

Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ in Vietnam

National Kick-Off Workshop - 6 March 2012, Hanoi

Workshop report

1. Introduction

Vietnam has been selected by the UN-REDD Global Programme as one of four pilot countries worldwide to pilot a Participatory Governance Assessment (PGA) for REDD+. Implemented with support from UNDP and FAO, the PGA in Vietnam will in 2012 enter a one-year pilot phase to test-case the approach in one province. A national kick-off workshop was held in Hanoi 6 March 2012. More than 80 participants from all over Vietnam attended, including participants from academia, civil society, government officials as well as international partners. A more detailed list of invited stakeholders and registered participants can be found in Annex B.

A general objective of a Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ (PGA) is to inform the development of a national system providing relevant information on how “safeguards are promoted, addressed and respected” as recommended in the Cancun Negotiation Text – paragraphs 69 and 71 d. The difference between a PGA and other more externally driven assessments is that it is fully initiated, implemented, and sustained by national stakeholders.

Conducted through a multi-stakeholder process, the PGA will identify indicators on which data will be collected. After the analyses of these data have been presented, training and capacity building of both non-state stakeholders and government officials on how to act upon the analyses will be offered. The PGA involves a diverse range of national stakeholders as owners of the process. With their participation in the design, choice of methodology and selection of framework to be measured, the identified indicators are likely to be more reflective of the country context, thereby providing more legitimacy to the PGA.

The PGA in Viet Nam is technically set-up through the existing Phase of the UN-REDD Vietnam Programme, for which VNForest in MARD is the implementing partner. VNForest hosted the PGA workshop as the implementing partner of the UN-REDD Programme as well as the co-chair of the Sub-technical Working Group under the National REDD+ Network.

2. Objectives of the workshop

The objectives of the workshop were as follows:

- ✓ To launch and present the PGA initiative to national REDD+ stakeholders
- ✓ To discuss and agree on
 - i. a prioritized list of governance challenges for REDD+ in Vietnam at sub-national levels

- ii. criteria for selection of a pilot province
- iii. work plan and next steps for implementing the PGA in Viet Nam

3. Workshop agenda¹

The morning session of the workshop presented the PGA initiative through a series of presentation on the concept of governance, especially in a Vietnamese context, and how a PGA for REDD+ could be applied in Vietnam. After lunch the participants discussed wider governance challenges in REDD+ and criteria for selection of a pilot province for the 12 month preparation phase, before agreeing on the next steps and a work plan.

4. Presentations

The opening remarks from Deputy Director General of VNForest, Mr. Nguyen Ba Ngai, underlined the increasing relevance to discuss and understand the concept of governance in REDD+ as REDD+ is gaining momentum in Vietnam. Deputy Country Director Mr. Bakhodir Burkanov from UNDP mentioned the steps Vietnam already has taken to ensure participation of local stakeholder through FPIC activities in his address. These steps are also supported by local communities' entitlements in the Grassroot Democracy decree. Ha also stressed that the PGA would add value only if national stakeholders from both state as well as non-state actors are placed in the driving seat.

With the aim to present the PGA initiative to national REDD+ stakeholders - the first objective of the workshop – a series of presentations² spanning from theoretical concepts of governance to REDD+ in Vietnam followed. The concept of Governance encompasses a lot of elements, and to bring the participants on the same page Ms. Sujala Pant from UNDP in Bangkok exemplified how some of the principles behind democratic governance – as inclusion & participation, accountability & transparency and responsive institutions – could be applied on issues in the forestry sector, such as land ownership, involvement of forest dependent communities and coordination between different ministries. Similar to the Forest Governance Monitoring workshop held by FAO and VNForest 12-13 January 2012³, the issue of how to translate governance into Vietnamese was brought up by some of the participants as a response to Sujala's presentation. In Vietnamese governance as a concept is translated into both *quản lý* as well as *quản trị*, in which the former relates to management. One message coming across from participants was to the need to give more content to abstractions within governance terminology, specifically when engaging stakeholders from the forest dependent communities.

¹ Complete agenda is located in Annex A.

