resources** are required for consultations that will successfully inform the REDD+ programming process. FIP partners, particularly indigenous peoples groups and civil society groups not only need to exhibit willingness for active and sincere participation but also to devote time and human resources.
- Productive relations between governments and indigenous peoples groups can be greatly enhanced through **information and knowledge sharing**. REDD+ investments, including those supported by FIP, need to address livelihood issues and involve stakeholders in a dialogue that is respectful of, and integrates, both the traditional knowledge and concerns of indigenous peoples groups and local communities.
- Private sector entities are eager to participate but the lengthy FIP process is not well matched with **private sector modalities**. Analyzing and addressing the needs of the private sector in each country could lead to better incentives for the active participation of the private sector in REDD+.
- Transformational change is **country-specific** and needs to be discussed and agreed on by REDD+ stakeholders during the FIP programming phase and monitored throughout the implementation of projects and programs agreed in endorsed investment plans.



Introduction

This Learning Product presents early lessons learned about REDD+ collaboration and consultations, drawn from countries piloting the Forest Investment Program (FIP). These lessons are intended to inform the ongoing work of the Climate Investment Funds (CIF), and in particular to enhance the FIP implementation strategy, as well as to provide insights for REDD+ and the larger debate on global climate finance.

This first section briefly reviews FIP goals and processes, highlighting the crucial role of collaboration and consultation, and describes the methodology used for this report. The second section, based on interviews conducted with stakeholders in the FIP program, discusses the experiences of participants in the consultation process and some broader lessons about the challenges to effective collaboration through the FIP.

REDD+¹ has gained momentum, backed by substantial pledges and allocation of funds, and REDD+ efforts have been initiated in many countries under a plethora of institutions, programs, and projects. REDD+ initiatives aim to reduce CO₂ emissions by creating incentives for forest conservation, sustainable forest management, expansion of carbon stocks, and low-carbon paths to sustainable development. Like many projects in forest lands, REDD+ initiatives are being implemented in challenging environments, often marked by extreme poverty, weak governance, deficient infrastructure and social conflict. Moreover, REDD+ is not yet fully institutionalized in national and international policy; negotiations are still ongoing at UNFCCC CoPs and other inter-governmental and stakeholder forums.

The Climate Investment Funds are designed to support low-carbon and climate resilient development in developing countries through scaled-up financing channeled through five multilateral development banks (African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank Group). The Forest Investment Program is one of three programs within the CIF's Strategic Climate Fund. The FIP provides up-front bridge financing to developing countries for readiness reforms and

¹ REDD+ is "Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries".

public and private investments identified through national REDD+ readiness or equivalent strategies. It takes into account opportunities to adapt to the impacts of climate change on forest ecosystems and to contribute to multiple benefits such as biodiversity conservation, protection of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, poverty reduction and rural livelihood enhancements.

The FIP supports a programmatic approach which allows countries to define and implement a strategic vision for interventions that reduce pressure on forest ecosystems and improve forest management. Projects and programs supported under a FIP investment plan will 1) initiate and facilitate steps toward transformational change in forest-related policies and practices; 2) pilot replicable models for REDD+ such as sustainable forest management, forest landscape management, or the introduction of alternative energy sources; 3) facilitate the leveraging of additional financial resources for REDD+, to promote scaling-up; and 4) provide experience and feedback in the context of the UNFCCC deliberations on REDD+.

FIP resources are complementary to other REDD+ financing mechanisms, including the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), UN-REDD Programme and GEF Sustainable Forest Management/REDD+ program. FIP financing is channeled through the MDBs as grants or concessional credit, loans and guarantees to catalyze national REDD+ interventions and to leverage additional resources from various partners, including from the private sector.

The FIP is distinguished from other REDD+ initiatives by its focus on transformational change of forest-related policies and practices in developing countries. REDD+ implementation is designed with three phases: Readiness, Implementation and Performance Payments. While there will necessarily be some overlap in these phases, responsibilities have been assigned to the main REDD+ initiatives². The FIP bears responsibility for investments in scaling-up activities to initiate transformational changes in the forest sector, and sectors affecting forest ecosystems, by building partnerships with public and private sector entities. With this responsibility for building partnerships, the FIP plays a central role in catalyzing collaboration among the REDD+ initiatives.

² The FCPF takes responsibility for building readiness and testing performance-based payments, and UN-REDD for building capacity for participatory and coordinated REDD+ strategies, as well as technical issues of REDD+ readiness (MRV, multiple benefits).

To date, the FIP operates in eight pilot countries (Brazil, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Mexico and Peru). To strengthen ownership and partnerships at national and local levels, FIP investment plans are being developed through a consultation process involving national, state, and local authorities, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples groups, the private sector, and other development partners. At the time this study was conducted, four countries had finalized the country programming process and had an endorsed investment plan. These countries are now preparing and implementing the agreed projects and programs with the support of the MDBs. The consultation and collaboration process is the focus of this report.

Consultation and Collaboration

Coordinated, collaborative multi-stakeholder involvement is central to finding a common base for addressing the challenges of climate change adaptation and mitigation. Multi-stakeholder involvement is believed to be instrumental in fostering transformational changes in society through building trust, enhancing mutual understanding of substance, sharing of interests, and enhancing program legitimacy.

Multi-stakeholder consultative processes are deemed essential to legitimizing complex initiatives such as REDD+. However, consultation is interpreted in various ways: it can range from simple provision of information, to obtaining prior consent for initiatives, to promoting collaboration and partnership. For REDD+ purposes, consultation is defined as, *“The meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing, and considering carefully the views of others, in a manner that is cognizant of all parties’ values, and, where feasible, seeking agreement. Consultation processes refer to mechanisms set in place with this specific purpose, which purposefully includes an extensive array of stakeholders”*³.

