


# Survey – Oslo REDD Exchange

Standardrapport


**1 . During the conference were you**



- A conference participant
- A member of the program committee/panelist / moderator / speaker


	Percentage	Count
A conference participant	81%	145
A member of the program committee/ panelist / moderator / speaker	19%	34
Respondents		179

## 2. Are you




	Percentage	Count
Male	61%	108
Female	39%	69
	Respondents	177

**3. In which region are you currently based?**



	Percentage	Count
Africa	10.1%	18
Asia	19.6%	35
Europe	35.8%	64
Latin America	19.6%	35
North America/ Australia	15.1%	27
	Respondents	179


**4. What is your primary professional affiliation?**



- Civil society representative - Northern (Europe, North America, Australia/ Singapore/Japan/Korea)
- Civil society representative - Southern (REDD+ countries)
- Government representative - Northern (Europe, North America, Australia/ Singapore/Japan/Korea)
- Government representative - Southern (REDD+ countries)
- Multilateral organization
- Private sector
- Research institution/ University


	Percentage	Count
Civil society representative - Northern (Europe, North America, Australia/ Singapore/Japan/Korea)	15.4%	27
Civil society representative - Southern (REDD+ countries)	23.4%	41
Government representative - Northern (Europe, North America, Australia/ Singapore/Japan/Korea)	14.9%	26
Government representative - Southern (REDD+ countries)	10.9%	19
Multilateral organization	6.3%	11
Private sector	16.6%	29
Research institution/ University	12.6%	22
<b>Respondents</b>		<b>175</b>

**5. Practical information prior to the conference. Please rate the following statements**




	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
It was easy to register for the conference	55.2%	34.3%	4.7%	3.5%	2.3%	4.37	172
It was easy to book the hotel through the conference website	54.5%	31.7%	9.8%	4.1%	0%	4.37	123
I found the information I needed though the conference webpages	42.1%	46.2%	10.5%	1.2%	0%	4.29	171
It was easy to navigate on the conference website	38%	48%	12.3%	1.8%	0%	4.22	171
The conference organizers were quick to answer my e-mails, and I got the information I needed from them.	50%	41.9%	6.1%	2%	0%	4.4	148
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.33</b>	<b>173</b>

**6. Practical information during the conference. Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
It was easy to register for the conference at the venue	67.7%	24.8%	4.3%	2.5%	0.6%	4.57	161
The HelpDesk was available to answer my questions, and I got the information I needed	56.7%	37.3%	3.3%	2.7%	0%	4.48	150
The screens at the conference venue made it easy to navigate the venue	41.8%	35.2%	18.2%	4.8%	0%	4.14	165
There were enough conference staff available to answer questions	41.1%	46.8%	10.8%	1.3%	0%	4.28	158
The security measures were easy to understand and follow	48.8%	38.2%	8.2%	2.9%	1.8%	4.29	170
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.35</b>	<b>171</b>


**7. Did you use the Conference App?**



	Percentage	Count
Yes	62.6%	107
No	37.4%	64
	Respondents	171




**8. The Conference App. Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents	
The Conference App was easy to download	40.6%	42.5%	9.4%	6.6%	0.9%	4.15	106	
The Conference App provided useful information	44.8%	49.5%	1.9%	2.9%	1%	4.34	105	
						Total	4.25	106

**9. What did you use the app for? (Multiple answers possible)**




	Percentage	Count
Program	95.3%	101
Venue layout	26.4%	28
Looking up participants	46.2%	49
Contacting participants.	11.3%	12
Learning more about the panelists and moderators	58.5%	62
Taking notes	5.7%	6
Looking at tweets	12.3%	13
Obtaining practical information about Oslo and travel information	17%	18
Other	0.9%	1
Respondents		106

other


recherche de partenaire et bailleurs des fonds pour la poursuite des activites sur terrain

**10. Did you use interpreters during the conference**




	Percentage	Count
Yes	56.1%	96
No	43.9%	75
	Respondents	171

**11. If you were listening to interpretation in English, for which languages did you use interpretation?**




	Percentage	Count
Spanish	58.1%	50
Portuguese	48.8%	42
French	25.6%	22
Indonesian	29.1%	25
Respondents		86

**12. If you were listening to interpretation from English to another language, what language of interpretation did you use?**




	Percentage	Count
Spanish	31.7%	13
Portuguese	24.4%	10
French	24.4%	10
Indonesian	19.5%	8
Respondents		41

**13. The interpreters. Please rate the following statement**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
The interpretation provided during the sessions I attended was of high quality	36.2%	46.8%	12.8%	3.2%	1.1%	4.14	94
Total						4.14	94