² All presentations are located at <http://vietnam-redd.org/Upload/CMS/Content/PGA/Mar%206/PPT.rar>

³ Workshop report is located on <http://vietnam-redd.org/Upload/CMS/Content/PGA/Mar%206/Report%20workshop%20FGM%20Vietnam.pdf>

Measuring the Vietnamese people's perception on democratic governance is not a new concept for Vietnam. By applying the same UNDP methodological approach on governance assessment, the Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI) has been piloted in Vietnam since 2009. Ms. Do Thi Thanh Huyen from UNDP presented how the PAPI was set up as a mechanism for Vietnamese users to provide feedback on public administration services in provinces. The presentations highlighted lessons for the PGA to learn from, one of them related to setting objectives – uptake of PAPI indicators in public M&E framework being an objective relevant for the PGA. Engagement of a broad range of stakeholders in an Advisory Board that would give feedback on the implementation was also highlighted as something for the PGA to learn from.

The before-mentioned workshop on Forest Governance Monitoring held in January included discussions on forest governance of relevance to PGA for REDD+. Speaking on behalf of the National Forestry Assessment (NFA) project in Vietnam, Mr. Tani Hoyhtya listed institutional embedding and participation as two key concerns stakeholders shared on forestry monitoring. Specifically mentioned were provision of favorable conditions for forest dependent communities to participate in discussions and monitoring activities. Feeding into the discussion of “what is forest governance?”, Mr. Hoyhtya could mention that a working group established VNForest will be looking to identify a clear definition and concept of forest governance and forest governance monitoring in Viet Nam as a next step in the FGM process. The conclusions from this group would be very relevant for the PGA.

Text from the Cancun Agreement asks countries to establish national information system on how safeguards are addressed. Director of DOSTIC in VNForest and National Programme Director for the UN-REDD Programme, Mme Thoa, pointed in her presentation titled “REDD+ and Forest Governance” to how the PGA could support the establishment of such a system. She also underlined that forest governance should focus more on enhancing the *quality* of decision making, and that the main elements of democratic governance – transparency, accountability, equity and participation – should apply to all stakeholders.

Vietnam is one of four countries to pilot PGA for REDD+ through the UN-REDD Global Programme. Emelyne Cheney from FAO took the workshop participants through some of the key lessons learned so far, maybe especially based on experience from Indonesia, which has made most progress of the four countries. A dedicated PGA coordinator at the country level is recommended to drive the process, if not the process risk to fail. Likewise, involvement of national stakeholders at the outset of the PGA increases the chance for the PGA to succeed. The four pilot countries will meet each other in Indonesia in mid-April to share experiences, and bring good practices back to their respective PGA processes.

5. Group discussions⁴

In order to get effective feedback from stakeholders on a prioritized list of governance challenges for REDD+ in Vietnam at sub-national levels as well as a list of criteria for selection of a pilot province –

⁴ The matrix made by the groups are located in Annex C.

workshop objective 2 and 3 – stakeholders were divided in groups to brainstorm. Participants from civil society, state actors, academia and others were represented within each group. One international group also convened.

a. Governance challenges

The three national groups pointed in essence to challenges within two of the governance pillars, namely participation and transparency. Examples included: lack of time allocated to involve local forest dependent communities and other sub-provincial stakeholders in decision making processes, consultation activities not being formalized, and the process of allocating land and forest titles not involving local people. Some groups explained the lack of involvement of local forest dependent communities to the fact that people only understand forest cultivation, and not forest protection and forest management. Related to the latter was the message coming from several groups on the need to provide more information to local stakeholders on benefit sharing, on forest areas and products, responsibilities and resources under their management, and other topics relevant for REDD+ - also in a form and language that would suit ethnic minorities and respect traditional knowledge. Gender roles were also mentioned: “If women are the ones attending the training on forest protection and development, but men the ones who deploy the forest and make decisions without engaging the women, the targeting is not very effective.”

Groups pointed to a lack of supply-driven transparency from the local government’s side. That said, REDD+ is a new concept for provincial and district authorities as well. Some topics, like benefit distribution, are still being researched and tested, and no legal decisions have been made on a BDS for REDD+. However, on other topics, such as land tenure, legal decisions have nevertheless been issued. One of the groups also mentioned the lack of capacity among stakeholders to actually comprehend REDD+, as the concept is fairly complex.