Under REDD+ initiatives, REDD+ partners endeavor to reach agreement primarily through discussions and consultations in the preparatory phases of REDD+ activities, often with roundtables serving as multi-stakeholder forums, bolstered by smaller meetings and telephone and electronic communication. Roundtables have been successful in increasing the par-

³ Brockhaus, M., Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S. and Di Gregorio, M. (2012). Global Comparative Study on REDD+ (GCS-REDD+), Component 1 on National REDD+ Policies and Processes. Guide for Country Profiles. CIFOR. Under preparation.

ticipation of civil society⁴, which should increase the perceived legitimacy of REDD+ initiatives and the likelihood of successful implementation. According to one study, *“REDD+ success depends on its legitimacy, which will, in turn, depend on its ability to gain broad support and engagement from indigenous groups, civil society, local governments and other stakeholders”*⁵.

By definition, multi-stakeholder partnerships assemble a diverse array of societal interests, experiences and perspectives that may make consultation and collaboration difficult. Large differences in interests or opinion may lead to friction or conflict. More powerful or experienced stakeholders may dominate decision-making processes. For example, a study of REDD+ process in one country found that consultations fell short of expectations in terms of including weak and disadvantaged groups⁶.

Consultations serve to flesh out opportunities for coordination and collaboration among stakeholders, but the process of consultation itself requires a coordinated and collaborative effort. Previous studies have found that careful preparation of the consultation process—from informing participants to establishing clear mechanisms for participation and well-defined objectives, as well as providing sufficient time and resources—are all essential for success. Efforts to anticipate the process by holding extensive consultations before proper preparation can be carried out do not improve the debate or enhance collaboration. Without a clearly defined international REDD+ mechanism or national implementation measures already in place, consultations tend to revolve around broad political issues, such as land tenure systems and recognition of indigenous rights, rather than specific REDD+ actions⁷. Likewise, efforts to accelerate the consultation process can be detrimental. Even for informed stakeholders, REDD+ is not easy to understand given its administrative and scientific complexities⁸.

4 Eisinger, F. (2012). REDD+ In Peru – Participation and Roundtables from a Legitimacy Perspective, Schriftliche Arbeit zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades Diplom-Politologe Eingereicht am Freie Universität Berlin Fachbereich für Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften 10.

5 Larson, A. M. and Petkova, E. (2011). An Introduction to Forest Governance, People and REDD+ in Latin America: Obstacles and Opportunities. In *Forests* 2 (1): 86–111.

6 Che Píu, H. and García, T. (2011). Estudio REDD+ Perú. La Situación de REDD+ en el Perú. Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales—DAR. Lima, Peru.

7 Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Kanninen, M., Sills, E., Sunderlin, W.D., and Wertz-Kanounnikoff, S., eds (2009). Realising REDD+: National Strategy and Policy Options. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.

8 UN-REDD Programme Indonesia (undated). Multi Stakeholders Approach for Developing Indonesia's First REDD+ Strategy, Lessons Learned from Consultation Process. www.un-REDD+.org.id

Substantial time is needed for information-sharing and reflection; early deadlines may force poorly informed decisions. While there has been some criticism of multi-stakeholder consultations in terms of both inclusiveness and effectiveness, and lengthy consultation processes may slow down implementation, most stakeholders find them more valuable than simple information-dissemination activities.

FOREST INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The Forest Investment Program aims to strengthen ownership at national and local levels and to promote strong partnerships as a means to supporting transformational change of forest-related policies and practices. Countries will need to invest in transformational change as a continuous process and must organize, manage and evaluate their investment plans periodically, with a view to changing circumstances. National ownership of the REDD+ process is critical to transformation and scaling up. Stakeholders at all levels need to have a common understanding of “where we are” before making decisions about “where we can go” or “how to get there.”

FIP stakeholder meetings, workshops and assessments are considered an essential part of the FIP process. These consultations are necessary to develop a shared vision for addressing the challenges related to REDD+ at the country level. The consultation, collaboration and partnership this requires should be considered not as a constraint on the FIP but as a positive outcome of the process.

The FIP Operational Guidelines set out the basic process for consultations. A joint mission of the MDB and the government will initiate the process of developing the FIP investment plan. This joint mission is expected to hold consultative workshops that will include key government agencies, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples groups and local communities, private sector stakeholders, and other development partners, such as the FCPF, UN-REDD Programme and bilateral development institutions, as relevant.

Governments are responsible for establishing, or building up, a multi-stakeholder steering committee at the national level which should play a key role in program planning, coordination, monitoring and evaluation. The committee is expected to include representatives of provincial, state, and local authorities, indigenous peoples and local communities, the

private sector and other members of civil society. This collaborative body will strengthen country ownership of the investment program and identify activities that other development partners can contribute, mobilize co-financing for FIP programs and projects, ensure harmonized policy support, and promote complementarity with the other activities of government and development partners. Drafts of the investment plan are also to be made publicly available for the purposes of consultation.

To support the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the development of FIP investment plans, programs and projects, the FIP has established a Dedicated Grant Mechanism. Grants provided through this mechanism will support 1) capacity-building for indigenous peoples groups and local communities to play an informed role in the REDD+ and FIP processes; 2) tenure rights, forest stewardship roles and traditional forest management systems; 3) participation in the development of FIP programs and projects; and 4) implementation of FIP projects. Development of the Dedicated Grant Mechanism has been carried out through a consultative process with stakeholders in the FIP countries; the mechanism is not yet in effect. The FCPF provides similar funding on a smaller scale.

METHODOLOGY

The CIF Administrative Unit commissioned this Learning Product to record experiences and lessons learned regarding the role of the FIP in fostering collaboration among REDD+ actors at the country level during the consultative programming process. These lessons are meant to inform the implementation process for FIP investments and help develop the FIP's potential to build and support meaningful REDD+ partnerships at the country level.

