



IUCN
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland
Switzerland

Tel. +41 22 999 0000
Fax +41 22 999 0002
www.iucn.org

Niels Hedegaard Jørgensen
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark -
DANIDA
Asiatisk Plads 2
DK-1448 Copenhagen K
Denmark

3 August 2016

Dear Mr. Jørgensen,

I am pleased to submit for your attention the IUCN's management response to the midterm review of the Towards Pro-poor REDD+ Phase II project, which was conducted under the leadership of DANIDA in

[REDACTED]

IUCN welcomes the report conclusions and recommendations of the midterm review of the "Towards Pro-

[REDACTED]

poor REDD+ Phase II" project that DANIDA led, together with IUCN. This report provides detailed feedback on

PP. Reed
[REDACTED]



IUCN Management Response to the conclusions of the Midterm Review of the Towards Pro-poor REDD+ Phase II project

Name and year of evaluation or review: 2016 Unit/person responsible for ensuring follow up: George Akwah (George.akwah@iucn.org), GFCCP	Date created: July 2016 Date updated:	Actors and units involved in follow up (full and abbreviated names): IUCN's Global Forest and Climate Change Programme Team
---	--	--

IUCN welcomes the report conclusions and recommendations of the midterm review of the "Towards Pro-poor REDD+ Phase II project that DANIDA led, jointly with IUCN. This report provides insightful and very constructive reflections that not only form the base for prioritizing interventions of the project in the remaining timeframe, but also motivates and strengthens the vision and approach of IUCN on REDD+ broadly and human rights-based approaches in forest conservation and climate change mitigation particularly. The project's global learning workshop that IUCN organized in May 2016, after the midterm review, generated insights on how the current progress, lessons and experiences of the project across the five countries can help more effectively repackage or consolidate interventions in ways to address the recommendations of the midterm review. The table below outlines IUCN's response to the specific recommendations of the review.

Recommendation of the Midterm Review	Response (agree/disagree)	Intended Result	Pending/planned Actions (responsibility, timeframe)
		<i>What will change as a consequence of the actions taken to respond to the recommendation?</i>	
<p>1</p> <p><i>"To increase the focus on results at the landscape level"</i>: A number of livelihood options have been identified for the landscape sites and proposals for supporting these have been prepared. Achieving tangible benefits at the community level in the selected landscapes is important. The IUCN teams and partners need to increase the focus on providing capacity development through key partners operating at the landscape level, including implementing partners, service providers and local level institutions (government and non-government) such as the</p>	<p>From the beginning, the project has adopted an implementation approach through which i) in-country implementing partners are empowered not only to deliver the project and support mainstreaming of HRBAs, but also to understand, take ownership of and promote results and lessons of the project within their organizational strategies and future actions: i.e. in Cameroon, Ghana and Uganda, the national project implementing partners have seen their understanding of concept and practice of HRBA broadened, and IUCN has organized sessions to train them on the concept and practice of HRBAs and their meaning for REDD+ process recommended under this recommendation sustainable forest management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lessons from experiences with implementation of HRBAs by IUCN and partners are captured and promoted within national and sub-national policies and strategies to support effective deployment of national REDD+ and forest conservation programmes; 	<p>From 2016, the project will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - initiate the process for documentation and consolidation of lessons on demonstration and mainstreaming of HRBAs; - The project will upscale and intensify policy outreach and communication actions to ensure that emerging lessons and outcomes from landscape demonstration are effectively delivered as inputs to national policy and action through appropriate and most effective channels at landscape, sub-national and national levels

IUCN has also engaged with, and is enabling and deploying grassroots organizations to understand and

of the midterm review is in line with IUCN's implementation of the project. Capturing lessons and building on field evidence and experiences to build landscape, sub-national and national capacity for HRBA based decision was planned to start from the second year of the project. The remaining period of the project will thus be dominated by actions of such nature.

“That partnerships and strategic engagements are further clarified”: Some strategic partners remain loosely associated with the project at country level. In order to benefit from the range of stakeholders and the depth of expertise, it would make sense to track contributions by relevant stakeholders in each country, to define and document the nature of their stakes (in REDD+ and landscape improvements, etc.) and their relevance to the project. A stakeholder engagement framework is useful for determining the nature, depth and timing of partnerships. The framework also helps to clarify how different stakeholders are involved in REDD+ both at the national and landscape levels as well as the linkages that could be established between the two levels. In many cases, contracts and agreements are required to formalise engagements, indicating clear roles and expectations from each stakeholder in line with the overall project goal.¹

PARTIALLY AGREE: At this stage mapping of relevant stakeholders may not lead to the result intended by this recommendation, and it is proposed to concentrate on the consolidation of ownership/group dynamic of existing partnerships in order to best achieve the intended results. The roles and benefits of project partners, including implementing partners and key actors, were specified at the beginning of the project. For implementing partners, agreements were signed with the project, with specification of resources involved and modalities for deployment of these resources for activity implementation. Some partners, particularly governments and other key organizations involved in REDD+ and forest management in each country, are seen as strategic partners or key stakeholders to involve. These strategic partners or key stakeholders participate intensively in the project both as beneficiaries and actors in implementation of some key actions. However, they don't have a standard defined role with the project based on an agreement.

- Stakeholder engagement enhanced by developing clearer knowledge uptake pathways by ensuring that lessons and outcomes of the project are more effectively communicated throu

stakeholder institution) that will use the information and make that the target audience; iii) formalise and institutionalise information sharing to make it relevant not only to individuals but to the overall stakeholder

<p>a policy brief on CBNRM with REDD+ potential. This would include an overview of the engagements in different types of community based natural resource management. The brief would include policy options depending on land tenure system and/or formal status of forests and landscapes (e.g. customary land, forest reserves and national parks, cross border landscapes, etc.). The brief would also include policy options vis-a-vis different types of management: community, joint, collaborative.</p> <p>a policy brief on benefit-sharing arrangements with REDD+ potential. This would include an overview of the mechanisms and models analysed and tested to date in connection with the project. The brief would provide policy makers with a menu of benefit-sharing options that could be used at sub-national and national levels.</p> <p>Other issues and topics could also be taken up.</p>			Recommendations 1 and 3.
---	--	--	--------------------------