

UN-REDD PROGRAMME



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.



Workshop report

*National Workshop on
REDD+ Safeguards, Paro,
Bhutan, October 2015*

[UN-REDD PROGRAMME](#)

Final Report: January 2016

The UN-REDD Programme is the United Nations Collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD) in developing countries. The Programme was launched in September 2008 to assist developing countries prepare and implement national REDD+ strategies, and builds on the convening power and expertise of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

The United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) is the specialist biodiversity assessment centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the world's foremost intergovernmental environmental organisation. The Centre has been in operation for over 30 years, combining scientific research with practical policy advice.

Editor: Elina Väänänen

Copyright: UNEP 2015

Copyright release: This publication may be reproduced for educational or non-profit purposes without special permission, provided acknowledgement to the source is made. Re-use of any figures is subject to permission from the original rights holders. No use of this publication may be made for resale or any other commercial purpose without permission in writing from UNEP. Applications for permission, with a statement of purpose and extent of reproduction, should be sent to the Director, UNEP-WCMC, 219 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK.

Disclaimer: The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of UNEP, contributory organisations or editors. The designations employed and the presentations of material in this report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNEP or contributory organisations, editors or publishers concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city area or its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries or the designation of its name, frontiers or boundaries. The mention of a commercial entity or product in this publication does not imply endorsement by UNEP. Should readers wish to comment on this document, they are encouraged to get in touch via: ccb@unep-wcmc.org.

Citation: Väänänen, E. (ed.) (2016). *Workshop report: National Workshop on REDD+ Safeguards, Paro, Bhutan, October 2015*. Prepared by UNEP-WCMC on behalf of the UN-REDD Programme, Geneva.

Acknowledgements: We thank the Department of Forests and Park Services, the Technical Working Group on REDD+ Safeguards and Benefit Sharing as well as members of other REDD+ Technical Working Groups for their contributions to the national workshop and to this report. We also thank Thomas Enters (UNEP), Blaise Bodin (UNEP-WCMC), Celina Yong (UNDP) and Jennifer Laughlin (UNDP) for serving as resource persons at the workshop and for their contributions to this report.



UNEP



WCMC

UN-REDD
PROGRAMME



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

UNEP promotes environmentally sound practices globally and in its own activities. Our distribution policy aims to reduce UNEP's carbon footprint. Consider the environment before printing this publication.

Contents

1. Summary	2
2. Workshop overview	2
2.1 Day 1: Country approaches to safeguards and the context of REDD+ in Bhutan.....	2
2.2 Day 2: Identifying benefits and risks in the context of the Cancun safeguards.....	3
2.3 Day 3: Analysing PLRs in the context of the Cancun safeguards	4
2.4 Day 4: Next steps in filling gaps in PLRs and implementing Bhutan’s road map for safeguards	5
2.5 Day 5: Communicating results	7
3. Workshop evaluation.....	8
Annex 1: Workshop agenda	9
Annex 2: List of participants	13
Annex 3: Workshop results – Identifying benefits and risks.....	14
Annex 4: Workshop results – Analysing policies, laws and regulations (PLRs).....	21

1. Summary

The five-day 'National Workshop on REDD+ Safeguards' was held between 5 and 9 October 2015 at Namsay Chholing Resort in Paro, Bhutan, as part of Bhutan's REDD+ Readiness Process. The workshop was organized by the Watershed Management Division (WMD) of the Department of Forests and Park Services, in collaboration with the UN-REDD Programme, as part of UNEP's targeted support to Bhutan on REDD+ safeguards. The workshop was attended by 20 participants, including 2 women, and involved the participation of the Technical Working Group on Safeguards, Governance and Benefit Distribution (TWGSGBD).

Building on an initial review of policies, laws and regulations (PLRs) relevant to REDD+ safeguards, a draft road map document on Bhutan's approach to REDD+ safeguards and the results of a 2012 UN-REDD Programme workshop on safeguards, the workshop had the following objectives:

1. Support participants in understanding UNFCCC decisions on safeguards for REDD+ (the 'Cancun safeguards') and what they mean for Bhutan
2. Identify where the activities covered in the workshop fit in the process of developing a country approach to safeguards
3. Progress development of a country approach to safeguards by identifying benefits and risks of REDD+ actions in the context of the Cancun safeguards
4. Building on the review of relevant policies, laws and regulations (PLRs) compiled by the Watershed Management Division, determine how Bhutan's existing PLRs already address the benefits and risks identified
5. Identify any gaps and conflicts in the PLR framework in relation to the Cancun safeguards and consider how gaps could be filled
6. Agree on tentative outline/structure of road map to country led approach for REDD+ safeguards for Bhutan
7. Identify next steps in developing a country approach to safeguards in Bhutan

The workshop participants identified benefits and risks of Bhutan's potential REDD+ actions in the context of the Cancun safeguards and assessed how Bhutan's existing PLRs already address the benefits and risks of these potential actions. Participants also identified gaps in the PLR framework in relation to the Cancun safeguards and considered measures to mitigate risks and enhance benefits. The workshop also recommended next steps in developing a country approach to safeguards and presented results from the workshop to a broader group of stakeholders, including members of the other technical working groups.

2. Workshop overview

2.1 Day 1: Country approaches to safeguards and the context of REDD+ in Bhutan

Following a key note address by the Director General of the Department of Forests and Park Services, the first day of the workshop set the context for the benefits and risks assessment and the PLR analysis.

Sigyel Delma, the national REDD+ coordinator, gave an overview of existing REDD+ readiness efforts and the vision for the future REDD+ strategy, followed by Tashi Samdrup's presentation on the objectives of Bhutan's approach to safeguards and draft road map on national REDD+ safeguards.

A UN-REDD Programme presentation focused on the content of the Cancun safeguards and the UNFCCC requirements on safeguards. A presentation on UN-REDD Programme support on developing country approaches to safeguards, included a discussion on links to the World Bank SESA/ESMF, run jointly with Dora Cudjoe, a representative of the World Bank. The plenary discussion that ensued communicated the complementarity of the UNFCCC safeguards requirements and those of the World Bank to the workshop participants. Ms Cudjoe also highlighted the utility of the Benefits and Risks Tool (BeRT) in flagging the potential positive and negative impacts of REDD+ actions, with results that would be complementary to the SESA process.

After an overview of the BeRT and the workshop structure, the afternoon centred on discussion of Bhutan's candidate REDD+ actions and linking them to the REDD+ activities as defined by the UNFCCC. The discussion illustrated that while many of the R-PP's actions were likely to be relevant to a future REDD+ strategy, further clarity on drivers of deforestation and forest degradation was needed before a complete list of priority actions could be developed. In the absence of this information, before a drivers study is completed (scheduled to start in November 2015 with FCPF support), a preliminary list of priority actions for analysis was collated with the guidance of the WMD (See Annex 3, Table 1).