Closely linked to lacking supply-driven transparency, was the observation from one of the groups that lower levels of the management structure only account to higher levels, and not vice-versa, so-called missing downward accountability.

b. Criteria for selection of pilot province

Following the brainstorming on governance challenges, the groups were asked to define a set of criteria for selecting a pilot province. Interestingly, the groups suggested very similar criteria. First of all, the selected pilot province should have expressed interest from the local government. Without local ownership the PGA would risk failing. It would furthermore be useful to build on existing REDD+ initiatives and activities implemented in a province, thus a key criteria would be to choose a province which already have been involved in REDD+ or in which activities are being planned. The six pilot provinces under UN-REDD Phase 2 would be suitable, although not exclusive, candidates. The PGA pilot province should also contain a large forest area, and given the somehow short time for implementing the PGA pilot phase, 12 months, it would operationally be easier if the province and selected

districts/communes were easily accessible. Presence of ethnic minorities and vulnerable groups in the pilot province would also add value to the PGA. A summarized list of the criteria follows below, whereas the criteria listed by the groups are added to Annex C.

- Commitment and interest from local stakeholders, especially local government
- REDD+ activities or of similar content already undertaken
- Large forest area in which parts are exposed to high risk of being deforested
- Presence of ethnic communities and vulnerable groups
- Easily accessible given the pilot phase's short period

6. Work plan and next steps

Following the group discussion Tore Langhelle suggested for the participants a possible way forward through the next 12 months. The suggested structure followed very much lessons learned from the PGA in Indonesia as well as the PAPI in Vietnam. The immediate next step would be to set up two groups that would be key for implementing the PGA. A Research Team, consisting of focal points in UNDP & FAO to facilitate the implementation as well as a sub-contracted national NGO, would be established within April. The Research Team would be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the PGA.

The selected governance challenges and criteria for the pilot province were suggested to be used when contracting a national NGO for the Research Team. Every month, or based on needs, the Research Team would meet with a multi-stakeholder Advisory Group to get immediate feedback on the implementation progress of the PGA. Members of the Advisory Group were to be selected based on interest and relevance, but government representatives from both national and provincial level, governance experts from academia, civil society representatives and other stakeholders that would add value to the PGA could be potential members. The idea would be to establish an Advisory Group that would represent national stakeholders best possible, but at the same time be a practical and operational group. Stakeholder consultations at provincial level would follow in May, before the work on establishing indicators would start⁵.

Mme Thoa and Dr. Luc from VNForest both agreed to the propositions for the steps through 2012, adding that a pilot province with already good data sources and materials would be beneficial to ease implementation. Involvement of FPD and DARD at provincial level would also be granted, perhaps better as roles in the Advisory Group. Based on the pilot phase experiences, the stakeholders would then

⁵ An indicative timeline can be located at <http://vietnam-redd.org/Upload/CMS/Content/PGA/Mar%206/National%20kick%20off%20workshop%20-%20overview.pdf> and the presentations for suggested next steps is located at <http://vietnam-redd.org/Upload/CMS/Content/PGA/Mar%206/PPT.rar>

decide if and how to expand the PGA in the next years provided funding from the UN-REDD Programme was secured.

ANNEX A - Agenda

REDD+ PGA Kick Off Workshop and Working Session
Date: 6 March 2012
Venue: Flower Garden Hotel, 46 Nguyễn Trường Tộ, Ha Noi, Viet Nam

Objective: To launch and present the PGA initiative to national REDD+ stakeholders, and to discuss and agree on i) a prioritized list of governance challenges for REDD+ in Vietnam at sub-national levels ii) criteria for selection of a pilot province iii) work plan and next steps for implementing the PGA in Viet Nam.