**14. Did you know about the hashtag #OsloREDDX?**



	Percentage	Count
Yes	65.3%	109
No	34.7%	58
	Respondents	167




**15. Did you actively tweet during the conference?**




	Percentage	Count
Yes	29.9%	50
No	70.1%	117
	Respondents	167

**16. Did you know that the sessions were streamed and are available for later viewings at <https://www.norad.no/osloreddx>?**



	Percentage	Count
Yes	74.7%	124
No	25.3%	42
	Respondents	166

**17. Will you watch or refer to the streams in the future?**



	Percentage	Count
Yes	65.5%	110
No	11.3%	19
Don't know	23.2%	39
	Respondents	168

## 18. Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the logistical organization of the conference? (Optional)

### Response

1. It would be good if all participant can get the resources of panelis (by email to partisipants as a learning in future)

2. In conference, it would be good to give the political intervention towards the country become the perpetrators of environmental destruction

A diagram of the room locations would be useful

all good

Apoyo logistico con las aerolineas y de informacion de lugares de cambio de moneda y servicio medico

At least one session with smaller groups, to increase participation of delegates.

At least one warm food would be good. People from south are not used to cold food.

Because I registered late, I faced some challenges to get my registration finalized and this is way my response on the registration was not positive. Overall the logistic was perfect.

better if the security started earlier. Our session started at 08:30 but at 8 am security still checking everything and so hotel staff could not set up the venue with snacks etc

Congratulations for a fantastic and very well organized event!

due to the Hotel strike in Norway, communication with radisson blu scandinavia Hotel prior to the conference was difficult. there was miscommunication between the organisers and the hotel regarding the booking of a venue/break out room for a side event which lead to last minute changes and us having to shift to a different hotel. communication could be improved next time.

every thing is ok except the daily subsistence is too low

Everything was ok

facilitation de visa pour voyager Schengen Oslo

Hotel nights at The Special rate of the conference should be 3, not only 2.

I realize standing allows more people but some more seats would have been easier for some of us

I thought everything was running smoothly but it is necessary to add participants from other countries ts to participate in the meeting

I thought it all went smoothly and the logistics worked.

In future Field visit to forest would be great

invite local indigenous participant musicians in evening venues to share their music/culture

It should be easier to obtain the conference badge the same day as the conference starts.

It was incredibly inconvenient that the delegates needed to arrive before 7.30 am for the 9am start in the morning, especially for those not staying in the hotel.

I live 1 hr outside of Oslo, and did not have the possibility to arrive that early.

It would have been more human to have delegates arrive at 8.30 for a 10am start.

It was not comfortable to check-in and check-out many times at the Thon Hotel.

It was perfect

It was perfectly organized

It was well organized

It will be better if such information venue more clear
It would have been helpful to state on the website to pre-book taxis from the airport as I paid NOK1400 to get to the hotel (not the NOK1000 stated online).
Keep up the excellent work.
Link the participants list to LinkedIn, so that it would be easier to know who was there who i was also LinkedIn with professionally
Logistical organization was AMAZING.
longer registration periods
More panels with program, venue map could be featured in the halls.
More time for audience questions and discussion would be valuable. More time for networking the same.
need some kits of seminars
no
no
No
No
No
No – it was impressive organization
No, I thought it was all brilliantly done, many thanks to you all
nothing
Overall it was fantastic. There was a bit of confusion in preparing for the panel between overlapping instructions from the panel moderator vs. the ORX scientific committee, but this was a minor issue.
Perhaps the "Yes Please" button on the initial invitation email concerning registration could be made larger and located further up the email?
Please next time, make sure that posters sessions and booths are available during the conference. they provide venue for exchanges between participants...
Make sure that side events are well announced/publicized and rooms of these side events well known by the participants.
Pour l'amélioration de la logistique dans l'avenir ,il faut disponibiliser les interprète presque dans toutes les sessions parallèle ou panel ,puisque il y a de place ou il y avait pas de des intrepres et aussi donnée un peu plus de temps pour la conférence
Put introductory statement (prior to PM's opening remarks) on website
Screens to indicate time as well as location of sessions
Switching the one parallel session room to be inside security. The translation booths or other items could have been remote (using that room as an event room as in past REDD Exchanges
The app was slow and often crashed it would be good to have a hardcopy program available if you wanted it- so it could be downloaded.
The bureaucracy for those sponsored were unusual. A contract (!!!) to travel costs reimbursed... what's the point?
The coffee breaks didn't have enough food. Here in Brazil, we are not used to have sandwiches for lunch and the other options didn't have meat. The conference dinner was wonderful.
the Conference app should allow you to directly enter the program after using other programs. as it

was now, you needed to start from the "home page" each time you opened the app and then look up the program and then the relevant session. a bit cumbersome...

The conference dinner was lovely, but a bit long

The logistical organization was excellent

The logistics were well organized!

The translators for French were quite variable in quality – from excellent to marginal. There was a noticeable difference between translators in accuracy and clarity.