2.2 Day 2: Identifying benefits and risks in the context of the Cancun safeguards

Day 2 of the workshop focused on identification of the benefits and risks of five broad priority REDD+ actions, also known as Policies and Measures (PAMs): the scientific management of forest; conservation of forest landscapes and biodiversity; strengthening stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation; strengthening law enforcement to reduce illegal forest offences; and reducing (halting where possible) the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. Divided into an environmental and a social group, participants used the content (key issues and guiding questions) and structure of the BeRT in this analysis.



Figure 1: Workshop participants discussing the benefits and risks of candidate REDD+ actions, also known as REDD+ Policies and Measures (PAMs)

The environmental group covered all five actions for safeguards e) and f), while the social group covered safeguards a), b), c) and d) for two REDD+ actions. Annex 3 lists the benefits and risks identified in relation to the REDD+ actions for each safeguard considered.

Workshop participants highlighted that it was important to prioritise benefits and risks, and that the assessment of probability and impact of benefits and risks identified is a useful element of the analysis.

2.3 Day 3: Analysing PLRs in the context of the Cancun safeguards

Risk/Benefits	Relevant PLRs and amendment of coverage	Mitigat/enhancement-measures / changes in PLR on its implementation
R ₁ (e) Risk mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HWC strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigates range HWC through focused interventions. Jump in progress. First developed in 2011. NFP 2011 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigating & managing HWC in Congo landscapes. Integrates HWC as part of FP. NBSAP 2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentions HWC as a critical conservation challenge. TTS on genetic diversity T3 positive initiatives. National guidance adoption. Bhutan Biological Conservation Center complex <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sets the basis for corridors that are a source of HWC. pp defined by law. Status of corridors unclear → in progress. NEPA 2007 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> supports the establishment of Conservation Landscapes for which there is higher risk of HWC. Some activities are restricted in these landscapes. → effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of risk through improved integrated planning. Zoning of PA network in progress. inclusion of local population in the zoning of PAs within their existing limits. Consider established on basis of wildlife movement and could impact more significantly on development of social work. land allocation under forest act and forest act could be done in ways that reduce HWC incidence → address the financial gaps. Mitigate HWC through better design of measures. more research, national legislation, performance measures in that strategy + more research into social dimensions of HWC. Managing the risk through improved compensation of impacts. streamlining of local breeds and good breeding practices. → rely on capacity of the NBC and its partners. Insurance scheme for farmers should be improved.
Risk mitigation/compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NBiodiv Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> keeps a record of local varieties and breeds and promote on farm - not for agriculture biodiversity. 	
Risk reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Act & Forest Act <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Allow for doing private forest Ministry increase of interaction with wildlife. 	

Figure 2: Notes from PLR analysis for safeguard e) on natural forest, biodiversity and enhancement of social and environmental benefits

Day 3 was dedicated to the PLR analysis. Dr. Lungten Norbu started the day with an overview of the initial review of PLRs that was compiled prior to the workshop.

The environmental and social groups continued with the benefits and risks identified the previous day, to assess how existing PLRs address them. The environmental group used prioritisation based on probability and impacts to choose the most pertinent benefits and risks for analysis. Groups also identified gaps in PLR coverage, including the need for a better understanding of their effectiveness.

Groups also considered how gaps could be filled. The PLR analysis gave way to a broader discussion on how to mitigate risks and enhance benefits through the design of REDD+ actions themselves and participants suggested measures to enhance benefits and minimise risks identified. Annex 4 includes the results for this analysis.

During the PLR analysis the social group identified several relevant PLRs that were in the process of being reviewed and amended. The group saw that it is easier to introduce amendments or gap filling measures to a PLR when it is already in the process of being revised

(rather than proposing a change be made solely to address safeguards). Considering this, the TWG may wish to prioritize a review of those PLRs which are in the process of being reviewed or amended, in order to ensure recommendations arising from the PLR review can be considered and accommodated during the revision process.

2.4 Day 4: Next steps in filling gaps in PLRs and implementing Bhutan's road map for safeguards

Day 4 of the workshop focused on lessons learned and challenges faced as well as next steps in developing the country approach to safeguards. Groups discussed the benefits and risks assessment and PLR analysis exercises and provided valuable feedback on the approach and the BeRT, including what worked well and what could be improved on. Recommendations from the workshop will be incorporated in the tool in the coming weeks. Participants also discussed additional information needs and identified next steps for developing a country approach to safeguards in Bhutan.

In discussions on the approach, participants emphasized the utility of the analysis of benefits and risks of REDD+ actions – it can inform how actions are prioritized for the National REDD+ Strategy and how they are designed for implementation.

Participants pointed out that at times the distinction between a risk and a benefit was not clear-cut. The guiding questions for identifying benefits and risks were found helpful but participants saw that going beyond them was necessary to ensure that other risks and benefits are not overlooked. It was also noted that participation of a wider group of relevant stakeholders can ensure a more complete assessment of the pertinent risks and benefits. One of the groups saw that the involvement of a broader stakeholder group should follow a preliminary screening of the relevant issues to ensure that stakeholder input is well-targeted. Undertaking stakeholder mapping that reviews government, non-government and local actors could ensure more systematic stakeholder engagement and allow for improved consistency in stakeholder participation. The Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines developed with support from UN-REDD Programme were seen as a valuable resource on how to engage with communities on safeguards.

Involving members of the other technical working groups (TWGs) was a key recommendation from the workshop. It was seen necessary to think further on how to systematically engage members of other TWGs in light of the upcoming drivers study with implications on potential policies and measures. WMD may also need to review the composition of the TWGs, and incorporate representatives from other stakeholder groups such as civil society.

The question arose: what to do when there are conflicting benefits and risks between safeguards and how should trade-offs be addressed to ensure a balanced approach? Recognizing the associated challenge, the conclusion was reached that the probability and impact of the associated risks and benefits needed to be considered as well as their significance for the REDD+ activities. In seeking to reconcile any conflict, measures to address both the benefits and risks should also be considered.

Participants commended the initial PLR review prepared by WMD. It was noted that due to the draft form of the review, some questions still remain on the content of the relevant PLRs and their coverage. It was pointed out that the PLR analysis could benefit from clearer criteria for determining whether a PLR is being implemented or enforced effectively. Development of such criteria need to be considered in further analysis of the legal and policy framework.

Participants further recommended ensuring the input of legal experts in future PLR analysis, as legal expertise could be particularly valuable for the interpretation of legal text. Involving ministry representatives, involved with the implementation or enforcement of the relevant PLR, was also seen necessary.

The workshop highlighted the synergies between different REDD+ processes, demonstrating how different work streams can become more connected. It was seen necessary to ensure close

collaboration between work on safeguards and the development of the National Strategy and the National Forest Monitoring System. Participants also saw the Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines and the Corruption Risk Assessment, recently developed with the support of the UN-REDD Programme, as valuable resources to inform safeguards work.