| | | Lead |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 8.30-9.00 | Registration | PMU |
| 9.00-9.15 | Welcome and opening remarks | Nguyen Ba Ngai, Deputy Director General, VNFOREST Bakhodir Burkhanov, Deputy Country Director, UNDP Vietnam |
| 9.15-9.30 | Presentation of participants | Facilitator |
| 9.30-9.45 | Relevance of a PGA for REDD+ in Vietnam. Objectives of the workshop and agenda | Tore Langhelle, Programme Officer, UNDP Vietnam |
| 9.45-10.00 | Overview and introduction to Democratic Governance - Present the major principles of Democratic Governance and why it is relevant in sectors like forestry | Sujala Pant, UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre |
| 10.00-10.20 | What is a Governance Assessment and how has it been applied in Vietnam? - Present an overview of governance assessments through the illustration of the Provincial Administration Performance Index in Viet Nam (PAPI) | Do Thanh Huyen, Policy Officer, UNDP Vietnam |
| 10.20-10.35 | Break | |
| 10.35-10.50 | Lessons Learned and take away points from the workshop on Forest Governance Monitoring, | Tani Hoyhtya, Chief Technical Adviser for the NFA project in |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | focusing especially on the topics of most interest | VNFOREST |
| 10.50-11.05 | REDD in Viet Nam - Governance issues relevant for REDD+ in Viet Nam | Pham Minh Thoa, Director, VNFOREST |
| 11.05-12.00 | Questions and Answers | Facilitator |
| 12.00-13.00 | Lunch break | |
| 13.00- 14.30 | Governance challenges for REDD+ in Vietnam on sub-national levels Definition of criteria for selection of a pilot province | Break in groups with facilitators |
| 14.30 – 15.00 | Group presentations | Plenary |
| 15.00 – 15.15 | Break | |
| 15.15 – 15.30 | Examples from the structural set-up of REDD+ PGAs in Nigeria, Indonesia and Ecuador. - Management structure - Governance issues given priority - First steps of the PGA process | Emelyne Cheney, FAO Rome |
| 15.30 - 16.30 | Initiate a Road Map - Present the options discussed in the group work regarding the composition of the groups - Agree on criteria for selection of a pilot province - Engagement of stakeholders at provincial levels - Agree on a work-plan and the next steps | Facilitator |
| 16.30-16.45 | Conclusions | Trieu Van Luc, VNFOREST |

ANNEX B – List of participants

| # | Name | Position | Organization |
|----|---------------------|--|---|
| 1 | K'Bril | Vice Chairman | Bảo Thuận PPC, Di Linh Dist., |
| 2 | Do Manh Hung | Vice Director | Bidoup National Park |
| 3 | Nông Thế Mạnh | Chairman | Bình Long PPC, Võ Nhai, Thái Nguyên |
| 4 | Nguyen Thi Van | | CENEV |
| 5 | Hoang Thanh Tam | Director | Center for Development of Community Initiative and Environment (C&E) |
| 6 | Hà Trọng Hiếu | | Centre for Sustainable Development in Mountainous (CSDM) |
| 7 | Lương Thị Trường | Director | Centre for Sustainable Development in Mountainous (CSDM) |
| 8 | Nguyễn Thị Tuyết | | Centre of Research and Development in Upland Areas (CERDA) |
| 9 | Leyla Ozay | Research Coordinator and Programme Assistant | CIRUM (a Vietnamese NGO working on community forestry in Northern Vietnam) |
| 10 | Vu Linh | research and development department | CIRUM (a Vietnamese NGO working on community forestry in Northern Vietnam) |
| 11 | Ngo Tri Dung | Director | Consultative & Research Center on Natural Resources Management (CORENARM), Hue |
| 12 | Lê Thanh Yên | Director | CRD Thanh Hoa - Cooperative for Rural Development |
| 13 | Phạm Xuân Cừ | Former Director | Dai Hoc Forest Management Unit, Na Meo Commune, Thanh Hoa |
| 14 | Lê Cẩm Long | Chief of Planning Dept. | DARD |
| 15 | Mai Kiều | Vice Director | DARD |
| 16 | Nguyễn Huy Lợi | Vice Director | DARD |
| 17 | Phạm Văn Án | Former Director | DARD |
| 18 | Hoang Sy Bich | Chief of Planning Dept. | DARD Lam Dong |
| 19 | Hoàng Thị Thu Hương | Vice Director | DECEN - Cao Bang Community Development Center |
| 20 | Võ Đình Tuyên | Senior Official | Department of Economic Sector – Office of Government |
| 21 | Phạm Minh Thoa | National Programme Director, UN-REDD Vietnam | Department of Science, Technology and International Cooperation – VNFOREST / UN-REDD Viet Nam Programme |