There should be clearer information at the venue regarding the program and where the various rooms are located.

to cover accommodation and transport cost to private sector participants as well, especially small companies (startups)


Vegan options were few.

Very complicated security during the second day. Mostly because of a visit by higher official, John Carry. Too expensive to have him, roads closed no in no out!

We could have been provided with much larger choice for hotels. Also, the sudden rise in prices of hotel was disappointing.


We should have one person assign as a contact person from the beginning to the end.

**19. During the conference, which plenary sessions did you attend? (Multiple answers possible)**



	Perc enta ge	Coun t
Welcoming remarks and opening	89.9%	152
First round of voting and Plenary 1: REDD+ Post-Paris: Implementation	89.3%	151
Plenary 2: REDD+ Post-Paris: International partnerships and alliances	77.5%	131
Second round of voting, Secretary Kerry's speech, and Signing of the joint statement between Norway and the USA	81.7%	138
Plenary 3: The way forward and Closing remarks	72.8%	123
None of the above	3%	5
Respondents		169


**20. The plenary sessions. Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
Plenary 1 provided a good overview of the implementation of REDD+ at national and sub-national levels in light of the agreement reached in Paris at COP21.	29.1%	58.9%	9.3%	2.6%	0%	4.74	151
Plenary 2 provided a good overview of how international alliances and partnerships can support national-level implementation of REDD+ in forest-rich countries.	25.4%	53.5%	15.5%	4.9%	0.7%	4.51	142
Plenary 3 provided a good reflection on the way forward in light of the December Paris agreement and discussions held at the 2016 Oslo REDD Exchange.	20%	56.3%	18.5%	5.2%	0%	4.47	135
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.57</b>	<b>161</b>




**21. The voting exercises. Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
The voting exercises were a good use of limited plenary time at the conference	49.1%	31.4%	14.5%	3.1%	1.9%	4.23	159
The technology used during the voting exercise was easy to understand and follow	76.7%	20.8%	1.9%	0%	0.6%	4.73	159
The voting exercise inspired discussions afterwards	32.9%	36.1%	20.9%	9.5%	0.6%	3.91	158
It was interesting to compare the results at the beginning of the conference with the results on Day 2	38.9%	34.9%	16.8%	8.7%	0.7%	4.03	149
The discussion on the voting questions and reflection on the parallel sessions on Day 2 was interesting.	31.1%	37.8%	22.3%	6.8%	2%	3.89	148
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.16</b>	<b>161</b>

**22. The speech by Secretary Kerry and Signing of the Joint Statement on Norway–USA collaboration.**  
**Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
The speech and signing ceremony were a good use of limited plenary time at the conference	36.2%	40.9%	17.4%	2.7%	2.7%	4.05	149
The presence of high-level officials at the conference was worth the inconvenience of extra security	35.1%	39%	16.9%	5.8%	3.2%	3.97	154
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.01</b>	<b>159</b>


### 23. Any comments or suggestions for improvements to the plenary sessions in the conference program? (Optional)

Response

all good
Avoid scary , complicated security issues. No need to invite personalities with high security requirement. Can delegate low level officials.
been very good
Datos de contacto de panelistas y organizaciones de panelistas
I am happy and congratulation for all those involved in organising such a big even without any hick ups that I have noted.
I found alot of speakers did not answer the questions well (World Bank, GEF....) They just answered with what they wanted to talk about. There was not alot of anything NEW discussed at the plenaries. For this audience, it should have been more sophisticated discussion rather than rah-rah from the World Bank and GEF about principles of SD and what they are doing (without any interesting details).
I had thought that gender and women's issues in REDD+ was of high priority but was disappointed that it was very lightly covered by one session (4A) only. And in this session too the moderator did not highlight it. In future suggest having one separate session dedicated to gender issues.
I like the use of panels and limiting interventions and questions from the audience as these are often peripheral and partisan. I thought the system of written questions piloted last time was good – it allows grouping and exclusion of the marginally relevant. Could be worth using again in future
I thought they were a bit lacking in content. Maybe giving the panel members a stronger steer on what to prepare would improve this
I would have appreciated a more detailed account of the whole NICFI program – but perhaps I missed that in a session I did not attend.
In future more time should be allocated to participants from the floor to ask questions to the panel.
In general, panel discussions were a bit boring and too rigidly staged. It would have been interesting to see more discussion/dialogue directly between panelists. In general, too little tension and Dynamics in the discussions. panelists should be challenged to a larger degree.
le temps est court
More on finance for REDD and on the ground experience of REDD projects, their challenges and opportunities could be featured next time.
More researchers/scientists.
more space for on the groung projects and REDD Programs
more speakers from community based leaders working on REDD+
needed to complete the tv monitor
Next time, please give room for Research and Implementing organizations working on agriculture... it was good to have some representative of value chains, but it will be good to broader the stakeholders involved in Agriculture sector to share experience and lessons related to deforestation....
No
No
No