Four of the eight FIP pilot countries were selected for this study: Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Indonesia and Peru. These countries were chosen based on the assumption that their different geopolitical, socio-economic and ecological characteristics, as well as their diverse technical and administrative capacities, would enrich the lessons learned and render them of global value. While this diversity did provide a wide range of experiences, in some instances the variety of country-specific circumstances also made it difficult to draw general conclusions valid across all the countries.

Lessons learned were developed on the basis of visits to the four countries as well as questionnaires and interviews with the MDBs, the CIF Administrative Unit, and other REDD+ stakeholders including the FCPF, UN-REDD Programme and GEF. Interviews were conducted with a broad group of stakeholders in the four countries, focusing on:

- Practices, incentives and steps taken to promote coordination among REDD+ stakeholders in the pilot country during the development of the FIP investment plan.
- Successes and failures in establishing a coordinated and programmatic approach to REDD+ at the country level, including the implementation of the FIP investment plan.
- Challenges and opportunities for advancing REDD+ and FIP objectives through consultation and collaboration.

This document should be read in conjunction with other relevant FIP documents and be seen as a snapshot capturing the lessons to date on collaboration and consultation in the four FIP pilot countries. The FIP process is moving fast and new challenges and opportunities arise almost daily—hence new lessons will soon be available which will complement and enrich the ones presented in this document.



Findings

Each of the four countries included in this study—Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Indonesia and Peru—initiated activities shortly after they were selected as pilots under the FIP. All four are currently at different stages in the programming process. DRC is the only country which has an endorsed FIP investment plan and is now in the process of developing the agreed projects and programs. Burkina Faso and Indonesia have just finalized their country programming processes and submitted their investment plans for review and endorsement by the governing body of the FIP. Peru is still in the programming process and has expressed need for additional consultations among REDD+ stakeholders with a view to reaching consensus on which REDD+ priorities should be supported by the FIP.

In the process of developing the FIP investment plan each country has carried out meetings and consultations across government agencies, as well as with representatives of other REDD+ initiatives, indigenous peoples groups and local communities, civil society groups, and private sector entities. Interviews conducted for this Learning Product addressed these different stakeholders' perspectives on the successes and challenges of collaboration. The following discussion of the lessons learned is divided in two sections: 1) lessons articulated by each stakeholder group, and 2) FIP process issues relevant to consultation and collaboration.

LESSONS LEARNED: FIP PARTICIPANTS

GOVERNMENTS

The governments of the four pilot countries are all strongly committed to REDD+ and the FIP. During the FIP programming phase some governments established a National REDD+ Committee (or similar arrangements) as an inclusive platform to engage all stakeholders in the FIP programming process. Some designated a National FIP Coordinator early in the process and appointed technical staff involved in REDD+ initiatives already operating in the country as members of, or advisors to, the National REDD+ Committee.

While national committees are primarily serving efforts to develop national REDD+ strategies, the FIP investment planning process in most countries has been driven by a smaller subset of inter-ministerial collaborators and

focal points. Responsibility for FIP-related issues is spread across several ministries in the pilot countries. Each of the four study countries has put in place an inter-ministerial body, most commonly consisting of the Ministries of Environment, Forestry, Agriculture and Finance, with decision-making and coordination responsibilities for their FIP investment plans. These inter-ministerial committees can play a vital role in promoting collaboration, since the ministries may have competing mandates that reduce the incentive for cooperation. Responsibility for forestry-related issues is often split between Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry for administrative reasons. Ministries of Environment are expected to play a central role in driving the FIP process; however, these ministries are usually new and, as a result, may have limited capacity and political power. In addition, because REDD+ and the FIP involve substantial international funding, Ministries of Finance are also involved in the process. However, their role in REDD+ is often poorly defined.

The effectiveness of any national coordination mechanism for REDD+ is a function of good management and continuous commitments by the government, especially at high levels. The FIP inter-ministerial committees have generally been successful in overcoming institutional difficulties stemming from overlapping authorities over forest and land resources. However, some ministries still need to reach a common vision for REDD+ and better define and understand their involvement and contribution to the implementation of FIP and other REDD+ initiatives.

Strong cross-sectoral and cross-level coordination within governments will be essential for successful REDD+ implementation. The greatest challenges for meaningful inter-ministerial collaboration on FIP and REDD+ more generally often stem from poor flow of information between the relevant ministries. In some countries, sectoral silos still prevail. The sector-based approach needs to be replaced by mechanisms which promote integration and collaboration among relevant government agencies. Allocation of funding among ministries can also be a difficult issue. Moreover, while these arrangements appear to be working at the national level they are only weakly connected to provincial or sub-national levels.

Intra-ministerial communication is equally important. In many instances, communication from top to bottom in these institutions was deemed to be weak, with the result that field staff were poorly informed about the FIP and REDD+ more generally. Some government agencies have

expressed frustration with the large number of new climate initiatives and the complexities introduced through REDD+ mechanisms, compounded by national rules, which may overwhelm their capacity.

Success of REDD+ will depend on coordination of the many national and local initiatives affecting forestry and climate mitigation through a national development strategy. In addition to REDD+ activities, policies and programs for economic sectors dealing with natural resources such as agriculture, environment (e.g. conservation of biodiversity), water and energy need to become part of that common vision. Notably, the Ministries of Energy, Mining and Transport are not included in any of the FIP inter-ministerial committees, despite the potential impact of these sectors on REDD+ activities.