The workshop identified the following next steps for further developing a country approach to safeguards in Bhutan:

- 1) Drivers study to inform selection of priority REDD+ actions (ToR developed)
- 2) Benefit and risk assessment to inform selection of priority REDD+ actions and their design
- 3) Then come back to draft PLR review:
 - a. Include additional PLRs, (e.g. Water Act, CSO Act, amendments to existing acts, Access and Benefit-sharing policy, gender policy, National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, national action program to combat land degradation 2014, Public Finance Act, relevant international legal obligations, conventions and treaties)
 - b. The PLR review should not only look at 'PLR' in a narrow sense but also processes, initiatives, systems (Non-Formal Education, Stakeholder Engagement guidelines, existing grievance process, etc.)
- 4) After PLR review (to establish how safeguards are/can be addressed) is completed, undertake more comprehensive assessment of PLR effectiveness (to find out how safeguards are respected), looking at institutional capacity to implement and enforce PLRs, including multiple institutions (already outlined in safeguards roadmap)
- 5) Following the findings of the review of PLR effectiveness (above), a plan should be developed to address any gaps (both in addressing and respecting safeguards), including through institutional capacity building, changes to institutional arrangements, and identifying human and financial resource implications

Participants also identified immediate actions to be taken:

- 1) Review ToR for driver study to ensure benefits and risks assessment is incorporated (to be done by all three TWGs), referring to outputs of this workshop, following the initial identification of priority REDD+ actions
- 2) Reflect above next steps in Safeguards Roadmap
- 3) Ensure closer collaboration and iterative feedback between safeguards TWG and other TWGs:
 - TWG on REDD+ Options: Need to ensure links are made between safeguards work and NS/AP work, e.g. studies on drivers and PaM identification and prioritization
 - TWG on NFMS/RELS: Need to ensure links are made between SIS and NFMS – reduce duplication, ensure SIS draws on information made available from NFMS, recognizing that not all information for the SIS can be sourced from NFMS. NFMS can be a potential source of information for safeguards f, g and maybe e
- 4) Through implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines, a broader set of stakeholders will be made aware of the national REDD+ process and plans, including on safeguards. Likewise, stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide input into the national REDD+ process.



Figure 3: Participants of the national workshop on REDD+ safeguards

2.5 Day 5: Communicating results

Day 5 of the workshop communicated the results of the workshop to a broader group of stakeholders, including members of the other technical working groups (TWG). Following opening remarks from Sigyel Delma, linking the workshop results to the broader context of REDD+ readiness work in Bhutan, Celina Yong introduced the broader audience to the Cancun safeguards and the framework for developing a country approach to safeguards. K.B. Samal continued by giving an overview of the initial PLR review.

Ngawang Gyeltshen then gave an example for safeguard e) by presenting the results for the risk to agri-ecosystems from human wildlife conflict and the PLR analysis undertaken. Chukey Wangchuk then presented proposed next steps, recommendations and links with the development of the National Strategy and the National Forest Monitoring System. One of the key messages was to involve the other TWGs, particularly the TWGs on REDD+ options and on the reference level in further work and discussions on safeguards.

Comments from the floor highlighted potential synergies with other policy processes, including the Convention on Biological Diversity and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). The NBSAP had been referred to during the workshop and highlighted by participants as a complementary process.

3. Workshop evaluation

Participants completed an evaluation form for the workshop and its individual sessions. More informal feedback sessions during the workshop were also held to allow for more immediate improvements to the workshop.

Overall, workshop participants rated the workshop as very useful, as the average session rating was 4 (very useful) on a scale from 1-5. 9/12 (75%) of responses highlighted benefits and risks assessment as the most useful component of the workshop. The utility of the PLR analysis, discussion on risk mitigation measures, an improved understanding of the Cancun safeguards, the group work format and the active participation of participants were also mentioned as strong points of the workshop.

Recommendations for improvements included varying break-out group composition and spending more time on clarifying the content of the Cancun safeguards and the use of the Benefits and Risks Tool before delving into group work. Presenting more examples from other countries and their experiences was also requested.

Annex 1: Workshop agenda

Please note that the agenda includes hyperlinks to relevant resources.

Monday, 5 October: Country approaches to safeguards and the context of REDD+ in Bhutan		
8:30 – 9:00	Registration of Participants	WMD
9:00 –9:20	Welcome	CFO, WMD/ Thomas Enters, UN-REDD
9:20 - 9:35	Keynote Address	DG, DoFPS
9:35 – 9:40	Vote of Thanks	WMD
9:40 – 10:10	Presentation: Objectives of Bhutan’s approach to safeguards and draft Roadmap document on National level REDD+ Safeguards Q&A	Tashi Samdrup, National Consultant
10:10-10:30	Photo session	
10:30 –10:45	Presentation: REDD+ Readiness Program: Vision, components and the workshop objectives	Sigyel Delma, WMD
10:45 –11:15	Presentation: Cancun safeguards and UNFCCC requirements on safeguards Q&A	Celina Yong, UN-REDD
11:15-12:30	Presentation: UN-REDD support on developing country approaches to safeguards, including links to SESA/ESMF Q&A	Jen Laughlin, UN-REDD and Dora Cudjoe, FCPF-WB
12:30- 12:50	Presentation: Overview of the Benefits and Risks Tool and workshop structure for the week Q&A	Elina Väänänen, UN-REDD
12:50 - 1:00	Plenary Discussion: Questions and Answers	Thomas Enters, UN-REDD
13:00-14:00	Lunch	
14:00-14:30	Presentation: A refresher on Bhutan’s REDD+ actions	Tashi Samdrup, National Consultant
14:30- 15:30	Interactive exercise: Linking REDD+ actions (Policies and Measures) and REDD+ activities as defined by the UNFCCC Worksheet	Plenary
15:30-16:00	Coffee break	
16:00 -16:45	Interactive exercise continued	Plenary