No one
No, it was excellent except of the voting nonsense and the signing of the treaty which made me almost lose my flight
nothing
See previous– more discussion with the audience would make them more interesting.
Stronger linkage with specific ongoing or emerging programs would be helpful rather than generalities.
that was good
The Conference is too short to talk about so many issues. Maybe it could have 3 days.
The moderators should do a better job at summarizing comments from panelists and stimulating discussion between the panelists. Some moderators were better than others at this.
The panelists needed to understand that responses must not be strictly tied to direct questions..
The plenary sessions did not go much into depth about the main challenges for implementing REDD+ and related aspects. We know that there is a lot of controversies and different positions, and it is important to touch upon these to actually be able to move forward
The plenary sessions were well organized.
The presence of Kerry and the signing of the agreement was interesting but nobody could explain what actually was agreement about.
The quality of some of the interventions was poor with use of jargon–eg national development plan, mainstreaming green growth, redd strategy which meant difficult to understand what concrete actions are being taken to reduce deforestation
They were very good!
Toujours par rapport au temps il faut donnée et pour la technooogie c'est bien
Voting was a time filler and reflect audience not necessarily what happens in the real world so gives a false sense if reality
voting was really cool
Was great

**24. Which parallel sessions did you attend during Day 1? (Multiple answers possible)**




	Percentage	Count
Parallel 1A: Brazil: Can REDD+ contribute to sustaining the miracle into a second decade?	41%	59
Parallel 1B: Indonesia: Can business-as-usual deforestation be confronted and reversed?	32.6%	47
Parallel 1C: REDD+ in the Green Economy: Transforming the forest sector in Ethiopia and Liberia	21.5%	31
Parallel 2A: Domestic and international options for results-based finance: Reasons for optimism?	45.1%	65
Parallel 2B: REDD+ and Peace Processes: How can they be mutually supportive?	20.8%	30
Parallel 2C: Advancing IPs' Rights through REDD+	22.9%	33
Respondents		144

**25. Which parallel sessions did you attend during Day 2? (Multiple answers possible)**



	Percentage	Count
Parallel 3A: REDD+ in the Mayan region of Mexico: Can subnational programs be effectively linked with national results?	29.9%	44
Parallel 3B: Kalimantan, Indonesia: What are the prospects for transformational change in land-use?	31.3%	46
Parallel 3C: Mai Ndombe, DRC: Progressing toward payment for performance	28.6%	42
Parallel 4A: Lessons from place-based initiatives: Finance, tenure, and linkages to national programs	23.1%	34
Parallel 4B: Jurisdictional implementation of supply chain commitments	29.9%	44
Parallel 4C: Practical Tools for Monitoring and Implementation	31.3%	46
Respondents		147

**26. How did you select which parallel sessions to attend? (Multiple answers possible)**



	Percentage	Count
I selected sessions featuring topics most relevant to my work	90.9%	140
I selected sessions focused on countries and regions of most interest to me	61%	94
I selected session focused on topics or countries and regions unfamiliar to me in order to learn more	11%	17
I selected sessions based on specific moderators and panelists	11%	17
I served as a moderator or a panelist	12.3%	19
Other (please specify)	3.9%	6
<b>Respondents</b>		<b>154</b>

other (please specify)

countries more pioneer/model/transformational approach than others
--

I was asked to present
------------------------


Reporting responsibility
--------------------------

Session which were more technical were of interest.
---

Was responsible for the session
---------------------------------




**27. The Parallel sessions. Please rate the following statements**




	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
The parallel sessions provided an opportunity to learn about new perspectives and experiences relevant to the future of REDD+	38.4%	51%	7.3%	3.3%	0%	4.25	151
The parallel sessions helped me to identify the most important ways to forward REDD+	24.3%	43.2%	27%	4.7%	0.7%	3.89	148
The parallel sessions helped me to identify individuals and organizations that can be helpful in my work going forward	29.1%	54.1%	12.8%	3.4%	0.7%	4.1	148
Total						4.08	151

**28. Did you attend side-events occurring before or after the conference?**




	Percentage	Count
Yes	57.9%	92
No	42.1%	67
	Respondents	159

**29. Did you have meetings with partners in the sidelines of the conference?**



	Percentage	Count
Yes	93.6%	147
No	6.4%	10
	Respondents	157

**30. Networking and side-meetings. Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
The side-events were a good way of learning more about REDD+ related issues	41.7%	41.7%	15%	1.7%	0%	4.23	120
The meetings were a good way of moving the REDD+ work you are involved in forward	40.8%	49%	9.5%	0.7%	0%	4.3	147
The new contacts made at the conference will be valuable for your future REDD+ work	45.5%	46.1%	7.8%	0%	0.6%	4.36	154
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.3</b>	<b>156</b>