Success will also depend on a shared vision of the FIP's potential transformative impacts. Some government agencies do not have sufficient capacity, or have not received sufficient information, to understand the new dimensions of REDD+, and view FIP as yet another forest program to be implemented using already existing approaches and procedures ("business-as-usual"). Other ministries, however, recognize that early involvement of all relevant sector ministries in the FIP programming process allows for a better understanding, and ultimately ownership, of the decisions regarding prioritization of REDD+ activities and allocation of FIP resources.

Lessons:

- Managing the REDD+ process at the country level, including the FIP programming process, needs a special modality for intergovernmental collaboration and coordination due to the multi-sectoral nature of REDD+ and the need to integrate strategies to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.
- Setting up an inter-ministerial coordination mechanism may seem costly at first but long-term benefits include greater efficiency in managing REDD+ funding flows and investments at the country level, transparent information sharing with other REDD+ stakeholders, and joint ownership of progress and sustainable outcomes.
- Intra-ministerial information-sharing and consultation and inter-ministerial cooperation at the working level are as important as inter-ministerial collaboration at the top levels. Good mechanisms for communication

across levels within ministries and between ministries at the working level will facilitate FIP and REDD+ implementation.

- National REDD+ strategies and funding initiatives need to be incorporated as an integral component of national development strategies for all relevant economic sectors. FIP, in particular, should be integral to these strategies because of its transformative objective.
- Information and knowledge sharing on REDD+ activities must go beyond the key ministries to include other relevant ministries and agencies in order to develop viable national strategies.

Collaboration in FIP implementation between governments and REDD+ initiatives

In each of the pilot countries a variety of REDD+ initiatives are underway with multilateral and bilateral support. These initiatives should be part of the national strategy; coordination efforts should prevent overlap or conflict. Considering the multitude of REDD+ players, collaboration between governments and REDD+ stakeholders is generally functioning well. Collaboration revolves mainly around participation in consultation meetings, joint missions and occasional coordination meetings.

Despite the evident goodwill among partners towards collaboration beyond preparatory stages of FIP, it is necessary to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all REDD+ initiatives and their implementing agencies, not only during the FIP programming process but also once the implementation of FIP investments begins. Often, the multiplicity of agencies or departments within the government that are in charge of different aspects of REDD+ and forestry is confusing for national and international partners. One study country has established a national REDD+ coordination office that manages FIP, FCPF, UN-REDD+ and other funding streams, which helps reduce confusion and overlap. In some countries, the staff assigned to REDD+ initiatives is housed in the same government premises, facilitating active collaboration, while in other countries they are scattered over several offices, which reduces opportunities for interaction.

Lessons:

Transparent and inclusive communication during the preparation and implementation of REDD+ activities, including FIP, is essential for effective collaboration between governments and other REDD+ partners.

National leadership for coordinating REDD+ is essential for managing relevant funding streams, fostering partnerships, and achieving successful outcomes. Coordinating REDD+ support through a unified national platform has proven useful in this regard.

Creating a platform for REDD+ partners to interact on a regular basis is conducive to active collaboration and participation.

MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS (MDBS)

All participating MDBs understand their role in operationalizing the FIP. They use their respective comparative advantages to respond to country needs as they relate to REDD+. The MDBs have gradually shifted from business-as-usual to a new model of partnership at the country level. This includes the establishment of FIP focal points in some countries and contracting of consultants and research groups to support the program. The MDBs are working on delineating the roles and responsibilities of MDB headquarters and field staff.

Notwithstanding strong interest, actual participation by MDBs in FIP programming activities at the country level appears to vary from active to weak depending on the country and the MDB. Not all staff had a clear understanding of the FIP focus on transformational change.

MDBs usually participate in the National REDD+ Committees and generally support the consultation processes and inform partners appropriately. MDBs have developed a good dialogue with REDD+ stakeholders including governments, CSOs, the private sector and other development partners. However, some CSOs have noted the need to clarify roles and responsibilities of the MDBs at the country level and to provide better public information about their objectives. A case in point is the need to clarify the role of the private sector within REDD+ and the role of the private-sector arms of the MDBs in promoting private sector participation in the FIP, a role which was often poorly understood by governments and civil society groups alike.

Lessons:

- MDB field staffs need to adopt a more collaborative approach to doing business at the country level in terms of working with other MDBs and with other REDD+ partners.

- MDB focal points at headquarters are responsible for informing and guiding the MDB staff at the country level so they can interact with the government in an informed way and provide proper advice on programming FIP resources. Effective two-way communication contributes significantly to improving the performance of the MDBs at country and headquarters levels.
- MDBs should make a greater effort to provide accurate information to all REDD+ stakeholders about their country activities and the nature of their involvement in FIP.
- Private-sector arms of the MDBs need to make clear that interacting with the private sector is an integral and effective part of the FIP as well as the MDB mandates.
- Full awareness of MDB staff of all aspects of the FIP, including its mandate to initiate transformational change, is crucial for effective participation in FIP programming and implementation at the country level. In this regard, dissemination of information and knowledge management within the MDBs should be a key task for coordinators in the MDBs.

OTHER REDD+ INITIATIVES, PARTNERS, AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

There is a good level of cooperation among the major REDD+ initiatives (FCPF, FIP, GEF and UN-REDD Programme) across the three phases of REDD (readiness, implementation and performance payments) at both headquarters and country levels. Clarity on the roles and responsibilities of these REDD+ initiatives in support of countries' REDD+ activities ensures close collaboration in most countries where they operate.

In DRC and Indonesia, all three initiatives are active and collaborating well, with the World Bank acting as the delivery partner for the FCPF and the lead MDB for the FIP. In Peru, collaboration is fostered between the FCPF and FIP through the Inter-American Development Bank, which functions as the delivery partner for the FCPF and lead MDB for the FIP. Burkina Faso recently submitted its revised investment plan which builds on the FCPF Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) and will use FIP resources for readiness and investment activities.