Tuesday, 6 October: Identifying benefits and risks in the context of the Cancun safeguards		
09:00-09:30	Demonstration: Working through an example of identifying benefits and risks	Elina Väänänen, UN-REDD/ TWG Plenary
09:30-13:00	<p>Interactive exercise: Identifying benefits and risks under three safeguards, for priority actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group 1: with a focus on the social safeguards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of links between Corruption Risk Assessment and Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines (Sigyel and Celina) ○ Relevant issues from safeguard a) ○ Safeguard b) - <i>Transparent, effective forest governance and sovereignty</i> ○ Safeguard c) - <i>Respect for knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities</i> ○ Safeguard d) - <i>Full and effective participation of stakeholders</i> • Group 2: with a focus on the environment safeguards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relevant issues from safeguard a) ○ Safeguard e) - <i>Natural forest, biological diversity and enhancement of benefits</i> ○ Safeguard f) - <i>Address risk of reversals</i> ○ Safeguard g) - <i>Reduce displacement of emissions</i> <p>Worksheet</p> <p>Including coffee break (10:30-11:00)</p>	<p>Group 1: Celina Yong and Jen Laughlin, UN-REDD</p> <p>Group 2: Elina Väänänen and Blaise Bodin, UN-REDD</p>
13:00- 14:00	Lunch	
14:00- 15:30	Continue interactive exercise: Identifying benefits and risks under three safeguards, for priority actions (Same groups)	Same facilitators as above
15:30-16:00	Coffee break	
16:00- 16:45	<p>Plenary discussion:</p> <p>Report back from group exercises</p> <p>How do the benefits and risks identified for each safeguard help clarify the Cancun safeguards in the Bhutanese context?</p>	Facilitated by Thomas Enters, UN-REDD
16:45 – 17:00	Feedback from participants – Evaluation Forms	

Wednesday, 7 October: Analysing PLRs in the context of the Cancun safeguards		
09:00- 09:30	Presentation: Initial review of policies, laws and regulations in Bhutan Q&A	Dr.Lungten Norbu, safeguard TWG team member, CoRRB
09:30- 10:00	Demonstration: Working through an example of analysing PLRs	Blaise Bodin, UN-REDD/ TWG plenary
10:00-13:00	Interactive exercise: Identifying relevant PLRs, gaps and conflicts Worksheet Same groups throughout workshop (Using initial PLR review and table of relevant PLRs for each safeguard prepared by WMD as a starting point) Including coffee break (10:30-11:00)	Group 1: Celina Yong and Jen Laughlin, UN-REDD Group 2: Elina Väänänen and Blaise Bodin, UN-REDD Thomas, Sigyel and Tashi split time between both groups
13:00- 14:00	Lunch break	
14:00- 16:45	Continue interactive exercise: Identifying relevant PLRs, gaps and conflicts Including coffee break (15:30-16:00)	Same facilitators as above
16:45 – 17:00	Feedback from participants – Evaluation Forms	

Thursday, 8 October: Next steps in filling gaps in PLRs and implementing Bhutan's Road map for safeguards		
09:00- 9:30	Plenary discussion: Report back from group exercises the day before	Facilitated by Thomas Enters, UN-REDD
9:30- 13:00	Interactive Exercise: Filling gaps identified in PLRs to ensure the Cancun safeguards are addressed and respected <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What plans are already in place to address some of the gaps?</i> - <i>Which institutional capacities could be strengthened to address the gaps?</i> - <i>Which processes could be put in place to address the gaps?</i> - <i>What is realistically feasible in terms of legal reform?</i> Same groups throughout workshop Including coffee break (10:30-11:00)	Thomas, Sigyel and Tashi split time between both groups Group 1: Celina Yong and Jen Laughlin, UN-REDD Group 2: Elina Väänänen and Blaise Bodin, UN-REDD
13:00- 14:00	Lunch	
14:00-15:30	Group discussion: Next Steps to Address the Gaps -- Developing and implementing the Draft Roadmap for national level safeguards for REDD+ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Next steps to achieve the measures?</i> - <i>Who / which ministry is best placed to undertake the measures identified in the morning?</i> 	Thomas, Sigyel and Tashi split time between both groups Group 1: Celina Yong and Jen Laughlin, UN-REDD

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which of the measures are 'easiest' to achieve? Which are most difficult? - How best to sequence the measures? <p>Same groups throughout workshop</p>	Group 2: Elina Väänänen and Blaise Bodin, UN-REDD
15:30-16:00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
16:00 – 17:00	<p>Plenary Discussion:</p> <p>Report back to plenary</p> <p>Next steps for Watershed Management Division and the Technical Working Group on Safeguards, Governance and Benefit Distribution</p>	Facilitated by Ms. Sigyel Delma, WMD and Thomas Enters, UN-REDD
17:00 – 17:30	<p>Plenary Discussion:</p> <p>Preparing for Friday's stakeholder meeting</p>	Facilitated by Sigyel Delma, WMD
17:30 – 17:45	Feedback from participants – Evaluation Forms	

Friday, 9 October: Communicating results		
10:00-12:30	<p>1. Opening Remarks (Sigyel Delma)</p> <p>Objectives and agenda of the meeting and review of what has already been done related to safeguards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks and Benefits workshop 2012 • Draft PLR review • Corruption Risk Assessment • Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines • Draft Safeguards Roadmap <p>2. Presentation: Summary of Workshop Results</p> <p>UNFCCC requirements, including Cancun Safeguards and Country Approach to Safeguards, including links with FCPF SESA/ESMF (Celina Yong)</p> <p>Draft PLR Review (K.B. Samal)</p> <p>Example results using safeguard e): REDD+ action, benefits and risks, PLR analysis, information sources (Ngawang Gyeltshen)</p> <p>Proposed next steps, recommendations and links (with NS/AP, NFMS via TWGs) (Chukey Wangchuk)</p> <p>3. Closing Session</p> <p>Officiating DG</p> <p>UN-REDD Programme (Thomas Enters)</p> <p>WMD (Chief)</p>	

Annex 2: List of participants

Name	Institution	Email address
Dorji	Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation	dorjibt@gmail.com
Kesang D Tshering	Social Forestry & Extension Division	kdtshering@moaf.gov.bt
Ngawang Gyeltshen	Nature Recreation & Ecotourism Division	ngyeltshen@moaf.gov.bt
Tashi Samdrup	National consultant	samtash2014@yahoo.com
Chukey Wangchuk	Clean Bhutan	wangchuk@gmail.com
Dr. Purna Chhetri	RNR-Research Development Centre	purnab_2000@yahoo.com
K. B Samal	Watershed Management Division	kbsamaja@yahoo.com
Arun Rai	Forests Resources Management Division	arunrai.ar@gmail.com
Pema Wangda	Watershed Management Division	pemaparop@gmail.com
Dorji Gyeltshen	Watershed Management Division	dgyaltshen20004@gmail.com
Jamyang Phuntsho	Tarayana Foundation	
Dr. Lungten Norbu	Council for RNR of Bhutan	lungtenorbu@gmail.com
Sigyel Delma	Watershed Management Division	sdelma@moaf.gov.bt
Samten Wangchuk	Watershed Management Division	samtenwangchuk@moaf.gov.bt
Thomas Enters	UNEP	thomas.enters@unep.org
Elina Väänänen	UNEP-WCMC	elina.vaananen@unep-wcmc.org
Blaise Bodin	UNEP-WCMC	blaise.bodin@unep-wcmc.org
Celina Yong	UNDP	kin.yii.yong@undp.org
Jennifer Laughlin	UNDP	jennifer.laughlin@undp.org
Dora Cudjoe	World Bank	dcudjoe@worldbank.org
Participants attending opening and closing sessions:		
D. S Rai	Nature Recreation & Ecotourism Division	drai_bt@yahoo.com
Gyeltshen Dukpa	Social Forestry & Extension Division	gyeltshendukpa@gmail.com
Lobzang Dorji	Forest Resources Management Division	lobsangdoj@gmail.com
Akey Dorji	Dzongkhag Forestry Sector, Paro	
Kaka Tshering	Paro Forest Division	
Chencho Norbu	Director General, Department of Forests and Park Services, MoAF	cndofps@gmail.com
Jamyang Phuntshok	Watershed Management Division	pjamyangs@gmail.com
Tsering Gyeltshen	Watershed Management Division	tseringgyeltshen@gmail.com
Chenga Tshering	Ugyen Wangchuck Institute for Conservation & Environment, Bumthang	ctshering@uwice.gov.bt
Chadho Tenzin	FAO	Chadho.Tenzin@fao.org
Pasang Wangchen	Department of Forests & Park Services	
Thinley Namgyel	National Environment Commission	tn@nec.gov.bt
Ugyen Tshering	Paro Forest Division	ugyentse09@gmail.com

