## Workshop Survey Report:

## UN-REDD Programme LAC Regional Workshop on the Right to Prior Consultation and Free, Prior and Informed Consent, October 2013

In order to understand the effectiveness of the workshop and how the UN-REDD Programme could improve further capacity building efforts in the future, all 49 participants of the workshop were asked to fill out a survey at the beginning of the first day and at the beginning of the last day of the workshop. The surveys were a mix of self-evaluation questions that were subjective and objective technical questions on FPIC and prior consultation (PC) in the ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ format.

There were 48 responses in the first round of pre-workshop questionnaires (98% response rate), and 37 responses in the post workshop survey (76% response rate). Find both the pre and post workshop surveys in Annex 1 and 2 of this report.

## Survey Concept

The survey was meant to gauge participants’ knowledge of the basic concepts and principles related to consultation and FPIC before and after the workshop with the hopes that their comprehension would increase as a result of the workshop. The results are gathered in this report to provide an approximate picture of the state of knowledge prior to and after the workshop differentiated by country, stakeholder, group, sex and whether they attended the first regional FPIC workshop (January 2013) or not.

## Specific Questions

The number of correctly marked answers for every question, *except for one*, increased when comparing the before and after surveys. In the first survey, 45% of the questions were answered correctly and after the workshop, **there was an 11% increase in correct answers,** increasing the percentage of correctly marked answers to 56% and demonstrating a better understanding of some of the key concepts of PC and FPIC.

The one question that did not see an increase was correctly answered 78% of the time, therefore it was generally well-understood, but it is concerning that there was no increase in participants’ comprehension on the specific subject throughout the workshop. The ‘Mark Yes/No’ style question was:

1. **If a government wants to protect its country’s forests, when should consultation be applied?** :
	1. Before starting the analysis of possible solutions that protect forests **(Answer -Yes)**

Perhaps this concept was not developed enough over the course of the workshop and could be discussed more in the next event.

## Most Difficult Questions

The questions that were most difficult, judging by the lowest number of correctly marked answers before and after the workshop are the following YES or NO type questions:

**1. Consultation is a right that should be applied to:**

a. Other forest-dependent communities **(Answer - No)**

b. Non-indigenous individuals **(Answer - No)**

Participants generally had a difficult time answering ‘No’ on these questions both before and after the workshop. In regards to other **forest dependent communities**, only 9% correctly marked ‘No’ before the workshop; after the workshop, 27% correctly marked ‘No’. Similarly, when asked whether consultation is a right that should be applied to **non-indigenous individuals**, participants’ understanding increased 19%; from 11% before the workshop to 30% after.

Although there were improvements in participants’ understanding on these questions, there is still a stark contrast with the 96% correctly marked before and 97% correctly marked after question on if consultation is a right that should be applied to **indigenous peoples** (the answer is ‘Yes’). It is clear that the participants have a solid understanding that the right to consultation is applicable to indigenous peoples but they have a far less grasp on its applicability for non-indigenous individuals and other forest-dependent communities.

**2. Before which of the following actions should the right to be consulted be applied? :**

a. Developing a national climate change, biodiversity, or REDD+ strategy **(Answer - No)**

b. Develop a national REDD+ safeguards information system **(Answer - No)**

c. Analyzing possible political, economic, administrative or normative solutions and strategies to protect forests **(Answer - No)**

d. Carrying out a national forest inventory **(Answer - No)**

For this main question in bold, there were 11 sub-questions, four of which are listed above. It was found that all the sub-questions that should have been marked ‘No’ received significantly lower number of correctly marked answers than the ‘Yes’ category, both before and after the workshop. This could be explained by the hypothesis that participants believe that consultation should be applied to all of the options, or that participants grew tired of marking ‘Yes’ and ‘No‘ and simply marked ‘Yes’ to all. Keep in mind that there were 11 sub-questions, 6 of which should have been marked ‘No’. The four with the lowest improvement in correctly marked answers are listed above.

In general, it can be understood that the workshop did not specifically address that the actions listed above do **not** require consultation to be applied. Perhaps more time needs to be dedicated in following workshops to discuss REDD+ specific topics in relation to FPIC and PC, such as safeguards information systems and REDD+ strategies.