The FIP has a catalytic role in the REDD+ process not only as it brings together various REDD+ stakeholders at the country level to prioritize REDD+ action and provide scaled-up finances, but also it has re-energized activities agreed under other REDD+ initiatives in some countries.

In most cases, the staff of these REDD+ initiatives work as a team providing support to the pilot countries. Some MDB team leaders act as advisors to national focal points for the FCPF and FIP. However, in several instances it was noted that there are overlaps or gaps in the REDD+ programs that could be addressed through improved information about REDD+ activities and increased collaboration. Creating greater consistency across programs, for example in evaluation methodologies, serves to reduce workloads and take advantage of synergies.

In addition to the FCPF, FIP, GEF and UN-REDD Programme, there are several bilateral organizations (including from FIP contributor countries) working to support REDD+ at the country level. Since these actors mainly work through a project-based approach, there is the risk of unnecessary overlaps and poor integration into the national REDD+ strategy (or equivalent). Hence there is need for governments to coordinate and link these bilateral activities to national REDD+ programs and initiatives.

Research institutions, including international institutions such as CIFOR and national institutes, can play an important role in the design of REDD+ and FIP investments. Involvement of these organizations in the REDD+ processes has been growing; however, the quality and magnitude of such support varies from country to country. Major international research institutes have varying levels of investment in the FIP pilot countries.

Cooperation and collaboration between research organizations and governments has improved in recent years, but full use of research results remains to be achieved. While in some countries MDBs have contracted research groups to assist with the FIP process, in other cases there is no clear mechanism for collaboration on major research projects. Flow of information from governments to research centers, and of research results to governments, civil society organizations, and indigenous peoples groups, has been problematic in some cases. Researchers have been included in REDD+ roundtable forums, but are not always well informed about the FIP initiative.

Lessons:

- Enhanced collaboration and coordination among the FIP, FCPF and the UN-REDD Programme at headquarters and in-country is the key to successful and sustainable REDD+ investments. Defining their respective roles and harmonizing implementation procedures and reporting will improve efficiency and efficacy of delivery on the ground.
- Overlap of REDD+ activities supported by multilateral and bilateral initiatives is a challenge requiring better coordination at the national and sub-national levels. Efficient coordination will allow for transparency and systematic information-sharing on activities supported by various REDD+ actors and reduce duplication of efforts.
- A country-level assessment may clarify the REDD+ landscape, indicating overlap and gaps, key information for the REDD+ initiatives and for government to fulfill its role as national coordinator for REDD+.
- Investigation of potential national REDD+ policies and investments in a coordinated manner by international and national research institutes can fill critical knowledge gaps at the country level. Collaboration between FIP committees and research institutions in disseminating information to all stakeholders maximizes the benefits from research results.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES GROUPS

Indigenous peoples groups are central players in REDD+ because many are forest-based communities and depend on forests for their livelihoods. While indigenous peoples constitute a diverse stakeholder group, in general they have shown strong interest in participating in FIP and other REDD+ initiatives. Some indigenous peoples groups are well organized, politically powerful, and technically competent while others are less prepared in some or all of these aspects. Many consulted for this study stressed an urgent need for capacity building to enhance their active participation in REDD+ and FIP processes, from consultation to implementation.

The challenges facing most indigenous peoples groups in the FIP pilot countries include: (1) obstacles to uniting under umbrella associations; (2) difficulties in agreeing on representation in national and international fora;

(3) engagement in an overwhelming number of projects and initiatives supported by different and uncoordinated REDD+ initiatives; (4) different understandings of REDD+ and FIP principles; and (5) weak capacity to deal with specific technical FIP issues.

Some indigenous peoples groups feel that they are misrepresented in REDD+ initiatives, either by NGOs which claim to speak for indigenous peoples or by representatives who do not have their full confidence. Some indigenous peoples groups are better funded and more politically able than others, leading weaker groups to feel excluded. Also, as a result of prior experiences, many mistrust their own governments. Recent or unresolved issues over land tenure or resource rights contribute to this mistrust. In one FIP pilot country, an indigenous peoples group decided to develop alternatives to working with the government, including a new concept called "Indigenous REDD+". The proposal was to bypass the government by splitting REDD+ funding between the government and indigenous peoples groups, instead of finding better approaches to collaboration.

Most forest-dependent communities emphasize their concern with livelihood issues, including land tenure rights, sustainable forestry and the multiple challenges of poverty. Promoting FIP primarily as a climate mitigation program to these communities will not foster ownership and could result in strong opposition to the proposed investments. Indigenous peoples' participation and collaboration in REDD+ is based on the understanding that REDD+ funds will address their livelihood objectives. Likewise, indigenous peoples' knowledge of natural resource management needs to be incorporated into REDD+ initiatives to ensure both ownership and effectiveness.

The plethora of REDD+ initiatives and jargons has confused local communities to the extent that some have lost confidence in the various climate change initiatives, which do not seem to address their needs and concerns. Information-sharing has been inconsistent, and some indigenous peoples groups have serious misperceptions of REDD+. Numerous and frequent visits by different government agencies, researchers, private developers or NGOs for various projects without tangible results impose on the time and goodwill of these communities and can further erode their interest in REDD+.