| | | | |
|----|---------------------|--|---|
| 22 | Trần Hoàng Hiệp | Official | Dept. of Planning, MARD |
| 23 | Nghiêm Phương Thủy | | Dept. of Science, Technology and Environment |
| 24 | Carmen Tedesco | | Development Alternatives Inc |
| 25 | Kevin Carlucci | | Development Alternatives Inc |
| 26 | Nguyễn Nam Sơn | | DFD |
| 27 | Lê Viết Phú | Vice Chairman | Di Linh DPC |
| 28 | Nguyễn Văn Tâm | Vice Director | Di Linh Forestry Company |
| 29 | Emelyne Cheney | | FAO |
| 30 | Heini Utunen | | FAO |
| 31 | Tani Høytyä | | FAO |
| 32 | Liam Walsh | | Forest and Fauna International |
| 33 | Trần Mạnh Long | | Forest Protection Department |
| 34 | Triệu Văn Lực | | Forest Protection Department |
| 35 | Suzanne Robertson | Forestry Advisor | FORMIS |
| 36 | Phạm Xuân Phương | | FSIV |
| 37 | Nguyễn Bích Hằng | | FSSP, MARD |
| 38 | Guenther Rapp | Program Advisor | GIZ |
| 39 | Nguyễn Văn Chí | Chairman | Hòa Bình Co-operative, Bình Long, Võ Nhai, Thái Nguyên |
| 40 | Đỗ Thị Kim Anh | | Institute of Sustainable Development for the North (ISDN) Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences (VASS) |
| 41 | Vũ Văn Đức | | Liên minh giáo dục |
| 42 | Vì Văn Dắng | Deputy Chief | Mai Chau Agricultural Extension Center, Hoa Binh |
| 43 | Nguyen Thi Thuy Nga | Coordinator | Malteser International |
| 44 | Tran Dinh Duoc | chuyen trach ve mang nong nghiep | Malteser International |
| 45 | Anders Poulsen | Senior Adviser - Danida | National Target Program to Respond to Climate Change (NTP-RCC) -MONRE |
| 46 | Lương Lăng | Former Chairman | Nghia An PPC, Nghia Lo District, Yen Bai |
| 47 | Lê Thị Sâm | Programme Officer Livelihoods Programme | Oxfam |
| 48 | Mathew Tiedemann | | PACT |
| 49 | Nguyễn Hải Vân | | PanNature |
| 50 | Vu Minh Duc | Development Adviser | Royal Norwegian Embassy |
| 51 | Trịnh Đức Trình | Vice Director | Science and Technology Advisor Center (local NGO), Thanh Hoa |

| | | | |
|----|------------------------|--|---|
| 52 | Vu Thi Bich Hop | | Sustainable Rural Development, SRD |
| 53 | Lương Hoàng Phi | Deputy Chief of Planning and Forest Development Dept. | Sub-department of Forest Management - DARD |
| 54 | Nguyễn Thị Thu Hằng | Deputy Chief of Planning and Forest Development Dept. | Sub-department of Forest Management - DARD |
| 55 | Nguyễn Văn Hiệp | Official | Sub-department of Forest Management - DARD |
| 56 | Trần Thanh Bình | Director | Sub-Department of Forest Protection |
| 57 | Tô Mạnh Tiến | Dept. of Forest Development and Natural resources conservation | Sub-Department of Forest Protection, DARD |
| 58 | Trần Quốc Hưng | Dean, Faculty of Forestry | Thainguyen University of Agriculture and Forestry |
| 59 | Bạc Thị Luyện | Former teacher | Thanh Nưa Commune, Điện Biên Dist., Dien Bien |
| 60 | Bui Thi Kim | Director | The Center for Promoting Development for Women and Children (DWC) |
| 61 | Nguyễn Anh Tuấn | | The CITES Management Authority of Vietnam |
| 62 | Nguyễn Thị Minh Thương | | The CITES Management Authority of Vietnam |
| 63 | Cao Hai Thanh | | Towards Transparency (Transparency International) |
| 64 | Sujala Pant | | UNDP Bangkok |
| 65 | Bakhodir Burkhanov | Deputy Country Director | UNDP Viet Nam |
| 66 | Jairo Acuna | | UNDP Viet Nam |
| 67 | Koos Neefjes | | UNDP Viet Nam |
| 68 | Phan Minh Nguyet | | UNDP Viet Nam |
| 69 | Tore Langhelle | | UNDP Viet Nam |
| 70 | Lâm Ngọc Tuấn | Department of Environmental Science | University of Dalat |
| 71 | Châu Bá Thủy Thành | | UN-REDD Vietnam |
| 72 | Phạm Thị Yên | | UN-REDD Vietnam |
| 73 | Hoang Vu Lan Phuong | | UN-REDD Vietnam |
| 74 | Nguyen Thi Kieu Oanh | | UN-REDD Vietnam |
| 75 | Nguyen Thi Thu Huyen | | UN-REDD Vietnam |
| 76 | Giang | Viện Khoa học Việt Nam | VAST |
| 77 | Nguyễn Thị Thu Thủy | | VCF |
| 78 | Phan Đình Nhã | | Viện tư vấn phát triển (CODE) |
| 79 | Hải Hà | Reporter | Vietnam Investment Magazine |
| 80 | Nguyễn Thị Hào | | Vietnam REDD+ Office |
| 81 | Nguyễn Bá Ngãi | Vice Director General | VNFOREST |