**3. If consent is not granted, can a government make a final decision? (Answer - Yes)**

By the end of the workshop, 48% of the participants correctly answered this question, compared to the pre-workshop response rate of 26%. This is an important increase in understanding, however, the number of correctly marked answers is still below half, and the concept will be emphasized more clearly in the next workshop or follow-up materials. Particularly, the next workshop that is planned for 2013 will discuss specifics on “limitations to rights” to clarify confusion around this topic.

## Survey Results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Correctly marked answers** | **Self-evaluation** |
| **Before** | **After** | **Before** | **After** |
| **Colombia** | 44% | 70% | 60% | 70% |
| **Costa Rica** | 47% | 49% | 30% | 45% |
| **Ecuador** | 53% | 66% | 65% | 72% |
| **Honduras** | 56% | 68% | 40% | 80% |
| **Panama** | 43% | 51% | 56% | 65% |
| **Paraguay** | 46% | 53% | 63% | 72% |
| **Peru** | 57% | 76% | 90% | 85% |
| **Suriname** | 41% | 46% | 56% | 80% |
| **Government** | 51% | 54% | 54% | 73% |
| **Indigenous Peoples** | 41% | 54% | 64% | 68% |
| **UN** | 55% | 48% | 53% | 63% |
| **Participated in first workshop in Lima**  | 52% | 63% | 63% | 65% |
| **Did not participate in Lima workshop** | 47% | 61% | 57% | 70% |
| **Male** | 46% | 55% | 57% | 69% |
| **Female** | 48% | 58% | 57% | 70% |

## Survey Findings Divided by Groups

In the preliminary survey, the percentage of correctly marked responses for individuals who self-identified as **government** was higher than the average number of correctly marked answers, at 51%; for individuals identified as **indigenous peoples or indigenous peoples’ organizations**, their number of correctly marked answers was below average in the preliminary survey, at 41%.

Interestingly, participants from the indigenous peoples’ category increased the number of correct responses by 9%, to 54% after the workshop; Government participants increased their number of correct responses by 3%, to 54%. This indicates that the workshop increased the understanding of the topic far more for indigenous peoples and indigenous peoples’ organizations than for government officials, yet in the end, the two groups achieved more or less the same level of understanding.

**Those who attended the first workshop in Lima** in January 2013 averaged a slightly higher level of correctly marked answers, 52%, versus those participants who did not attend the Lima workshop, 47% when comparing the before answers. When comparing the after workshop answers, the first timers increased their markings to 61% and the Lima participants increased their correctly marked answers by to 63%. With only a two percent difference between the correct answers after, perhaps the workshop material was new and more useful for the **first timer participants**. It should be noted that only 6 of the 49 participants attended the Lima workshop.

**UN participants’** percentage of correct answers was 55% before the workshop; after the workshop their number decreased to 48%. This could be explained by the lower number in UN colleagues who participated in the second post-workshop survey, and that a few expert UN colleagues specializing in the topic did not take the post-workshop survey.

Dividing results by **gender** shows that in the preliminary survey, women scored correctly 48% of the time and men 46%. Both groups increased their scores by about 10% in the post workshop survey; women responded correctly 58%, and men 55% of the answers. Women participants had the highest average of correctly marked answers in comparison to the other groups listed above. It is important to note that there was a good gender balance in the workshop with 25 female participants and 23 male participants.

## Self-Evaluation

Both before and after the workshop, participants were asked to answer two questions on a scale of 1-10, to gauge their perceived improvement in understanding PC and FPIC. The numbered responses were translated into the following levels of understanding**: beginner, basic, medium, good, expert.**

When participants were asked what their level of understanding on PC was, the before (blue) and after (red) comparison indicates that participants at beginner, basic and medium levels decreased by half, and the good and expert levels of understanding increased.

Similarly, participants felt that the workshop improved their understanding of FPIC, as the number of people at beginner, basic and medium levels was more than halved and the number with a ‘good’ level of understanding of FPIC was nearly doubled. Comparing the perceived understanding of PC compared to FPIC, it is observed that after the workshop there was about the same number of participants across the board at the beginners, basic, medium, good, and expert levels in both subjects.