Lessons:

- The diversity of indigenous peoples groups often poses challenges when it comes to representation in national and international REDD+ fora. Innovative and flexible ways must be found to involve indigenous peoples groups in order to take full advantage of the experience of these groups and to ensure that they consider themselves as partners in the FIP process. The FIP's Dedicated Grant Mechanism could play a role in capacity-building to improve participation.
- Engaging indigenous peoples and their organizations in the FIP programming process is advancing but it needs to be complemented by concrete actions on the ground. REDD+ investments, including those supported by FIP, need to address livelihood issues and involve local communities in a dialogue on the sustainable management of forests. Addressing these primary concerns of indigenous groups will be essential to ensuring the sustainability of any REDD+ intervention, including FIP.
- Unrealistic views of the FIP programming process result from poor communication about REDD+ and FIP with indigenous peoples groups. Overblown expectations of the resources involved are likely to complicate planning and implementation.
- Productive relations between governments and indigenous peoples groups can be greatly enhanced when information and knowledge is shared from the beginning. It is important that both sides understand each other's views and that indigenous peoples groups are an integral partner in the decision-making process and implementation of REDD+ initiatives. Both the traditional knowledge and concerns of indigenous peoples groups need to be respected and integrated in REDD+.

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS (CSOS)

National and international civil society organizations are very active in the FIP pilot countries in practically all aspects of climate change, in addition to other environmental and social issues. These organizations have a strong interest in REDD+, and FIP in particular. Some of these organizations have only a limited understanding of FIP in terms of its objectives, procedures and expected outcomes, yet they are keen to participate in the process, in part because of the expectation of funding. As members of National

REDD+ Committees, many CSOs participate in FIP consultations when invited. The level of satisfaction with the process varies among CSOs.

In some countries, CSOs are organized under umbrella organizations, which facilitate the consultation process. Where CSOs are not organized at the national level, larger, better-funded organizations may dominate the process. Perceptions that the process is unbalanced or exclusive create friction, in part because of the belief that participation will lead to funding. Like indigenous peoples groups, CSOs have a variety of agendas, and many are more concerned with addressing rural poverty and livelihood issues than climate change. This diversity of agendas also complicates the consultation process.

The large number of initiatives related to forests and REDD+ is overburdening many CSOs in the FIP pilot countries. Many CSOs have indicated that they do not have sufficient capacity to keep informed about all REDD+ relevant initiatives nor to understand how they can best contribute to national REDD+ efforts. In many cases, CSO roles and responsibilities are not clear, which undermines their active and effective participation in the REDD+ process.

Lessons:

Institutionalizing appropriate procedures for integrating CSOs into the consultation processes and providing timely information are prerequisites for their meaningful participation. Inviting representatives of the CSO community to consultations on a consistent basis reduces concerns about representation and keeps them well informed.

Support for CSO efforts to organize themselves for constructive participation in FIP processes is needed. The Dedicated Grant Mechanism under the FIP, which aims at developing the capacities of indigenous peoples groups and local communities and their organizations, may provide support in this regard.

The role of CSOs in the three phases of REDD+ needs well defined from the outset, to ensure constructive participation and prevent unrealistic expectations. The objectives of the consultation process should be also be clearly defined to ensure that CSO contributions are pertinent; likewise, funding possibilities should be clearly delineated.

Creating new or strengthening existing mechanisms for CSOs and other stakeholders to contribute knowledge and voice concerns during the preparation and implementation phases of REDD+ activities, including the FIP, is essential. Although the current FIP operational guidelines provide for public consultation, there is always room for improvement and for simplification through greater harmonization with the consultation guidelines of REDD+ partners, such as the MDBs.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR⁹

Most REDD+ initiatives emphasize the need for collaboration between the private and public sector. As one of the primary users of forests, the private sector is especially important to REDD+. It is often seen as the culprit in deforestation and forest degradation. Private actors in industries affecting forest use, including the financial sector, will be targeted with FIP advisory services and investments, since transformation of incentives in the private sector to support sustainable forest management and enhance forest carbon stocks could have a major positive impact on REDD+ outcomes. Moreover, the private sector can be an important partner in attracting much-needed financing for sustainable forest management. Among the multilateral REDD+ initiatives, currently only the FIP explicitly provides financing to invest in, and provide advisory services in support of, private sector REDD+ activities.

The private sector is a heterogeneous stakeholder group, including large corporations, small— and medium-sized enterprises, which may be community-based, philanthropic groups, industry and producers' associations, and banks and financial intermediaries. Many of these groups, particularly those in the forest-based industries, are already playing a positive role in national REDD+ processes. Private consultants, corporate social and environmental responsibility initiatives of large companies, philanthropic organizations and carbon developers already partner with and provide essential services to other public and private FIP stakeholders in support of REDD+ activities, and they can be expected to continue their engagement through the implementation phase. Private sector actors in the mining,

⁹ For more detailed discussion and lessons learned regarding private sector participation in the FIP, see the parallel publication, "Incentivizing the Involvement of the Private Sector in REDD+: A Review of Early Experiences and Lessons Learned in the Forest Investment Program." CIF, 2013.

energy, and transport sectors have generally not been involved in the FIP process to date, although there is still opportunity for them to participate.

Private sector actors are consulted in the preparation of the FIP investment plan in order to identify their capacities and constraints to their participation in REDD+ investments, and to identify appropriate incentives to increase private sector involvement. Although some private sector actors participate in the National REDD+ Committees, including some associations and confederations of producers that have played an important role in raising awareness among their constituents, many private sector actors in the pilot countries are not very familiar with FIP. Information about FIP, including procedures and expectations, needs to be better communicated to ensure active and long-term participation of the private sector. The private sector also needs to acquire experience in REDD+ projects in order to create knowledge and capacity for scaling-up.

Some governments and occasionally other REDD+ stakeholder groups, particularly indigenous peoples groups and civil society organizations, are reluctant to allocate FIP resources to the private sector because of concerns that private sector incentives conflict with REDD+ goals. However, the private sector is eager to participate in the FIP and to promote and engage in sustainable business models relevant to REDD+, including carbon markets. Beyond the caution voiced by other stakeholders, however, the reiterative nature of the FIP process, the extensive consultations, and the complicated requirements of multilateral lending do not fit easily with private sector culture or expectations. The mismatch between the lengthy multilateral process, combined with government caution, and the interest of the private sector in engaging rapidly in REDD+ often leads to lost opportunities to create viable models for collaboration.