| | | | |
|----|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 82 | Trần Hiếu Minh | | VNFOREST |
| 83 | Le Thuy Anh | GFTN Forestry Coordinator | WWF Greater Mekong - Vietnam Program |
| 84 | Nguyễn Xuân Giáp | | |

ANNEX C – Group Work

Group 1

Group Exercise 1: Identify the key governance challenges in the REDD+ sector. Please list in order of priority, and do not list more than FIVE per group

| Issue - | Why is it important | Which stakeholders are affected by it? |
|---|--|--|
| There was no participation of local people in the allocation of land and forest | Local people sometimes don't even know about the allocation of land and forest → how could they manage the protection/development? Most conflicts occur because people are not clear about the boundaries of their allocation forest land | Local people |
| Ownership of forest and forest land | | |
| Differences in culture of different ethnic groups limit the participation of ethnic groups in PGA | People do not fully understand about the protection and forest management. They only know to develop the forest for cultivation. Ethnic people do not get the red book. They only have house tenure certificate and know the area of forest that they have to protect. When assigned to protect the forest → people do a great job. But after 4 years the money was send to the cooperative → people destroyed the forest. People are not entitled to anything from the forest Local people were not involved in the establishment of the forest protection team. State policies are short-term | |
| Gender issue | In many communities in the decision-making often do not include women. When discuss and make decision about forestry livelihoods, women issues do not included. Women often attend training on forest protection/development but men are the one who do the job → conflict | |
| Interest and | If the province has more interest in REDD then | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| understanding of local government about PGA | they will be more involved in PGA, otherwise, they will not. | |
|---|--|--|

Group Exercise 2: Identify potential criteria to select a pilot province (please list in order of priority), and give a brief explanation why you think it is an important criteria to consider:

| Criteria | Rationale |
|---|--|
| Represent many different ecological regions of Viet Nam | Sub-tropical high Mt. Mt. area in the north |
| Large forest area | Represent different forms of management / ownership of forest occur in Viet Nam |
| Large group of ethnic communities | |
| Attention of local government | One indicator of PGA is about transparency so not many local government want to participate in PGA |
| NGOs doing related projects | Good database Inheritance |

Potential criteria: Below are examples of potential criteria to be considered in the selection of pilot provinces (these are only suggestions, and is not an exhaustive list)

- 1) Is the province already a REDD province?
- 2) Do the governance priorities and stakeholders identified earlier reflect the reality of the province?
- 3) What is the level of interest and commitment from the potential provinces?

Group 2

Group Exercise 1: Identify the key governance challenges in the REDD+ sector. Please list in order of priority, and do not list more than FIVE per group

| Issue - | Why is it important | Which stakeholders are affected by it? |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Non-readiness: Awareness, knowledge, capacity of local people and local governments (districts, communes): | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is implementing level, they need to well understand - They are beneficiaries and the most affected by policy changes and BDS | |
| 2. Standardised and consistent data/ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provinces need to use the same formats to enter data if a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical agencies at central and local level |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consistent/national system to be established - Critical for decision-making related to forestry - Critical for MRV for REDD+ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decision makers at all levels - International carbon credit buyers and other stakeholders |
| 3. REDD+ requires accurate and verified data, will local governments accept/resist the transparent announcement of forestry/carbon data measured by the new standards/methodology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can cause reluctance or resistance to participate in REDD+ programmes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provincial, district and communal governments - REDD+ programmes |
| 4. Financial issue | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - REDD+ requires technical complexity - Limited/No state budget for PGA in REDD+ - Low incentives for poor local people | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projects, programmes - Central and local governments |
| 5. Land tenure/ownership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closely related to participatory approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Households, policy makers |
| Short time project duration of PGA project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many works to be done in terms of capacity building, database, institution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Central level and pilot provinces |