## Workshop Evaluation

After the workshop, participants were asked to answer questions on a scale of 1-10, to help organizers understand the utility of the workshop. The numbered responses were then translated into the following measurements: **not at all, a little, medium, a lot, very much.**

## Recommendations from Workshop Participants

The closing survey of the workshop asked participants what aspects of consultation they would like to further explore in a future workshop, and what aspects of the workshop could be improved upon. Comments that were repeated a number of times were:

* Clarification of consultation and FPIC
* More positive, constructive, and specific examples of consultation
* More depth regarding legal mechanisms and jurisprudence
* Methodology (“how to”)
* Broaden participation at workshop to include representatives of the private sector, legislators and deputies.
* More interaction, less power point presentations
* Shorten the agenda

The survey also asked what kind of support was needed from the UN-REDD Programme and the most common responses were:

* Financial support (#1 response)
* Technical capacity
* Replicate workshop at country level
* More frequent workshops
* Need a workshop with ILO, High Commission for Human Rights, FAO, UNEP to discuss and clarify common messages and methodologies

## Annex 1: Preliminary workshop survey (in English)

**Objective:** The objective of the following survey is the generate information that measures participant’s understanding of the subject, in order to better focus efforts where they are most needed in the future. Your cooperation is much appreciated and very valuable.

Information from this survey is for the exclusive and confidential use of the UN-REDD Programme.

|  |
| --- |
| **Country:** |
| **Name** (optional): |

**Please mark with an “X” the group or association that pertains to you:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Academia | Private sector | International NGO | National NGO | UN | Government | Forest-dependent community | Afro descendent community | Others |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender:** | Female | Male |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Did you participate in the regional forum on consultation and consent in Lima, February 2013?** | Yes | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *1: Beginner Expert: 10* |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **What is your level of understanding on Prior Consultation?** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **What is your level of understanding on Free, Prior and Informed Consent?** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you believe that Consultation and Consent is the same thing?** | Yes | No | Unsure |
| **Is there a legal framework that regulates the right to Prior Consultation in your country? Comments:** | Yes | No | Unsure |
| **Do you know if experiences related to the obtainment of Consent exist in your country? Comments:** | Yes | No | Unsure |

**In your opinion, who is responsible for carrying out a Consultation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Government | Private Sector | UN | NGO | Others |

**Who do you believe decides the type of measure that requires a Consultation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Government | Private Sector | UN | NGO | Others |

**Who do you believe should finance a Consultation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Government | Private Sector | UN | NGO | Others |

**What is your level of involvement in Consultation?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Comments |
| Rights |  |  |  |
| Obligations |  |  |  |
| Responsibilities |  |  |  |

**Consultation a right that should be applied to:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Unsure | Comments |
| Indigenous Peoples |  |  |  |  |
| Other forest-dependent communities |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Indigenous Peoples |  |  |  |  |

**If a government wants to protect its country’s forests, when should Consultation be applied?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Unsure | Comments |
| Before starting the analysis of possible solutions that protect forests |  |  |  |  |
| When discussing and deciding the different solutions and possible actions that should be prioritized |  |  |  |  |
| When applying these actions in order to protect the forests  |  |  |  |  |

**Before which of the following actions should the right to Consultation be applied? :**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| Analyzing causes of deforestation |  |  |  |
| Burying toxic waste |  |  |  |
| Developing a national forest informational system |  |  |  |
| Constructing public works that displace populations  |  |  |  |
| Developing a national climate change, biodiversity or REDD+ strategy  |  |  |  |
| Exploiting natural resources in indigenous territories |  |  |  |
| Develop a national REDD+ safeguards information system |  |  |  |
| Analyzing possible political, economic, administrative or normative solutions and strategies to protect forests  |  |  |  |
| Developing a system for payment for environmental services  |  |  |  |
| Carrying out a national forest inventory |  |  |  |
| Selecting and implementing actions to protect forests |  |  |  |

**The Consultation process:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No  | Unsure |
| Is a negotiation process |  |  |  |
| Grants the right to veto |  |  |  |
| Is a process that guarantees the achievement of rights |  |  |  |
| Creates an obligation for the government |  |  |  |
| Creates an obligation for indigenous peoples |  |  |  |

**Consent is:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No  | Unsure |
| A precondition of the Consultation process |  |  |  |
| An objective of the Consultation process |  |  |  |
| Final |  |  |  |
| Irrevocable |  |  |  |