### 31. Any comments or suggestions for improvements to the parallel sessions in the conference program or side events? (Optional)

Response

all good
Also privilege gender issues; Include more countries and REDD+ champions; organise platforms for exchange of materials and learning from different orgs.
Better marketing.
COngratulations on the wonderful job ! Amazing opportunity to move the agenda forward.
Ensure better prepared and higher quality more detailed presentations overall. Some of the presentations were to general, even in policy approaches. Monitoring panel was good
I met several new people from other institutions and agencies with work related to REDD
I organised a parallel session. The organisers of REDDEX were realyl helpful in facilitating it,as were the hotel staff.
I was very disappointed that the structured networking was cancelled.
I ws interested in all the sessions but there were time clashes ..i am not sure how this can be improved but perhaps have a three day conference so i can miss less sessions :)
il faudrait organiser une série formation sur les questions pratique de la REDD+ c'est dire les outils de mise en œuvre de la REDD
Il faut disponibiliser les interpretes dans tout les pannel
In order to be able to bring ideas for innovation it will be interesting to share the time between the debates and reflections and also experiences and metodologies presentations.
It is important to get good moderators who understand the topic well and are good at moderating. There should be more time available for questions from the audience and the people asking questions should keep their questions or comments short.
it would be good to make a special team official REDD to discuss about the issues of REDD in each focus area of participants (exactly in working area)
locating them in the same hotel is much better
Mix some "formal" presentations in with the "panel dialog" format that was used.
More interactive sessions could have been of more worth to participants. It was sometimes becoming closed discussion. Questions were allowed only for a short time leaving many disappointed and unparticipated.
More private sector representation, including financial institutions and the investment community. How do they see REDD+? What conditions in country and on the ground do they need to see in order to invest in preservation? Is there a role for the financial markets to invest in forest preservation? If so, what it is?
More time for questions.
needed some leaflets
Next time, please give room for Research and Implementing organizations, or others stakeholders working on agriculture–forest interface.
no
No
No
No one

Not alot of new ground covered in many of the parallel sessions.

nothing

Panelists should be challenged to a larger degree by the moderators, and dialogue and discussions should be encouraged between panelists. Too little tension and Dynamics in the panelists. the set-up was a bit boring, with a round of talks, then two rounds of questions to each panelist by the moderator, before questions could come from the floor. This did not stimulate interesting discussions. The moderators were in general a bit too "kind", and should to a larger degree ask follow-up questions, Challenge claims and stimulate discussions.

Presentasjon of land restoration projects in REDD context

Security changes aside (which were understandable) the highlighting of certain side events was inconsistent and unclear on which were selected and which weren't. As someone strongly linked into the organizing of two of the events posted on the official site, it remains untransparent whether the ability to submit these for consideration was an option, and in parallel, it was discovered by chance on the event site without being aware it was posted in one case (as a closed meeting).

session on lessons learned and addressing challenges to REDD+ implementation

The content could have been more interesting. More often than not, the questions asked by the moderator were good, but the participants were possibly not the correct ones to answer them . Discussions were often very general


The more time should be allocated to participants from the floor to ask questions or provide comments to the panel

The schedule was very tied; this makes it difficult to attend the side events. In the future, it would be nice to have one more day for the conference so that side events can be planned at reasonable time.

the sessions had not moved on from where we were 3 years ago. You need to address some of the current and critical issues and challenges the status quo

they were great in terms of format and content. cant be any better.

**32. Overall impression of the sessions at the conference. Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
The introductory videos were useful to set the tone for the session topics	40.3%	46.1%	12.3%	1.3%	0%	4.25	154
The introductory 5-minute framing remarks provided a useful introduction	35.1%	54.5%	9.7%	0.6%	0%	4.24	154
The moderators were skillful at posing questions to panelists	45.2%	45.8%	7.7%	1.3%	0%	4.35	155
The panelists provided concise interventions with interesting information and insights	25.3%	61%	10.4%	2.6%	0.6%	4.1	154
I enjoyed the informal "Davos style" panels and limited use of PowerPoint presentations	46.4%	38.6%	12.4%	2%	0.7%	4.31	153
There was enough time for questions and comments from the audience during the sessions	14.9%	43.5%	25.3%	14.3%	1.9%	3.63	154
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.15</b>	<b>155</b>

### 33. In your opinion, which topics were not sufficiently covered in the conference program or discussed in the sessions you attended?

#### Response

1. Conflicts and conflict resolution during REDD+ implementation. 2. Problematic issues that REDD+ has been criticised for (e.g. tenure issues, some indigenous peoples' critics) and what are the answers to those critics).