Annex 3: Workshop results – Identifying benefits and risks

Table 1: Prioritised candidate REDD+ actions for Bhutan

Actions	Sub-Actions
1. Scientific management of forest	a) Sustainable management of FMUs/WS
	b) Management of Forests Areas Outside FMU System through Scientific Planning & monitoring
	c) Strengthen low-impact logging practices through introduction of cable logging to other regimes too
	d) Improvement of wood technology to reduce wastage of timber during conversion process through providing subsidies on new technology and development & implementation of upgradation guidelines
	e) Streamline & strengthen forest information system (by strengthening spatial & non-spatial data) (maintain digitized database on rural timber supply)
2. Conservation of forest landscapes and biodiversity	a) Protected areas management based on functional zones to integrate conservation and development
	b) Forest Areas of Natural, Historical, Cultural significance identified & established as Heritage Sites, Reserves, Recreational Sites
	c) Develop and implement management plans for degraded/critical watersheds
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	a) Enhance engagement of stakeholders and in particular local communities
	b) Capacity development of CFMGs for better CF management
	c) Income and employment generation through development of NWFP based enterprise
	d) Up-scale and implement of community-based conservation programs like community-based eco-tourism, CFs, etc.
4. Strengthen law enforcement to reduce illegal forest offences	a) Efficient litigation process for forest offences through capacity building of law enforcement bodies
	b) Establishment & upgradation of a national database on forest offences
	c) Strengthen coordination and linkage among law enforcement agencies
	d) Capacity building for field forestry officers to enhance monitoring, investigative and prosecution skills
	e) Promotion of public knowledge and awareness on forest offences
	f) Strengthen implementation mechanism by strict enforcement of rules and regulations
5. Reduce (halt where possible) the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation	a) Prevent and control forest fire in fire sensitive areas
	b) Ensure that policies on development activities (including roads, urban town expansion) in the country are in consistent with Constitutional mandate of maintaining adequate national forest cover
	c) Ensure that Hydropower development and subsequent do not have perverse impacts on forest cover, including promotion of other renewable energy options such as solar and wind

Table 2: Risks relating to safeguard (a) - Consistency with national objectives and international agreements

REDD+ action	Risks	Rank of risks	
		Probability	Impact
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	<p>More marginalized/vulnerable members of communities (gender, social status, different income levels, literacy level, remote communities) may benefit less than others (e.g. in understanding in awareness building; benefiting less from capacity building)</p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard a) related to consistency with human rights safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on gender</p>	Medium	

Table 3: Benefits relating to safeguard (a) - Consistency with national objectives and international agreements

REDD+ action	Benefits	Rank of benefits	
		Probability	Impact
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	Has the potential to empower the vulnerable parts of society to make decisions on the issues that affect them		

Table 4: Risks relating to Safeguard (b) - Transparent, effective forest governance and sovereignty

REDD+ action	Risks	Rank of risks	
		Probability	Impact
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	The Corruption Risk Assessment (CRA) indicated a corruption risk in CF governance related to decision making process – if there is not legitimate representation, if there is not a valid election process		
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	The CRA indicated there may be risk of corruption in the decision making around benefit sharing among the CF (elite capture within CF, or due to lack of capacity)		
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	<p>More marginalized/vulnerable members of communities (gender, social status, different income levels, less literate, remote communities) may benefit less than others (e.g. in understanding in awareness building; benefiting less from capacity building)</p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard a) related to consistency with human rights safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on gender</p>		
Current government policy (not necessarily a new REDD+ action)	The CRA indicated a corruption risk related to the misuse by beneficiaries of the current policy on subsidized timber (Geog approval of subsidized timber to those who may not be in need)		

Table 5: Risks relating to Safeguard (c) - Respect for knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities

REDD+ action	Risks	Rank of risks	
		Probability	Impact
5. a) prevent and control forest fire in fire sensitive areas (may need to be revised to be 'forest fire management')	<p>Prevention and/or restriction of forest fires in some cases could adversely impact livelihoods of local communities</p> <p>Overlapping relevance Safeguard c on right to livelihoods, self-determination Safeguard d on participation Safeguard e on biodiversity</p>		

Table 6: Benefits relating to Safeguard (c) - Respect for knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities

REDD+ action	Benefits	Rank of benefits	
		Probability	Impact
3. b and c (Capacity development of CFMGs for better CF management; and Income and employment generation through development of NWFP based enterprise)	Potential to enhance traditional rights and practices such as, leaf litter collection, medicinal plants (NWFP), wood lot protection (e.g. because it will provide further commitment from government to support traditional practices, e.g. through the REDD+ strategy)	Medium	

Table 7: Risks relating to Safeguard (d) - Full and effective participation of stakeholders

REDD+ action	Risks	Rank of risks	
		Probability	Impact
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	<p>ore marginalized/vulnerable members of communities (gender, social status, different income levels, less literate, remote communities) may benefit less than others (e.g. in understanding in awareness building; benefiting less from capacity building)</p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard a) related to consistency with human rights safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on gender</p>		
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	<p>The selection of pilot sites might increase conflict between communities between those who will take part in REDD+ activities and those that don't</p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard d) on participation</p>		

Table 8: Benefits relating to Safeguard (d) - Full and effective participation of stakeholders

REDD+ action	Benefits	Rank of benefits	
		Probability	Impact
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	<p>Through current institutional arrangements for REDD+ offer potential to enhance two way communication channel between CSOs and government</p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on accountability</p>		

