



REPORT ON THE MEETING FOR THE VALIDATION OF THE RISKS AND BENEFITS ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL REDD+ SAFEGUARD WORKING GROUP BY THE CROSS RIVER STATE REDD+ TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

HELD ON THE 28TH JUNE 2016 AT CHANNEL VIEW HOTEL, CALABAR

Objectives of the meeting:

1. To carry out first validation of Risks and Benefit Analysis (RaBa) of candidate Policies and Measures (PAMs) relevant for REDD+ implementation, developed by the Safeguard Working Group;
2. To plan towards final validation of RaBa by the Cross River State (CRS) REDD+ Stakeholder Forum; and
3. To discuss next steps towards developing Safeguards principles and criteria (P&C)

Attendance and participation:

In attendance were members of the RTC and other stakeholders (34 in total, 12 women), including participants from civil society organizations (CSOs), academia, state and national REDD+ offices, Ministries of Agriculture, Climate Change and Forestry, Environment, the Cross River State Geographical Information Agency (CRSGIA), State Planning Commission (SPC), Department of International Donor support, etc. Government functionaries including the Commissioner for Climate Change and Forestry and the Special Assistant in that ministry were also among those present. A participants list is provided at Annex 1.

Opening and welcome by the Commissioner for Climate Change and Forestry – Dr. Mrs. Alice Ekwu:

In her opening remark, the honorable commissioner remarked Cross River State was chosen by Nigeria to pilot the program on REDD+ as the state is very conscious of climate change issues. She asserted that this meeting of the Technical Committee was one of the last ones at this point and was meant to review aspects of the readiness stage of the REDD+ program. She went on to say that PAMs that can be put in place would be considered. She also said that at the meeting there would be planning towards the risks and benefits and the final validation of the risks and benefits. According to her, the implementation stage would also be considered in terms of issues that may likely confront us and how to go about it. She enjoined full participation and openness so as to throw up issues, so that these could be dealt with.

Introduction to risks and benefits analysis by the Programme Officer, UNEP-WCMC, Charlotte Hicks, and the UN-REDD State Coordinator Dr. Edu Effiom.



Charlotte Hicks' presentation:

She presented a recap of the safeguard issues, which she said was one of the four pillars of the REDD+ initiative. Highlights of her presentation include:

- There are 7 safeguards broadly categorized into three classes: governance, social and environmental issues.
- The main purpose of REDD+ is to contribute to global CC mitigation, but it has the potential to deliver other benefits as well.
- There are safeguard requirements set out by the UNFCCC, as well as the World Bank that apply to all their projects.
- There is a generic country approach to the safeguards; Nigeria's approach to REDD+ safeguards aims to meet the minimum requirements, but there may be other domestic goals as well.
- There is need to clarify the safeguards in the country context. Risks and benefits analysis can help to clarify the safeguards in the country context.
- In addressing the risks and benefits of the PAMs, there may be a need for capacity to be built to address and respect the safeguards and to define a safeguard information system (SIS).

Dr. Edu Effiom, the State Coordinator's Presentation:

She started her presentation with an overview of the work done during the last one year. The key message, she said, was to reduce risks and enhance benefits in the course of implementation and not just increasing forest cover. She remarked that in the Nigerian approach, the key elements were looking at relevant PAMs and assessing, to enhance the benefits and reduce the risks. She also said that principles and criteria would be developed to meet the requirement at the state level then extended to other states.

Highlights of the result of the work done so far:

- i. Risks & Benefits analysis of REDD+. Started by looking at planned/existing PAMs relevant to REDD+ in CRS.
- ii. Description of an example PAM - the moratorium on logging - and what it means.
- iii. Status: where we are on the moratorium, which is on-going. There is on-going debate and agitation on the status of this measure.
- iv. Drivers of deforestation that the moratorium was supposed to address.
- v. Listed benefits and how the benefits could be promoted.
- vi. Checked the inherent risks of the moratorium.
- vii. Checked which safeguard/s these relate to.

An addition to the Risks & Benefits Analysis (RaBa) template was recommendations to enhance benefits and reduce risks. After putting together measures, we asked what the way forward would be in terms of recommendations.



Reactions, questions and answers to the presentation:

- Amos Kajang: The safeguards have not really addressed community issues and there is little community presence in the meeting. The issue of timeline for the moratorium has to be addressed before recommendations can be made. The fear of reversal of the State Government political will by the new administration needs to be addressed.
- Moses Amah: The reason for validation is to see if we have left issues out. The responsibility of addressing timeline for the moratorium lies with the government because it came from them. Political will was considered in bringing in the other states in the process. It was political will that made CRS a pilot. So we have to seek for political will to be able to move forward. Since a policy person is around, there are PAMs in different stages.
- Francis Egim: The delay in instituting a climate change council is delaying the moving forward of some of these policies. If there has been a climate change council meeting, we would know what is happening. Moratorium issue: we may just advise and allow them to handle the issue.
- On the question of whether the present regime has the political will and commitment to REDD+ or not, the commissioner replied that her presence should convince people that the state has the political will to drive the process since the government obliged space and staff for the smooth operation of REDD+ in the state.
- On the right format of the safeguards approach, Mr. Amah said it had to be according to the Cancun arrangements but does not have to be linear. Charlotte added that safeguards approach should be tailored to be country specific but should meet minimum requirements.
- The issue of stakeholder mapping for working groups, the state coordinator remarked that stakeholder engagement had really taken roots as there was representation in the group including the CSOs, communities, academia, and so on. She added that commitment and time was a major requirement in the choice of representatives.
- On the approach to stakeholder engagement, Tijani rejoined that REDD+ has many components such as safeguards and PGA, which work together and should not be separated.
- Caroline Olory also commented that no new policies were developed/examined, since it was the existing policies and measures that relevant to REDD+ that were used.
- The issue of the Climate Change Council was clarified by Odigha. He informed members that Climate Change Council existed in the project document and that it had already been operationalized by the immediate past governor of the state and that decisions are meant to be taken at governmental level. He urged that since other countries are coming on-stream in the process, Cross River State should do her best not to be left behind.

Group Work:

Participants were divided into four groups to consider the risks & benefits analysis for the following PAMs:

- i. Group One:
 - Moratorium on logging



- Commercial Agriculture Program
- ii. Group Two:
 - Community Land Use Plans
 - Community-based management (CBM) associations
- iii. Group Three:
 - Green Police
 - Non-timber forest products (NTFPs) Regulations
- iv. Group Four:
 - Cross River National Park (CRNP) related PAMs (including Local Advisory Committee, Proscribed Offences & Penalties, Participatory Management Plan)

The task was to consider the original work (i.e. risks, benefits and mitigation/enhancement measures identified) and then agree or disagree, with comments made with reasons why. General comments could also be made concerning the original work.

Group One: Moratorium and Commercial Agriculture

These were the reactions that came out of their presentation:

- There should be included, as a risk, possible encroachment of commercial agriculture into national park/reserves so that we find ways of mitigating the risk. The risk of farmers clearing more land was identified as a risk already but it was recommended to strengthen the language.
- We can have multi-faceted approach to management of land.

Group Two Presentation: Community Land Use Plans and Community Based Management Associations

In their presentations they commented on the following:

On Community Land Use Plan (LUP):

- When there are available customary laws, there may be gaps.
- They have issue with the term 'sustainability', which they said should be replaced with sustainable livelihoods.
- Need to be consistent with use of terms, e.g. "can", i.e. in phrasing of risks & benefits.
- Points 1 (promote respect of community LUP in extant law) do not address the benefit identified.
- On domination of planning by elites, there should be full participation of all stakeholders which could be done through proper mapping of stakeholders to avoid hijacking of process.

Reactions to the presentation:

- One of the benefits is about ensuring optimal use of land. The LUP can enhance sustainable land use if it is recognized by other land users, like government. There was also the issue of community laws, which have to be factored in to be representative.
- There has to be clarity on land use.



- Can you do a land use plan on land that you don't have control over?
- There is a need to rephrase "can identify most suitable land for a particular use and thus regulate land use to ensure optimal and sustainable use of land", as optimal and sustainable are subjective terms.
- Most customary laws are not written. They should be so that government knows it. This will reduce acrimony.
- The sectors should include other sectors apart from the MDAs, i.e. govt, private, civil society sectors.

Group Three Presentation: Green Police and NTFPs Regulations

They considered the following issues in their presentation. Suggestions included:

- There should not be deviation from the original Green Police concept and also there should be clarification on who they are to report to.
- One of the key reasons they should work with MCCF is that the Green Police would not connive with the community to deforest.
- Roles should be streamlined between enforcement by Green Police and the Task Force.
- Reporting should also be from the Green Police to the Ministry and it should be in line with existing structure.
- Need for the provision of strict policies for domestication of NTFPs that are almost extinct.

Reactions on the presentation:

- Is there no structure for the Green Police?
- In creating more awareness, the comments are better under description of the PAMs.
- Ashikem opined that even though there are 3 components to the Green Police, they should be trained for general duties to enable them fit into any of the 3 units they may be so assigned.
- On the seemingly conflicting role of the Green Police, the Commissioner reiterated that the GP was constituted to work in 4 areas of assignment namely: engagement in nursery development, planting and nurturing, forest policing, and others to be posted to Ministry of Environment to manage waste.
- We should be talking of enhancement planting and ecological restoration.
- To enhance value addition to NTFPs, it should be emphasized that forest-dependent communities should be organized into cooperatives to be able to access funds.

Group Four Presentation: Three major PAMs of CRNP

They dwelt specifically on the National Parks Act of 2006. They suggested that government should synergize with communities to reduce farming in buffer zones, which should not have been allowed in the first place. Their comments outside those on the template include:

- That provision of alternative livelihoods should be adaptive to the communities' needs.



- Government should provide budgetary allocation for supporting development for support zone communities.
- Emphasis should be on enforcement of the laws of CRNP management.

Potential measures identified included:

- On connivance of officers, there should be adequate remuneration for officers.
- Government should encourage the development of ecotourism.
- Sitting allowance to local community advisory committee is not sufficient. They should also be given capacity building.