1. Straightening community model in land conservation  
2. Sharing the solution about the role models in adaptation and mitigation program from panelist

1. Cross linkage between REDD+ and newly established INDCs with respect to MRV.  
2. Methodology for verification of results/performance.  
3. Links between MRV and transparency, including communications, both domestic and international.

A good mix of topics

Acciones de política del sector agrícola y modernización. Alianzas público privadas para el desarrollo rural sostenible, rendimientos de inversión y potencialidades de inversión privada en otros países para el desarrollo de proyectos rentables Redd+

adaptation issues, food, water and the role of women as part of our climate change challenges

adapté les présentations aux réalités du terrain selon les régions

Breakthroughs in science of tropical forests

Community MRV, safeguards

Critical analysis of the current approach to REDD+; what is required to relay engage private sector investment; how to design innovative financing tools; the role of emissions regulation and carbon markets

Disproportionate focus on sub-national implementation vs. national

Energy

Carbon trading mechanisms

Estratégia Nacional de REDD+ dos diferentes países presentes, para que fosse possível fazer uma avaliação e comparação entre elas.

Everything were ok

Finance for Redd

Finance: types, size and availability

Financing REDD+ at national level was not covered

MRV for non-carbon benefits was limited

Gender and Women issues and opportunities

Gender/women related issues were very little addressed!

Governance issues within REDD+ countries, and how REDD+ programs are effective (or not) at addressing them.

Green economy and more structural issues around REDD+.

How to deal with private sector and vested interests in business as usual. The private sector reps were all "good guys" already on the zero-deforestation track, which is good, but there should be more discussions on how to Challenge or engage less progressive private sector actors to take the same direction.

I missed a balanced overview of the implementation process in different countries, including the



hurdles.
I tend to like charts with new findings of what is working and what is not – which usually needs to be accompanied by charts which doesn't happen as well in the Davos style. Too many speakers didn't really say anything new or interesting.
I think all the sessions very interesting
I will had love to have more details on some challenges in reducing deforestation at the ground level. so next time give more time for realities at the jurisdictional levels.... for example how Agriculture and Forest sectors (Environment, Protected area, etc...) are working together at the local/meso level to reduce deforestation?
i would have liked more on legality issues (forest crimes).
I would have liked to see more on linking REDD+ and FLEGT – which I think is insufficiently prioritised despite the commonalities. I would also have liked a little more clear emphasis on the way REDD+ has evolved since Bali. Too many of the people I encounter who are dealing with REDD+ seem unaware that things have moved since Bali!
Implementation and finance
Indigenous peoples rights and participation and challenges needed to be highlighted. What was missing was a focus on States criminalisation of environmental and human rights defenders.. focus also needed to be oh how States can revisit their development models perhaps in areas of strengthening due diligence and holding them accountable where prosecution and murders of environmental and human rights defenders occur.
It is more a challenge of getting sufficient depth for people work on the topic.
It seemed like the program participants discussed the need for the private sector in the REDD space but detailed discussions about how that would play out were lacking. I think the private sector should have been more represented on panels. For the most part, it was NGO, civil society, forest communities and government. Those perspectives are all important to represent but a private sector perspective would have been a nice complement/counterpoint, especially considering that everyone tends to agree that public funding will be insufficient to meet the challenge of deforestation.
Le mode de partenariat et les suivis acquis de la conférence sur le terrain
Lessons learned and addressing key challenges to REDD+ i.e. land tenure, good governance, role of the private sector
Limited time for questions and answers
Mining and shale gas as main problem to achieve best results to protect forest
more discussing on finance and the role of the private sector
More info on implementation on the field will be welcomed
Na
need to mention about how far the real result on the ground
no
None
nothing
partnerships and regulations
Place based activities or projects are the way forward for implementing REDD and didn't think they were covered enough
Practical challenges on the ground in constructing and maintaining partnership for resilient REDD projects

Private sector action in supply chains

Private sector financing through credit lines. Effectively packaging different types of finance (e.g. credit, subsidies, grants, results-based payments, etc). How to reach scale even though, in many REDD+ countries, small-holders are the predominant landowners/users.

Private sector inclusion

Private sector's involvement or contribution

REDD+ Forest carbon and emissions monitoring and reporting, data methodology

Restoration.

Public subsidies (despite Swapan's intervention in the financing discussion). Build this out.

Scientific capacity building. To sustain the initiative there is a need of local capacity building. I belong to an organisation that supports young research, to do research in their own country and create a critical mass for knowledge creation and continuation of any project programs that come from outside. This is completely missing from the program and it is something that needs serious thinking if we want to bring lasting change.

