

**7 September 2010**

**To the Co-chairs Interim REDD+ Partnership,**

The undersigned organizations are providing comments on the draft Workplan of the Interim REDD+ Partnership. However we also take this opportunity to reiterate our disappointment with the protracted lack of political will to ensure proper participation of civil society and indigenous peoples' organisations in the processes of the Interim REDD+ Partnership.

Following the Brasilia meeting where civil society was given one week notification to participate, many civil society organisations registered the unacceptability of the lack of participation through submissions to the co-chairs of the Partnership, and in turn suggested acceptable approaches the Partnership could take regarding the engagement of civil society and indigenous peoples' organisations. It is thus profoundly disappointing that the Partnership again failed to engage with indigenous peoples and civil society members who were prepared to meet them and present on issues during the recent meetings in Bonn, following which we are now tasked with commenting on the 2010 work plan with no previous participation or contribution to its development.

Engagement of all stakeholders in the design, planning, monitoring and implementation of the process is an essential part of the effective implementation of policies to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. **The modalities proposed so far by the Partnership do not satisfy the minimum requirements for effective participation and consultation**, and therefore we urge that the Workplan include a process to develop **concrete and effective procedures to ensure proper participation and input to the Partnership initiatives**. Simply using a mailing list that has been put together randomly, including organisations that are not working on REDD and excluding key actors, notably indigenous peoples organisations, is not an acceptable way to pretend that stakeholders are engaged in an effective and fair manner.

Additionally, we would like to point to an issue contained in the Workplan that is of particular significance to us. Notably, the draft Workplan mentions one area of work related to the effectiveness of REDD - **Work program component 3: Discussion on effectiveness of multilateral REDD+ Initiatives**. This will be one of the issues that will be dealt with in the announced workshop that will take place in Tianjin on October 2<sup>nd</sup>.

We recommend that in order to properly evaluate the effectiveness of REDD, a clear evaluation grid or terms of reference will have to first be developed, and made subject to public comment and input. We believe that the scope provided in the draft Workplan to assess effectiveness of REDD activities does not take into full consideration social and rights-related aspects that are key, especially in the readiness phase since they will form the architecture for any further activity and REDD implementation.

In this regard, we strongly recommend that any evaluation of REDD effectiveness will have to take into consideration the following criteria:

***Governance:***

Have readiness activities thus far supported reforms in the governance sector that would create an enabling institutional framework to protect the rights of indigenous peoples' and local communities, secure land tenure and land rights, tackle illegal logging and other drivers of deforestation?

***Proper diagnosis of causes of deforestation:***

Have the readiness activities carried out thus far been based on a proper identification of the real drivers of deforestation, or have they excluded such drivers of deforestation such as large scale extractive activities and infrastructure development while putting the blame to traditional practices followed by indigenous peoples and local communities? Have readiness activities carried out thus far ensured the proper inclusion of policy measures and processes aimed at supporting livelihoods, values, worldviews, knowledge systems and initiatives which promote the integrity of forest ecosystems, and recognized the contribution that indigenous peoples conservation practices can provide?

***Non-carbon values of forests:***

Have the readiness activities thus far properly integrated non-carbon forest values (biodiversity, livelihoods, cultural connections, etc) in the elaboration and assessment of proper response measures? Is the protection of natural forests and biodiversity conservation prioritised?

***Respect for indigenous peoples rights:***

Have readiness processes thus far properly respected international obligations and instruments related to indigenous peoples, such as those contained in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?

***Recognition of the role of indigenous peoples in forest conservation:***

Do multilateral REDD initiatives fully recognize the contribution of indigenous peoples' and local communities traditional forest management and conservation methods as efficient and cost-effective ways to ensure the integrity of forest ecosystems? It should be noted that the role of indigenous peoples' protected areas in mitigation and adaptation, and the relevance of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge, in capturing and nurturing the full spectrum of forest values, from cultural to biodiversity values, recently has been also recognized at the meetings of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

***Respect of the rights for adequate access to information, adequate access to participate in decision making processes, adequate access to justice and the Free and Prior Informed Consent:***

Have readiness processes and activities thus far respected the internationally recognized obligations to ensure proper access to information, public participation and access to justice in environmental matters. An evaluation of the effectiveness of REDD should also consider whether enablers have been put in place to ensure not only participation and consultation, but also respect for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples in relation to the design, planning and the implementation of REDD readiness plans and activities affecting indigenous peoples

Have REDD readiness processes and activities thus far envisaged tools to ensure the long term sustainability of consultation processes as well as capacity building activities to ensure the informed participation of affected parties such as indigenous peoples and local communities?

***Compliance with international social and environmental standards:***

We note that the Workplan envisages holding a specific workshop on experiences in the implementation of 'safeguards'. However, we iterate that an essential part of the criterion assessing the effectiveness of readiness initiatives is compliance with international human rights and environmental standards. We therefore recommend that compliance with international human rights and environmental standards should be included among the criteria upon which to assess the effectiveness of REDD activities carried out thus far, in terms of effectiveness and impact on indigenous peoples and local communities.

**Signed:**

Centre d'accompagnement des Autochtones Pygmées et Minoritaires Vulnérables (CAMV) DRC  
CARE International

Centre for Environment and Development (CED) Cameroon

Centre for Sustainable Rural Development (SRD) Vietnam

Centro de Planificación y Estudios Sociales (CEPLAES) Ecuador

Centro Humboldt, Nicaragua

Civic Response, Ghana

ClientEarth, UK

Community Forestry Conservation Network (MJUMITA) Tanzania

Dynamique des Groupes des Peuples Autochtones (DGPA) DRC

Ecoforestry Forum, PNG

Federation of Community Forestry Users (FECOFUN) Nepal

FERN, Belgium and UK

Forest Peoples Programme

Friends of the Earth (FOE) US

Fundacion Pachamana, Ecuador

Global Witness

Greenpeace International

Indonesian Civil Society Forum on Climate Justice

Maasai Community Outdoor Educators, Kenya

Maison de l'Enfant et de la Femme Pygmees (MEFP) CAR

Nepenthes, Denmark

Observatoire congolais des droits de l'Homme (OCDH) RoC

Organisation Concertée des Ecologistes et Amis de la Nature (OCEAN) DRC

Papua NGOs Forum, Indonesia

Practical Solution Nepal

Perkumpulan HuMa, Indonesia

Rainforest Foundation Norway

Rainforest Foundation UK

Rainforest Foundation US

Reseau des Communicateurs de l'Environnement (RCEN) DRC

Society for New Initiatives and Activities (SONIA) Italy

Sustainable Development Institute, Liberia

Sustainability Watch Network, Central America

Tanzania Forest Conservation Group