3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	<p>Potential to encourage CSOs to improve self-organization to influence upstream decision making</p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on accountability</p>		
---	--	--	--

Table 9: Risks relating to Safeguard (e) - Natural forest, biological diversity and enhancement of benefits

REDD+ action	Risks	Rank of risks	
		Probability	Impact
2. Conservation of forest landscapes and biodiversity	<p>Increased conservation landscapes results in increased HWC incidences which has implications on agri-ecosystems (crop loss and land fallowing) and limits genetic diversity of livestock (local breeds)</p> <p>Overlapping relevance Links to safeguard f) through the acceptability of the conservation action. HWC creates risk for long-term acceptability of the policy</p>		
	Regulating grazing in forest ecosystems may exert pressure on other ecosystems		

Table 10: Benefits relating to Safeguard (e) - Natural forest, biological diversity and enhancement of benefits

REDD+ action	Benefits	Rank of benefits	
		Probability	Impact
	Multiple use of forest in 1&3 will improve access of communities to forest resources (timber & firewood)		
	Through product diversification in CF, may enhance adaptation measures to reduce vulnerability to climate change		

Table 11: Risks relating to Safeguard (f) - Address risk of reversals

REDD+ action	Risks	Rank of risks	
		Probability	Impact
	REDD - Importance of monitoring degradation rather than just forest cover /and carbon content of different types of forest. --> Risk of not capturing future trends in emissions in forest in the reference level. (NFMS considering just forest cover but not carbon content of different types of forest would be misleading.)	Medium	Medium
	Balancing pillars of GNH between conservation & socio-economic development. The latter has taken precedence --> NFMS will be an important source of information in balancing these political priorities	Low	High
	Turnover in regulation/ political transition. Recent land act to nationalize pastureland and redistribute (previously assigned) to create management plans is facing opposition. Problems of understanding and perverse effects of regulations (- Risk of being unable to implement legislation & perverse effects)	Medium	Medium
	Risk of accumulation of fuel loads and lack of complete control over natural occurrence of forest fires (natural fire regime could be upset by CC)	Low	High
2. Conservation of forest landscapes and biodiversity	Climate change could trigger IAS, disease/ pest outbreaks and other forest disservices --> could lead to opening up of canopy in conservation areas --> Include climate change impacts in reference level	Medium	Medium
5. Reduce (halt where possible) the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation - c) hydropower	The prominence of hydropower as a source of clean energy could be threatened by climate change and trigger a reversal to fuel wood use.	Low	High
3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation	Expectations of communities could change over time with increased income or other economic opportunities --> uncertainty over success of community forests in the long-term --> compounded by age composition of population		
Overarching	Institutional failure risks delays in judiciary Emerging conflict of interest (e.g. agriculture and forestry) Brain drain and loss of skills to the institution		

Annex 4: Workshop results – Analysing policies, laws and regulations (PLRs)

Table 12: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (a) - Consistency with national objectives and international agreements

Benefit	PLRs relevant to this benefit	How does this PLR cover this benefit?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation</p> <p><i>Has the potential to empower the vulnerable parts of society to make decisions on the issues that affect them</i></p> <p>Overlapping relevance Safeguard d on participation Safeguard b on gender</p>	<p>1. Local Government (Amendment) Act of Bhutan 2014 (needs to be updated in PLR review)</p>	<p>1. Provides for how decisions are made at the local level</p>	<p>1. Generally effective, with possible room for improvement regarding representativeness of local governments of their constituents. Procedurally, consultations are happening at the local level, but due to practical circumstances some vulnerable populations may be excluded unintentionally.</p> <p>(for SIS development, a source of information to demonstrate the effectiveness of this PLR is Tarayana’s minutes of local consultations)</p>		<p>1. No specific provision focusing on most vulnerable/marginalize</p> <p>how to address this gap?</p>
<p>Possible gap filling measures:</p> <p>1. Enhance feedback loop to ensure local governments are actually representing their constituents (as proposed in the SE Guidelines, to be piloted)</p>					

Table 13: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (a) - Consistency with national objectives and international agreements

Risk	PLRs relevant to this risk	How does this PLR cover this risk?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation</p> <p><i>More marginalized/vulnerable members of communities (gender, social status, different income levels, literacy level, remote communities) may benefit less than others (e.g. in understanding in awareness building; benefiting less from capacity building)</i></p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard a) related to consistency with human rights safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on gender</p>	<p>See table above</p> <p>Non-formal Education (NFE)</p>	<p>Increases literacy level in more rural populations. Raises awareness of environmental concepts and approaches. Women in particular are benefiting from this program.</p>	<p>Being implemented effectively; good geographic coverage.</p>		
<p>Possible gap filling measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporated lessons from Tarayana, CF and GEF project experiences into the SE guidelines (e.g. targeted focus groups, gender sensitive approaches) 					

Table 14: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (b) - Transparent, effective forest governance and sovereignty

Risk	PLRs relevant to this risk	How does this PLR cover this risk?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation</p> <p><i>The Corruption Risk Assessment (CRA) indicated a corruption risk in CF governance related to decision making process – if there is not legitimate representation, if there is not a valid election process</i></p>	CF Plans	<p>Each CF Plan specifies rules for consultation / engagement as agreed between CF members</p> <p>Coverage varies for each CF, with gaps as identified in the CRA related to this risk.</p>	Different for each CF		In some cases CFs have developed as a parallel arrangement for natural resource management (parallel from national arrangements)
<p>Possible gap filling measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthen CF Plan bi-laws to increase transparency, include e.g. secret ballots, rotation of the CF heads (shorter fixed term) - Strengthen oversight of CF management by the Gup, e.g. CF can share plans at Geog planning meetings 					
<p>3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation</p> <p><i>The CRA indicated there may be risk of corruption in the decision making around benefit sharing among the CF (elite capture within CF, or due to lack of capacity)</i></p>	See above.				
<p>Possible gap filling measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearer structure on how funds are to be utilized, agreed criteria on how funds are to be allocated, decision making structure around allocation of funds (could be included CF Plan bi-laws or CF Manual) - Systematize practice of regular independent auditing (already happening in some CFs, e.g extension officer from one CF will audit another CF) (could be included in CF Plan bi-laws or CF Manual) 					

<p>Current government policy (not necessarily a new REDD+ action)</p> <p><i>The CRA indicated a corruption risk related to the misuse by beneficiaries of the current policy on subsidized timber (e.g. approval of subsidized timber to those who may not be in need)</i></p>	<p>See CRA recommendations if this is relevant to REDD+ activities.</p>				
<p>Possible gap filling measures:</p> <p>See CRA recommendations if this is relevant to REDD+ activities.</p>					

Table 15: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (c) - Respect for knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities

Benefit	PLRs relevant to this benefit	How does this PLR cover this benefit?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>3. b and c (Capacity development of CFMGs for better CF management; and Income and employment generation through development of NWFP based enterprise)</p> <p><i>Potential to enhance traditional rights and practices such as, leaf litter collection, medicinal plants (NWFP), wood lot protection (e.g. because it will provide further</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Act 2011 2. Land Act of Bhutan 2007 (revised version to be included in revised PLR review) 3. Forest and Nature Conservation Rules 2006 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Defines customary practice in the context of water resource management as a practice that has been in place for more than 20 years. 2. Lease of grazing land and leaf litter collection encouraged 	<p>Overall, low level awareness level of the beneficiaries about the provisions of the acts.</p> <p>Overall, the level of effectiveness depends on local government (personalities, interpersonal relationships) and available resources</p> <p>The Land Act, FNCA and Biodiversity Act are all under review.</p> <p>The ABS policy is awaiting cabinet approval</p>	<p>Need to revisit the Land Act, FNCA and Biodiversity Act once revised, as they are currently all under review.</p>	

<p><i>commitment from government to support traditional practices, e.g. through the REDD+ strategy)</i></p>	<p>4. Forest and Nature Conservation Act 1995 (revised version to be included in revised PLR review)</p> <p>5. Biodiversity Act of Bhutan 2003 (revised version to be included in revised PLR review)</p> <p>6. Interim Access and Benefit Sharing Policy 2015</p>	<p>3. Recognizes community right to leaf litter collection</p> <p>4. Recognizes community rights to NWFP</p> <p>5. Recognizes community rights to production, certification, and marketing of genetic and associated traditional knowledge</p> <p>6. Recognizes community rights to genetic resources and traditional knowledge, including intellectual property rights</p>			
<p>Possible gap filling measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To address the low level awareness level of the beneficiaries about the provisions of the acts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Through NFE and other channels, raise awareness about the provisions of the acts o Include awareness raising activity about these acts into the SE Guidelines 					

Table 16: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (c) - Respect for knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities

Risk	PLRs relevant to this risk	How does this PLR cover this risk?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>5. a) prevent and control forest fire in fire sensitive areas (may need to be revised to be 'forest fire management')</p> <p><i>Prevention and/or restriction of forest fires in some cases could adversely impact livelihoods of local communities (e.g. promoting regeneration, scare wild animals that damage their crops, grazing practice, facilitates collection of NWFP, enhance production of lemongrass)</i></p> <p>Overlapping relevance <i>Safeguard c on right to livelihoods, self-determination Safeguard d on participation Safeguard e on biodiversity</i></p>	<p>FNCA Forest Fire Rule 2012</p>	<p>As provisioned under the FNCA , the Forest Fire Rule 2012 allows burning for forest management within certain ecosystems, including rangeland, grazing land, high altitude, CF, areas for further improvement of forest crops, etc.</p>	<p>Not yet under implementation because guiding protocols for forest fire management have not yet been developed.</p>		
<p>5. REDD+ actions (broadly speaking)</p> <p><i>Potential conflict between community v. government over whether REDD+ activities should/can take place in their community</i></p> <p><i>(right to participation, right to FPIC)</i></p>	<p>The judiciary system of Bhutan recognizes the role at the Geog level for dispute settlement and appeals.</p> <p>Local leaders have been trained by the judiciary on mediation.</p> <p>Existing process / practice to address grievances from individuals and communities:</p>		<p>See notes from Meeting on SE Guidelines regarding effectiveness of existing process to address grievances</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any complaining parties will submit a formal complaint to the Tshogpa of the Chiwog for consideration; • If it cannot be resolved within the jurisdiction of the Tshogpa of the Chiwog, the grievance case will be submitted to the GT. The GT will review the grievance case and call a public hearing; • Where the complainant does not agree with the recommendation of the public hearing, he or she can file the case with the Dzongkhag Administration for review and intervention. The Dzongkhag Administration will review the case and make recommendations to resolve the case; • The complainant can always file his or her case in court at any time, where the case will be reviewed and settled. <p>Any appeals to the above-mentioned committees will be recorded in a register, identifying the name of the aggrieved party, date of grievance registered, nature of the grievance, and measures suggested to address the grievance, including escalating resolution of</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

	the grievance to MoAF or RGoB for recourse through traditional judicial practices, and date of grievance redress.				
Possible gap filling measures:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear agreed criteria for selection of sites for REDD+ activities - Review recommendations from Meeting on SE guidelines regarding existing process to address grievances 					

Table 17: Relevant PLR related to Safeguard (d) - Full and effective participation of stakeholders

Benefit	PLRs relevant to this benefit	How does this PLR cover this benefit?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation</p> <p><i>The current institutional arrangements for REDD+ has the potential to enhance two way communication channel between CSOs and government</i></p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on accountability</p>	<p>Water Act</p> <p>CSO Act of Bhutan 2007 (should be included in PLR review)</p> <p>There is a CSO representative on the national REDD+ task force and the TWGs</p>	<p>Water Act recognizes CSOs as a competent authority in relation water resource management</p>			<p>Insufficient funds for CSOs to sustain themselves and their programs.</p>
Possible gap filling measures:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase CSO participation and engagement (in a non-observer status) in annual roundtable meeting of donors, where CSOs can present their contributions to the donor supported activities, as a means of securing funds to enhance/strengthen existing activities. - Support/strengthen/systematize CSOs' (e.g. Tarayana) role in engaging with communities to bring their views to the national level - Strengthen CSO Authority's (CSOA) focus on coordinating, facilitating and raising CSO views to national level 					

<p>3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation</p> <p><i>Potential to encourage CSOs to improve self-organization to influence upstream decision making</i></p> <p>Overlapping relevance safeguard d) on participation safeguard b) on accountability</p>	See above.				
<p>Possible gap filling measures:</p> <p>Next steps:</p> <p>Sources of information:</p>					

Table 18: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (d) - Full and effective participation of stakeholders

Risk	PLRs relevant to this risk	How does this PLR cover this risk?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
------	----------------------------	------------------------------------	---	-------------------	-----------------

<p><i>3. Strengthen stakeholder participation in forest management and conservation</i></p> <p><i>The selection of pilot sites might increase conflict between communities between those who will take part in REDD+ activities and those that don't</i></p>	<p>See above related to criteria for pilot sites and GRMs</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--

Table 19: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (e) - Natural forest, biological diversity and enhancement of benefits

