

Response to comments from the UK on the DGM Global Component:

1. Clarity is needed on what the DGM Global Component can and cannot pay for in terms of non-FIP country Indigenous People and Local Community (IPLC) participation.

The Global Component will finance selected participants (from FIP or non-FIP countries) to attend targeted training programs, (for eg. to prepare policy papers on climate change for regional or global forums, training on negotiations, leadership etc. and technical training on REDD+ and climate change). Participants invited to the training would be paid for their travel and training costs. Participation in these programs will be carefully planned by the Global Executing Agency (GEA) in consultation with the DGM Global Steering Committee (or its working group). The GEA will work to ensure that trainings are organized to optimize on participants' presence at other related events and explore opportunities for cost-sharing with other REDD+ programs, especially for non-FIP country participants.

2. The Global Executing Agency (GEA) is already selected (Conservation International). The Global Steering Committee (GSC), which oversees what the GEA does, will be selected from representatives that make up the National Steering Committees (NSC). Since the NSCs are a long way off being finalised in each country, what are the interim arrangements until such time as NCS members are selected and their representatives to the GCS chosen? Will there be a continuing role for the transitional committee?

The NSCs are already formed in Peru, Brazil and Indonesia. They are in various stages of progression in the other Pilot countries. In those countries where NSCs are still under formation, the interim members who are in the DGM Transitional Committee will continue in that role until the establishment of the National Steering Committee. Once the NSCs are established in all countries, members select the representative and an alternate to the Global Steering Committee.

3. One of the risks in the programme document is elite capture. Since a "democratic" process is to be pursued in selecting members for the national steering committees, this might not help to get traditionally marginalised groups represented. Will affirmative action or other approaches be employed to ensure that particularly marginalised/voiceless groups get representation?

Lack of access to information is often a key reason some communities may be excluded from such processes. To level the playing field, country DGM projects have a strong emphasis on outreach and communications before and during the process of NSC formation and ensure that the process is documented. For example, the process for NSC formation in Indonesia used preliminary information sharing meetings to familiarize community members with the DGM, and then several sub-regional meetings and a national level meeting were organized to select representatives for the NSC. Each meeting was web-streamed and later made available by the DKN (the national forestry council) on Youtube. A final report on the NSC formation has been sent to the World Bank explaining the process and outcomes. This report will be posted shortly on the DGM website. While access to the internet is not uniform in all the pilot countries and the internet will not be the only mode of information dissemination for the program, the Indonesia case illustrates the importance given to transparency and dissemination of information.

Affirmative action is not mandated in the DGM guidelines. Each country follows culturally appropriate approaches to selection of NSC members. In Indonesia, for example, there was a voluntary decision by the stakeholders to allocate 2 seats in the NSC to women members and a selection meeting was organized for that purpose.

Membership in the NSCs is limited to a 2 year term to allow new members to be part of the decision-making body. The program grievance redress mechanism is another avenue available to community members to bring up issues related to NSC membership or decisions regarding grant-making. In addition, the World Bank team in each pilot country continues to be in contact with the stakeholders, provides guidance and maintains oversight of the process.

In sum, the program has multiple means to ensure that the more “voice-less” or marginalized groups participate in the governing body. However, it needs to be emphasized that this is just the beginning of the process. In due course, the capacity building and communications activities of the DGM will encourage more marginalized groups to seek membership in the NSCs.

4. On the results framework, the UK would like to see more explicit language in the 2nd common indicator (The % of participants in the capacity development activities with increased role and voice in FIP or other REDD+ programmes at local, national or global levels) This should gather data not only on gender. Given that there are concerns about elite capture, it would be good to also differentiate between particularly marginalised or traditionally excluded groups.

The Global Agency team and the IBRD team will work on this suggestion to find an appropriate way to capture this information in the results framework.