Reactions to the presentation:

- There should be fire tracing and look-out stations to detect fire. There should also be readiness of trained and equipped staff to fight fire (and to promote compliance to laws and regulations).
- Clarification provided that the NP law does not allow any form of harvesting in the park.
- It is not just a matter of new laws but the enforcement agency should be identified to deal with issues. Let this identification be clear so that we know who does what.
- Caroline Olory answered that only existing PAMs were considered. In the Participatory Management Plan, we checked the risks and benefits as it relates to REDD+. She emphasized that enforcement here was referring to that within the National Park.
- Charlotte noted that the process examined existing and planned PAMs, and if new PAMs for REDD+ were suggested, then these would need further analysis.

Closing Remarks:

1. Edu Effiom:

Dr. Effiom reassured the house of the new administration's commitment to support to the REDD+ programme, noting that the State has committed much resources to the programme and is willing to continue to give the programme all the necessary support it needs to ensure that the readiness phase is successfully completed and the investment phase is ushered in. She called for the support of all stakeholders, stating that the REDD+ programme has recorded remarkable achievements on the different work streams, such as on the strategy development and the forest monitoring and reference emission level establishment. She then requested Mr. Moses Amah, representing the National Coordinator, Nigeria UN-REDD Programme, to furnish the house with the combined activities to be undertaken at both the State and National on harmonizing the different work streams towards meeting the REDD readiness target come December 2016. She informed the house that the rest of the activities on the agenda will be carried out by the Safeguards working group at the State REDD+ Secretariat for the three remaining working days of the week.



2. Mr. Moses Amah

Mr. Amah remarked that they would be back for the validation of the strategy developed for CRS since the state is like a framework that others would fit into. He commented that the PGA done was not enough by itself to enable a good strategy development for the state and the country. He went on to say that all the pillars must be linked to be able to reflect all the issues in the strategy. According to him, to have a strategy, we must have a forest definition. He enjoined that as a state, we are almost there and so need to put in extra commitment in this last lap so as not to be overtaken by new entrants. In his words, “As we are delivering, we trust we can make it in July 2016”.

3. Charlotte Hicks

Charlotte reiterated that this assessment was meant to feed into a process of clarifying Cancun safeguards in the country context, saying that the goal is to carry out this work in the next 6 months before the end of the program. This, she said, can be used it as a way to define the goals and scope of the safeguards to flow towards the final outcome.

4. The Commissioner for Climate Change and Forestry

She thanked participants for sitting through the meeting, for the energy expressed and useful discussions that threw more light into issues. She enjoined participants to bear in mind that things could be thrown up over times. She observed that we have done well in terms of timeline. She then commended everyone that made it possible noting that the expectation that we would be launching into the next phase was now possible. The commissioner then admonished that being like the first born, others were looking up to us and so we should pursue the process with zeal and not allow ourselves to be outrun by others.



Annex 1: Participants list

Name	Organisation	Gender
Ashikem Akomaye	Ministry of Climate Change and Forestry (MCCF)	M
Bridget Nkor	MCCF	F
Tijani Ahmed	Fed. Min. of Environment	M
Asuquo Okon	Pilot Site Coordinator - Mangrove	M
Moses Ama	Fed. Min. of Environment	M
Patrick CocoBassey	Director, State Planning Commission	M
Martins Egot	Pilot Site Coordinator - Iko/Ekuri	M
Ekpenyong Ita	Chairman, REDD+ Technical Committee	M
Nathaniel Nkor	Desk Officer, Ministry of Agriculture	M
Caroline Olory	Cross River National Park(CRNP)	F
Bassey Ituen	CRS REDD+ Secretariat	F
Edu Effiom	UN-REDD State Coordinator, MCCF	F
Carswel Nkoro	MCCF	M
Dr. Elizabeth Essien	Lecturer, University of Calabar	F
Edwin Ogar (representative)	WATER	F
Okang Oku	Community Reps/Iko Ekuri	M
Eme Efang	NGOCE	F
Amos Kajang	NGO (Secretary, REDD+ Technical Committee)	M
Odigha	BOT Chairman, NGOCE	M
Chief Mrs. Atim Okon	Community Reps/Mangrove	F
Dr. Alice Ekwu	Commissioner, MCCF	F
Ben Usang	CRS Civil Society Coalition	M
Francis Ejim	Min. of International Donor Cooperation	M
Enagu, Blessing	MCCF – Information Officer	F
Dr. Augustine Ogogo	UNICAL	M
Odum Esira	MCCF/CRSFC Driver	M
Mfoniso Antia	MCCF	F
Austine Umo	CRSGIA	M
Emmanuel Egbe	MCCF	M
Timothy Akwaji	Perm Secretary, MCCF	M
Samuel Njar Inyang	Head, GIS Unit/MRV Coordinator CRSFC	M
Barr. Dan Takon Etta	CRS REDD+ Secretariat	M
Ikenna Iluono	MCCF	M
Charlotte Hicks	UNEP-WCMC	F