Subnational and national REDD+ initiative linkages

Subsidies, policies and agencies that drive deforestation eg Ministries of Agriculture and Commerce, agricultural credit, trade subsidies, procurement policies, approaches to clarifying forest and land tenure and rights

Technical aspects of REDD+ like MRV, remote sensing techniques, REDD fund flow mechanisms, REDD mechanism to evolve after Paris agreement. Also forest degradation aspects and non-carbon benefits were largely lacking in discussions.

The Amazonian Indigenous REDD+ (RIA) proposal

The future of REDD, expansion to other biomes.

The key, underlying driving forces and what to do with these were insufficiently covered

The plenary sessions were too overall and discussions could have been more focused.


The role for private sector, including the financial community. Commodity supply chains will not address the totality of the private sector role in solving the deforestation challenge.

The variety of REDD initiatives and how they evolved over time; the shifts in donor perspective

What are the implications for REDD+ in the context of the Paris Agreement?

What happens when REDD+ go on scale (e.g. International institutions, such as WB, BioCarbon fund that mainstream REDD+ at national level)- are we missing out on diversity of approaches and experiences? How to ensure that local models are nested and integrated? What to do with the part of private sector that is not in favour of REDD+, tenure rights etc? More critical view on financing and market mechanism – is all finance good?

**34. What are your impressions after Oslo REDD Exchange 2016? Please rate the following statements**



	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Average	Respondents
I learned a lot from following the discussions during the sessions	29.2%	49.4%	19.5%	1.9%	0%	4.06	154
I learned a lot from talking with other participants outside the sessions	38.3%	51.3%	10.4%	0%	0%	4.28	154
I will use what I have learned during the conference in the future	39%	52.6%	7.8%	0.6%	0%	4.3	154
I met a lot of new and interesting people and learned of their organizations during the conference	40%	46.5%	12.3%	1.3%	0%	4.25	155
The discussions and lessons learned will influence how I work in the future	31.6%	47.1%	19.4%	1.3%	0.6%	4.1	155
I would give priority to attending another Oslo REDD Exchange conference in the future	56.5%	34.4%	8.4%	0%	0.6%	4.49	154
<b>Total</b>						<b>4.25</b>	<b>155</b>

### 35. Overall comments or suggestions for improvements? (Optional)

#### Response

1 Prevoir les interpretes des toutes les langues dans tout le panel  
2Donnee un plus de temps pour la onference  
3 Donnee la change a tout les de donner leur experience sur le REDD

1. The screen is great  
2. Panelist was give the good knowledge in all aspect and implementation REDD  
3. The conference advise the good information that can be learned and usefull to participant in work in future  
3. It greatfull in management of official team in held the great conference of Oslo REDD Exchange  
4. The best of regulation for time management and schedule to participant  
5. That was a great room in conference  
6. That was a great security that advise by team official conference

A huge congratulations to Norad, Frances Seymour, the members of the scientific committee, the logistics organizers, and the moderators for a first-class event!

A three day workshop would have been super

A very good conference, but more critical dialogue needed. For this reason, I enjoyed the Indonesia session on day one the most.

Better representation from private sector

Congrats to the Norad team! An excellent conference.

Congratulations and thanks a lot!!

Congratulations on the Amazing work.

It seems from the mix of people in the audience that more people from private sector should be invited.

Excellent

fantastic conference – good job to all the organizers!

formation spécifique sur les thématiques qui étaient exposées

Good conference

Great job and event.

I found the Oslo REDD Exchange an extremely well organized event, with substantial content, where women´s voices and indigenous peoples participation were really included. My very sincere congratulations!! My hope for forest permanence in this planet has become higher after the meeting, thank you for that!

I have attended last years ORE and this one, this one was extremely good. I liked the focus on key issues and mix of conference tools and the very comfortable atmosphere. Really well done

I recommend adding an excursion (e.g. on forestry in Norway) informed in advance to all participants. Not all knew about excursion organised by Norwegian Forestry Group after the official program.

I thought everything was run very well

I thought it was a great idea to have a conference focused just on REDD with a variety of participants from different perspectives. My only comment relates to the participation of the private sector, which could have been increased in my opinion. As the private sector will be important to engage to address deforestation, more discussion about what that means, how it will

be implemented and what should be avoided would be excellent. We have learned a lot from the CDM about how the private sector can be mobilized and also pitfalls to avoid. I would love to see more detailed discussions about private sector and REDD in a future REDD Exchange. Beyond that, I thought the conference was well-run, informative and a good use of limited time.

I truly don't think I have the capacity to give suggestions for improvements since the conference was so well organised and the Chairperson, Frances Seymour professionalism was so effective and efficient. I admired how she presented thematic areas and the way she presented her questions to the panelists. I want to thank the Norwegian government for sponsoring me to participate as a panelist since we realised in the organisation that it was going to be too costly for us to participate. I am ever more energised in working to ensure the rights of indigenous peoples are protected in the development plans of our country and the conference has provided me with much needed networking both at the national and international level. I hope the next REDD Exchange takes place sooner than later. Best wishes always!!