The allocation of FIP funding to four of the eight pilot countries is divided between grants and concessional credits while the other four countries receive grant resources only. While in one visited country resources were allocated to public and private sector investments, in other countries all FIP resources are allocated to public sector operations only. In order to create incentives for private sector participation in REDD+, flexible and private-sector-relevant FIP financing modalities are required. In addition, private sector entities, including small and medium enterprises, often complain that local and national banks do not offer credit lines appropriate to REDD+ investments or only offer loans for equipment purchases.

Banks often consider forestry investments high-risk and are not familiar with REDD+. Nevertheless, private sector projects are included in all of the investment plans endorsed to date (direct investments in private organizations, and investments through government agencies aiming at private sector groups), indicating that some governments have come to understand the valuable role that the private sector can play. Learning has been assisted by MDB efforts to share knowledge and raise awareness as well as government engagement with private sector stakeholders during the investment plan consultations.

Lessons:

Full and constructive integration of the private sector into FIP programming and implementation necessitates a better dialogue with other REDD+ stakeholders, including local communities, indigenous peoples groups and CSOs. Information on the role of the private and public sectors should be disseminated to interested REDD+ stakeholders, including information on safeguards and the potential contribution to enhanced livelihoods of forest-dependent communities and other co-benefits.

Analyzing and addressing the needs of the private sector in each country and adjusting the FIP's current financing modalities could create better incentives for the active participation of the private sector in REDD+. Initial stages of FIP development have shown that the process-oriented and often lengthy nature of FIP investment plan development is not aligned with private sector culture or expectations. The financing process is likely to present the same type of obstacles to private sector participation.

Governments should encourage the private sector to participate actively in the national REDD+ dialogue. Private sector actors need to be educated about MDB and government policies, including financial, environmental and social criteria, and be given conservative estimates of the time it takes to move from business development to disbursement.

Creating a separate FIP funding window with a specific mandate to engage the private sector through either direct investments or financial intermediaries could support local and national banks in establishing REDD+ credit lines and offer capacity-building for bank personnel.

LESSONS LEARNED: FIP PROCESS

CONSULTATIONS

The FIP has supported an inclusive consultation process among REDD+ stakeholder groups at the country level build consensus around FIP investments that will address national REDD+ priorities and foster ownership for these future actions. The greatest challenge now is to maintain this inclusive process throughout the implementation phase. Partnerships among REDD+ stakeholders should be seen as an integral part of REDD+ planning and implementation, not just a one-time engagement.

Relevant sector ministries, civil society organizations, indigenous peoples groups, local communities, the private sector, and other development partners, including the FCPF, GEF and UN-REDD Programme, are vital to the success of the FIP and REDD+ process in every country. In building multi-stakeholder platforms for FIP consultation and collaboration, the FIP has benefited from pre-existing capacities and institutional mechanisms established by governments, in partnership with other multilateral and bilateral REDD+ initiatives. However, the level of involvement varies by country. Emerging lessons highlight the complexity and uncertainties of creating effective partnerships. Experience in each of the countries makes it clear that specific roles and expectations for different stakeholder groups need to be determined systematically and integrated into the overall development and implementation processes of REDD+ activities, including FIP investments, based on the particular country context.

Effective consultation processes require a significant investment of time and money. On average the FIP pilot countries invested over two years, from the time of selection by the FIP Sub-Committee through the development of the FIP investment plan. The minimum time was a year, and four countries took close to three years. The programming process also proved to be highly iterative. In terms of the use of financial resources, seven FIP pilot countries requested preparatory grant resources for activities supporting the development of the investment plan. USD 1.71 million has been approved by the MDB FIP Committee for this purpose, of which about 25% has been disbursed.

Different countries will require different levels of investment for REDD+ to build the necessary consultation and collaboration processes. Overlap with complementary programs may substantially reduce the need for develop-

ing new consultation mechanisms and investment plans. For example, in the case of Mexico concurrent preparation of an IBRD loan relevant to REDD+ allowed the FIP process to take advantage of those linkages to advance the investment plan.

Financial and time resources are only one part of the equation. There also needs to be sufficient political will, openness to learning, and commitment to sharing experiences both locally and internationally. This is the only way to ensure that stakeholders maximize the benefits of the investment of time and financial resources. Nor is this investment confined to the programming process. The engagement needs to continue through implementation and project conclusion in REDD+ projects. Without this continual process of stakeholder consultation, coordination and collaboration will suffer and the views and needs of stakeholder groups will not be adequately addressed.

Lessons:

- Successful implementation of REDD+ initiatives depends on the respect of all REDD+ stakeholder groups for the process and each other's differences and values. Consultations play an indispensable role in attenuating mistrust and animosity between ministries, civil society groups, indigenous peoples groups and the private sector in the REDD+ process. The sharing of information and knowledge empowers partners and allows everyone the opportunity to be on an equal footing, which builds trust among stakeholders.
- Clearly defined and relatively simple governance mechanisms for the consultation process, tailored to local conditions, will promote participation and allow for an effective and efficient process. Institutional efficiency results from any or all of the following: mutually agreed policies and standards on consultations; specialized human resources to effectively and consistently apply consultation policies and standards; and consolidation of the consultation function from many small platforms to a few larger ones.
- Clear definition of the roles of different groups will help reduce friction and concerns about equality of access to the decision-making process. However, conflict resolution and/or mediation mechanisms need to be in place in order to manage the different views and find common ground.