Group Exercise 2: Identify potential criteria to select a pilot province (please list in order of priority), and give a brief explanation why you think it is an important criteria to consider:

| Criteria | Rationale |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1./Relatively large forest area | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obvious for REDD+ |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2. /Local governments have appropriate interest in the programme | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Critical for organizing, implementing, monitoring of project activities |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3. With good forestry database | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will make projects feasible |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4. with pilot REDD+ or FORMIS project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can inherit existing capacity and database |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5. LUPLA implemented/allocated land and forestland to households | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basis for MRV and BDS |

Potential criteria: Below are examples of potential criteria to be considered in the selection of pilot provinces (these are only suggestions, and is not an exhaustive list)

- 1) Is the province already a REDD province?
- 2) Do the governance priorities and stakeholders identified earlier reflect the reality of the province?
- 3) What is the level of interest and commitment from the potential provinces?

Group 3

Group Exercise 1: Identify the key governance challenges in the REDD+ sector. Please list in order of priority, and do not list more than FIVE per group

| Governance issue | Challenge | Why it becomes important? | Stakeholder |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Participation | <p>Identify issues related REDD+ at provincial level (Provincial Vietnamese Fatherland Front, Forestry Union) than local level (local people and communities)</p> <p>Formalism of consultation activities</p> <p>Time of consultation is too short</p> | <p>Participatory design process</p> <p>Quality of decision making</p> <p>Cost and benefit analysis</p> | <p>Provincial departments, agencies related forestry</p> <p>Fatherland Front, Associations</p> <p>Communities, local people under direct/indirect effect from it</p> <p>Forest owners (Protection forest management units, forest owners are households)</p> <p>Forest Protection</p> |
| Publicity, transparency | <p>Limitation in information providing for communities including benefit, responsibilities on resources under their management</p> <p>Insufficient information on forest area and products</p> <p>In- transparency in decision implementation processes (cutting timber decision)</p> <p>Inappropriate information channel to different stakeholders</p> | <p>Public information related forest project to local people, especially their rights and responsibilities</p> | <p>Leaders of Village</p> <p>Leaders of Commune</p> <p>Forest state-owners and enterprises</p> <p>Local people</p> <p>Forest Protection</p> |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| | (Vietnamese, ethnic minority language) Lack of reliable forest inventory system | (Need to use popular approach to resolve this issue) | |
| Accountability | Sector-wise support, coordination among related departments and agencies Cross-sector in DONRE, DARD Formalism of monitoring system of elective organizations Limitation in information and experience sharing among sector-wise departments, agencies Only lower level to account to higher level | Good coordination among stakeholders | Related departments, agencies Elective organizations Sector-wise organizations Community Local people Forest owners |

Group Exercise 2: Identify potential criteria to select a pilot province

Criteria 1: Province has REDD+, forest area

Criteria 2: Commitment from provincial leaders

Criteria 3: Province successfully implementing REDD+

Criteria 4: Easily travel comply with budget

Criteria 5: Province has high risk on forest reduced (based on result of provincial annually forest status monitoring)

Group 4 – International group

Group Exercise 1: Identify the key governance challenges in the REDD+ sector. Please list in order of priority, and do not list more than FIVE per group

| Issue - | Why is it important | Which stakeholders are affected by it? |
|--|---|--|
| Cross sectoral coordination | <p>Mechanisms in place for coordination across various sectors</p> <p>Between various government departments such as MARD, FIPI or even the Ministry of Finance</p> <p>The manner in which various government sectors engage with the private sector</p> <p>Across different forestry initiatives such as FLEGT and CITES</p> | <p>All line ministries FIPI, ICD, FPD under MARD Forestry programme such as FLEGT, UN-REDD and FGM</p> |
| How to engage forest dependent peoples | <p>At national level meetings limited representation from forest dependent peoples</p> <p>PGA will must assess the capacity of various actors to engage in the process : assess the capacity of expected participants</p> | <p>Ministries, people at province and commune level</p> |
| Land tenure | <p>Need to clear land tenure, important to clarify who has land, forest and carbon rights</p> <p>Land tenure is an important issue for REDD globally</p> | |
| Consistency of Legal framework | <p>Legal framework to support REDD implementation, including benefit distribution system, legal reforms if required</p> | <p>Legal department</p> |
| Transparency of REDD+ fund | <p>Need to ensure transparent process to set up as well as distribution benefits</p> | |