**If consent is not granted, can a government make a final decision?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No  | Unsure | Depends |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Annex 2: Post workshop survey (in English)

|  |
| --- |
| **Country:** |
| **Name** (optional): |

**Please mark with an “X” the group or association that pertains to you:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Academia | Private sector | International NGO | National NGO | UN | Government | Forest-dependent community | Afro descendent community | Others |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender:** | Female | Male |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Did you participate in the regional forum on consultation and consent in Lima, February 2013?** | Yes | No |

**Evaluation of the workshop:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  | 1: Nothing Very much: 10 |
| Has the workshop been useful?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did it improve your understanding of PC and FPIC?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did it improve your understanding of the legal frameworks related to PC and FPIC?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did it allow you to learn about the region’s experiences related to PC and FPIC?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you believe it would be useful to organize a third regional forum for discussion and exchanges on this topic?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Would you like to participate in this third forum? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *1: Beginner Expert: 10* |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **What is your level of understanding on Prior Consultation?** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **What is your level of understanding on Free, Prior and Informed Consent?** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you believe that consultation and consent is the same thing?** | Yes | No | Unsure |
| **Is there a legal framework that regulates the right to be consulted in your country? Comments:** | Yes | No | Unsure |
| **Do you know if experiences related to the obtainment of consent exist in your country? Comments:** | Yes | No | Unsure |

**In your opinion, who is responsible for carrying out a consultation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Government | Private Sector | UN | NGO | Others |

**Who do you believe decides the type of measure that requires a consultation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Government | Private Sector | UN | NGO | Others |

**Who do you believe should finance a consultation?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indigenous Peoples | Government | Private Sector | UN | NGO | Others |

**Consultation a right that should be applied to:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Unsure | Comments |
| Indigenous, tribal, and afro peoples |  |  |  |  |
| Other forest-dependent communities |  |  |  |  |
| Non-indigenous peoples |  |  |  |  |

**If a government wants to protect its country’s forests, when should consultation be applied?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Unsure | Comments |
| Before starting the analysis of possible solutions that protect forests |  |  |  |  |
| When discussing and deciding the different solutions and possible actions that should be prioritized |  |  |  |  |
| When applying these actions in order to protect the forests  |  |  |  |  |

**Before which of the following actions should the right to be consulted be applied? :**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No | Unsure |
| Analyzing causes of deforestation |  |  |  |
| Burying toxic waste |  |  |  |
| Developing a national forest informational system |  |  |  |
| Constructing public works that displace populations  |  |  |  |
| Developing a national climate change, biodiversity or REDD+ strategy  |  |  |  |
| Exploiting natural resources in indigenous territories |  |  |  |
| Develop a national REDD+ safeguards information system |  |  |  |
| Analyzing possible political, economic, administrative or normative solutions and strategies to protect forests  |  |  |  |
| Developing a system for payment for environmental services  |  |  |  |
| Carrying out a national forest inventory |  |  |  |
| Selecting and implementing actions to protect forests |  |  |  |

**The consultation process:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No  | Unsure |
| Negotiation can be a part of the consultation |  |  |  |
| Grants the right to veto |  |  |  |
| Is a process that guarantees the achievement of rights |  |  |  |
| Creates an obligation for the government |  |  |  |
| Creates an obligation for indigenous peoples |  |  |  |

**Consent is:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No  | Unsure |
| A precondition of the consultation process |  |  |  |
| An objective of the consultation process |  |  |  |

**If consent is not granted, can a government make a final decision?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No  | Unsure | Depends |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Regarding which aspects of PC and FPIC would you like to receive information? Please indicate specifics and the form of information that would be ideal for you.**

**Do you have interest in receiving information on the progress of PC and FPIC in your country or in the region?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No | Unsure | Email: |

**Would you like to attend workshops and events that exchange knowledge on the topic?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No | Unsure | Email: |

**Next steps:**

In the case that a third regional forum on this topic is organized:

1. What aspects or specifics would you like to go more into detail about?

1. Who else should we invite?
2. What could we do to improve this workshop in the future (both logistical and substantive aspects)?

4. How do you believe that the UN-REDD Programme could or should continue to support this topic in the region?

5. Other comments or suggestions?