- Consultation that will constructively inform the REDD+ programming process requires significant time and financial resources. FIP partners, particularly indigenous peoples groups and civil society groups, not only need to exhibit willingness for active and sincere participation but also have to devote time and human resources. In setting up consultation processes, these factors need to be taken into account by all participants
- The number of meetings and planning iterations should be kept to a level that is manageable for participants, and information should be provided in a timely manner to reduce pressure on organizations with staff and time constraints.

CAPACITY BUILDING

REDD+ is a cross-cutting issue which needs to engage various ministries and government agencies in planning and implementation. The task of coordinating a group of usually competing ministries is a huge challenge and often exceeds the capacity of all institutions. Leadership at the highest levels of government is needed to bring these diverse groups together both at the ministerial level and the working level.

Because the guidelines, procedures and objectives for FIP investments are new to many countries, some government employees experience a mismatch between their technical capacities and tasks related to the FIP. Field officers generally have received little training to deal with the different aspects of REDD+ and FIP in particular. This affects their ability to coordinate with other working-level staff and to communicate REDD+ information to civil society groups and local stakeholders.

Civil society groups and indigenous peoples groups, as well as the private sector, also lack full understanding of FIP and often have limited capacity for implementation. The transformational-change objective of FIP in particular is often poorly understood. Addressing information-sharing and capacity-building for FIP will be essential to the full participation of these groups. They are often overwhelmed by the multiplicity of initiatives. Better coordination of REDD+ initiatives should reduce this burden, and the Dedicated Grant Mechanism may provide important support in capacity building for indigenous peoples groups and local communities.

Lessons:

- Limited comprehension of the full dimensions of REDD+ and limited understanding of the associated activities may seriously constrain active support for REDD+ initiatives.
- Capacity building for REDD+ relevant institutions, especially government agencies and national committees, but also civil society groups, indigenous peoples groups, and local communities that are apt to be discouraged by REDD+ jargon and technical requirements, is essential and needs to be a continuing process.
- Consultations can help to avoid unnecessary duplication of reporting mechanisms and ensure uniformity in result indicators at the national level for the myriad of projects contributing to REDD+ objectives, thus reducing time and effort required of limited staff.

TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE

The FIP aims to initiate transformational change in the forest sector and other economic sectors affecting the integrity of forest ecosystems by promoting strong partnerships and strengthening ownership of REDD+ at the national and local levels. However, there is no global definition for transformational change. The definition of transformation will depend on country circumstances; what is considered transformational in one country may be normal practice in another. Although it is a central principle of the FIP, transformation is often not fully understood by government agencies or other REDD+ stakeholders, especially in terms of its practical aspects. These need to be worked out in the context of each country through the consultation process.

Triggering transformational changes requires a programmatic approach that addresses the barriers to REDD+ in a systemic way. REDD+ initiatives need to support the implementation of national or sub-national strategies that shape policies and incentives, rather than isolated projects. Coordinating initiatives and organizing REDD+ funding streams at the national level is one of the most fundamental steps, and will allow for efficient and effective direction of resources and actions to REDD+ priority areas and issues. High-level political support is essential to sustain this approach.

Some countries have opted for immediate implementation of small REDD+ and livelihood projects in order to show progress on the ground before a full consultation process has been carried out. However, these small-scale, isolated projects, while individually useful, are unlikely to contribute to transformation. The process of reaching consensus on a national REDD+ strategy and FIP investment plan should build a partnership among the stakeholders that will serve to support long-term REDD+ investments and transformational change in the pilot countries. This partnership or collaboration is itself a major product of the FIP.

Lessons:

- What constitutes transformational change is country-specific and needs to be discussed and agreed on by REDD+ stakeholders during the FIP programming phase and monitored throughout the implementation of projects and programs agreed in endorsed investment plans.
- Achieving the FIP’s mandate requires a programmatic approach that allows for targeted interventions that address the barriers to REDD+ in a systematic way. It must be understood that strong partnerships and transformational results will be achieved only over the long-term and with high-level political support.
- Building effective partnerships and consultation and collaboration processes should be viewed as a key outcome of the FIP and fundamental to transformational change.



Moving Forward

This Learning Product found that the FIP has initiated a strong process of consultation and partnership-building in the four countries. By encouraging better relationships between governments, indigenous peoples groups and local communities, other REDD+ institutions, the private sector and development partners, the FIP has contributed substantially to the participatory process in pilot countries in support of national REDD+ efforts. Extensive and inclusive consultative meetings have been held in all the countries, involving government agencies, other REDD+ initiatives, civil society groups, indigenous peoples groups and local communities, and the private sector. At the national level, inter-ministerial collaboration is working well. Despite the multitude of REDD+ and other climate and environment initiatives, collaboration between governments and REDD+ stakeholders is also proceeding well. The MDBs are shifting to a new model of partnership that facilitates collaboration. National REDD+ processes have been inclusive of indigenous and traditional peoples groups; civil society groups have been active participants; and some private sector actors have expressed strong interest. In sum, the FIP has made a substantial contribution to fostering the participatory process in support of national REDD+ efforts.

While the initial experiences were largely positive, collaboration could be improved by addressing a number of common problems. Specific and more targeted strategies are needed to strengthen and expand meaningful participation and to manage expectations. Across the range of stakeholders a set of cross-cutting issues is evident that are creating challenges for FIP preparation and implementation. Ensuring strong national-level leadership, improving information dissemination and sharing at all levels, increasing the effectiveness and legitimacy of governance mechanisms, committing sufficient time and resources to the process, finding improved ways of integrating both the private sector and the concerns of indigenous peoples and local communities, and enhancing understanding and incorporation of transformational change will all be essential to the next steps in the process.



FIP: REDD+ Stakeholder Collaboration

Cover Illustration Credit: Cienpies Design