Benefit	PLRs relevant to this benefit	How does this PLR cover this benefit?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>Increased conservation landscapes results in increased HWC incidences which has implications on agri-ecosystems (crop loss and land fallowing) and limits genetic diversity of livestock (local breeds)</p> <p>Links to safeguard f) through the acceptability of the conservation action. HWC creates risk for long-term acceptability of the policy</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Human-Wildlife Conflict Strategy 2. National Forest Policy (2011) 3. NBSAP (2014) 4. Bhutan Biological Conservation Complex 5. National Environmental Protection Act (2007) 6. National Biodiversity Centre 7. Land Act & Forest Act 8. Endowment Fund for HWC insurance <p>4,5,7: risk reduction</p> <p>1, 2, 3: risk mitigation</p> <p>6: risk mitigation & compensation</p> <p>(HWC risk– relates to safeguard f)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mitigates and manages HWC through species-focused interventions (human-bear, human-elephant) 2. Also mitigates & manages HWC in conservation landscapes 3. HWC as a critical conservation challenge; NBSAP Target 13 (genetic diversity) and target 3 (positive incentives) 4. Sets the basis for PA network and sets up corridors, a source of HWC (a strategy document) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAs established by decree until 2008, PA defined by law: declaration goes via parliament • Status of corridors unclear: currently defined by policy, more flexibility in their adjustment 5. Supports establishment of conservation landscapes 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Being implemented (fencing, HWC wildlife fund) and some institutions have been established 2. Integrates HWCS as part of FP 3. NBSAP submitted to CBD & adopted as national guiding document for biodiversity (strong normative role) 4. - 5. Effective: PAs respected in the country 6. Corridors mapped but not set, being discussed 7. Unclear how big this impact may be 8. Currently not effective – pilot phase – sustainability of fund, unwillingness 	<p>Land Act – earlier private forest, now Land Act allows person to convert forest to agriculture (</p> <p>Earlier people unable to harvest forest</p>	<p>Land allocation under Land Act & Forest Act potentially</p> <p>Endowment fund</p>

		<p>in which there is higher risk of HWC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of conservation landscape – restricted access, strict environmental regulations (no developmental activities) <p>6. Keeps record of local varieties and breeds and promote on farm management of agricultural biodiversity</p> <p>7. Land Act allows for clearing private forest thereby increasing intervention with wildlife; Forest Act allows for leasing allowing for development activities, also clearing forest</p> <p>8. 8000 USD per village - compensation HWC insurance, endowment fund to local communities but not effective as it is too simple</p>	<p>of people to participate, design of insurance scheme (can compensate monetary losses, but not social)</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Mitigation/ Enhancement measures/ Changes in PLR or its implementation

Reduction of risk through improved integrated planning

- Zoning of PA network in progress
- Implementation of PLRs need to consider community participation in PAs for inclusion of local population in the zoning of PAs within their existing limits
- Corridors established on the basis of wildlife usage, and could integrate more systematically consideration of local usage.
- Land allocation under Land Act & Forest Act could be done in a way that seeks to reduce HWC → Address financial gaps

Mitigate HWC through better design of measure

- More research into animal behaviour to strengthen measures in HWC and more research into social dimension of HWC.

Managing the risk (through compensation HWC insurance, endowment fund to local communities but not effective as it is too simple)

- Incentivizing local breeds and good herding practices
→ Rely on good capacity of NBC and its partners
- Endowment Fund & Insurance Scheme to be improved
- Relevance for the Summary of Information

Sources of information for providing information on addressing & respecting the safeguard

Addressing : description of measures taken to reduce/mitigate/ compensate the risk

Respecting:

Department of Forestry and Park Services has record of zoning

- Number of PAs zoned

National Land Commission overall responsibility

- Number of meeting with stakeholder

Department of Forestry & Park Services (Taskforce in HQ & field) collects data on incidence of HWC:

Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation / DFPS

- Number of Farmers benefitting from the Fund
- Volume of funds

NCB

- Inventories of agriculture and trends of losses of local breeds

Table 20: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (e) - Natural forest, biological diversity and enhancement of benefits

Benefit	PLRs relevant to this risk	How does this PLR cover this risk?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>Through product diversification in CF, may enhance adaptation measures to reduce vulnerability to climate change</p>	<p>Relevant PLRs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forest Policy 2. CF strategy 3. National Adaptation Programme of Action (incl SAPA for Climate-Smart Agriculture) 	<p>Coverage by PLR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promotes CF within a range of CC issues 2. Sustainable management of resources incl promotion of NWFPs, PES?, pro-poor approach that focuses on intensification of livelihood activities in relation to forest products. 3. Community based fire management and prevention, holistic approach to Climate Smart Agriculture 	<p>Effectiveness of PLR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In place, Focuses on timber and NWFP as well as conservation and protection 2. Effective in terms of number of communities involved since 2009. Livelihood income is minimal compared to agriculture. Poor ppl underrepresented. Limited commercialization of timber extracted. PES drinking water scheme complementing income. 3. New, pilot implementation 		
<p>Enhancement measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge and capacity gaps in terms of livelihoods impacts and CC impacts esp in terms of disease and shifts in cropping patterns. - Incentivizing and reviving where necessary the use of traditional systems in terms of reducing vulnerability and improving food security through resilient social structures - Upscaling successful initiatives for CSA, tourism and PES - Improve market access and knowledge on marketing and transformation to strengthen the value chain for community NWFP and wood products - Improving awareness of CC impacts and adaptation measures - Improve access to CSA technology 			<p>Provision of information on how this is respected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Biodiversity centre gathers documentation on traditional knowledge and customary practices - DFPS has info on sustainable mgt plans of CF products, ecotourism plans and PES schemes in CF - Council of Renewable and Natural Resources Research of Bhutan has info on research data, climate trends - Department of hydro-met has information about weather and climates with flood warning systems - Agriculture 		

Table 21: Relevant PLRs related to Safeguard (f) - Address risk of reversals

Risk	PLRs relevant to this risk	How does this PLR cover this risk?	How effectively the PLR is being implemented?	Conflicting PLRs?	Identified Gaps
<p>Expectations of communities could change over time with increased income or other economic opportunities --> uncertainty over success of community forests in the long-term --> compounded by age composition of population</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic Development Policy 2. Local government act 3. Sustainable Development Goals 4. Tourism development strategy 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. accelerated hydropower development may lead to other employment opportunities and tourism to a diversion to other economic zones. This could lead to acceleration of other uses such as development of industry and urban expansion; commercialisation of cash crops 2. local government rights to natural resources and lands > could lead to conversion to other uses 3. goals 8 and 9 4. expanding tourism industry 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation in full swing 2. Implemented but limited implication of issue until now 3. Ongoing, number of tourists increasing 		
<p>Mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Product diversification to make CF attractive - Integrating tourism into CF as CF product - Increased dialogue between central and local government - Integrating cultural values into CF 			<p>Sources of information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National statistics bureau has info on population trends and rural-urban migration - Ministry of Economic Affairs has info on hydropower plans - Tourism Council of Bhutan has info on tourism plans, on numbers of tourists and tourism circuits - SDG indicators - Centre for Bhutan studies – GNH indicators on ecological integrity, community vitality, cultural cohesiveness 		