Impressive technology, excellent organization, rich content and potent symbolism. An excellent event. Well done Norway!

It was very interesting event. I suggest more influential people like John Kerry from different continents to participate in the future REDD conference

more balance representation of participants from key actors including community-based leaders, southern voice from Africa; inclusion of gender issues as a session and or in the plenary; more thought provoking questions/discussions in the plenary sessions; perhaps include open sessions with no designated speakers but only moderators/facilitators

More clarity on the panelist support. Hotel booking according to the flight schedule. Difficulty of extending stay in the Hotel (Ping pong between organization and Hotel)

More time and opportunity for networking. Longer coffee breaks etc.

Multi-stakeholder country panels are a good idea. But perhaps fewer speakers per panelist, deeper presentation by each speaker. There were a lot of organisations either receiving project funding or seeking funding which made the "outside" networking a bit strange. Need to broaden the community of practice beyond the "clique"

no

No

None. It was an impressive conference, one of the best I have attended, and I really appreciate the effort the hosts put in to making it work. Perhaps I could suggest having them more often? Every 2 years perhaps? And perhaps having one part of it dedicated to understanding how NICFI works as an overall programme.

Oslo REDD Exchange should not take place while there is a European Football Cup or World Cup (2018!!!)

OSLO REDD+ Exchange 2016 has been a great success! Thank you very much!

Please add science capacity building by supporting young talented research from the developing countries.

Please repeat it every 2 years

Professional with goodwill running through every aspect

Side events were not informed in advance. They could be posted on conference website. Some basic discussion on emerging MRV systems, existing and proposed REDD fund flow mechanisms, challenge of measuring forest degradation and financing through REDD+, estimates on potential and available REDD finance, etc would improve productivity of conference.

Also, there is no list of participants on the website yet. Can you please post the list with email IDs and phone numbers so that we can interact among each other. Thank you very much for your invitation and assistance and best wishes for future. It was a memorable and worth attending conference.

Thanks for all

The "Davos" style panels are good in principle... but it turned to be too prepared, to organized, leaving no space for spontaneity... So we tend to lose the "details/thoroughness" that we can get with powerpoint presentations, without compensating so much by inspiring and spontaneous experiences...

Otherwise, the event was excellent, very well prepared, and extremely relevant to direct action in the future... Importantly, it is not so much a place for technical excellence and comprehensiveness, but a unique opportunity to set a "political landmark" and sport key messages and approaches that are expected to become references in the future... and being there to feel these messages is unvaluable.

The conference adopts a very "Norwegian" view of REDD+ and fails to address many of the very current issues facing REDD+. The lack of private sector engagement is also an issue as there is a call for private finance to help with REDD but not a proper engagement of that sector. There is too much focus on supply chains as well. Also some more focus on challenging the current approaches and blue sky thinking beyond the status quo is important. Nonetheless, Norway's efforts and the REDD+ Exchange must be congratulated and commended.

the conference was hold successfully and results the best impacts in the future

The event was very well organized. I enjoyed very much all the moments. I wish there was more time of Conference.

The informal panels are good but they should be alternated with other formats, such as presentations.

The one difficulty I had with the Conference website is it was very difficult to print out the program schedule. Since I did not use the conference app, I would have liked to have a paper copy that I could consult and scribble notes on. So having a pdf that would print easily would be a plus.

the organizing committee can continue to select the speakers and participants for the plenaries and sessions, but it will be good to keep the posters session, booth exposition, side events and be flexible so that stakeholders can organized their event in the same building as the main event.

June is a good time for the year also. please keep the same date, the same venue, etc..

Please do not forget Agriculture (not only perennial crops, but also food crops and their linkage with effort to reduce deforestation....) in the next agenda...

Please keep also the balance between researchers/scientists, decision makers, civil society, private sector, etc... but continue to invite VIP ( Ex John Kerry) during the plenaries

Thanks for this nice event

The REDD Exchange is a very important and rare opportunity to bring together a large number of the key actors working on REDD. I look forward to the next one.

The team of organiser well than the work. You should organise UNFCCC COP with success!

This event should continued

This was the best of the three REDD Exchange meetings to date. Keep it up, please!

To invite participants proportionally next time.


Very stimulating and successful conference. But I felt it was bit exclusive in terms of the participating countries/participants and topics covered e.g. gender was largely underprivileged and missing.

Very well organized and fantastic evening on the first day.

was really good. 2 days is enough. Oslo is a good venue

We need experiences from grassroots actors, local communities and IPs at the project levels to speak out their experiences as well, and more space for side events. If possible three days with a whole for ice events would be great

### Respondents over time



Recipients	Not reachable	Respondents	Response frequency
503	5	179	35.9%