



Technical Consultation on Social and Environmental Safeguards in Nigeria
2-4 August 2011
UN House, Abuja, Nigeria

Summary

On 2-4 August 2011 a technical consultation was convened in Abuja to review both the Nigeria National Programme Document and the draft UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria in the light of multiple benefits and risks of REDD+. The 15-20 participants from the Federal Government, Cross River State Forestry Commission, federal and state NGOs and UNEP discussed aspects of social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ in Nigeria, and identified key strengths and potential improvements in both of the documents they reviewed. This joint review process provided a basis for reinforcing both the strengths of the Nigeria National Programme and the relevance and applicability of the draft Principles and Criteria.

Detailed report

In the light of the forthcoming submission of Nigeria's national programme document to the UN-REDD Policy Board and the UN-REDD programme's development of Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria, Nigeria's REDD Technical community convened a workshop with the following objectives:

To position Nigeria to take a lead in operationalising social and environmental safeguards for REDD, by:

- Raising awareness of multiple benefits (and risks) from REDD+ and how they relate to UNFCCC safeguards
- Assessing the applicability in Nigeria of the draft UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria and providing insights for their improvement
- Reviewing the draft Nigeria REDD+ readiness programme and identify potential improvements to it in the light of the draft UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria

Workshop participants were drawn from major groups active in the development of REDD+ in Nigeria, including the national Forest Department and other Federal Government departments, the Cross River State Forestry Commission, and NGOs/CSOs active at national and state levels. A total of 15-20 participants (listed in Annex A) met at UN House over 3 days. The full programme of the workshop is included in Annex B.

The opening day was directed principally at providing context on REDD+ in Nigeria, and on multiple benefits and safeguards, to support the detailed review of the Nigeria national programme (and context) in light of the UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria (hereafter referred to as the Principles and Criteria) over the subsequent two days. This first day included opening remarks and an introduction of the objectives and agenda, as

well as a presentation on the “Status of REDD+ Readiness in Nigeria” (including a description of the country’s two track –federal and state level – approach and the process for developing the National Programme Document for submission to the UN-REDD Policy Board) and on approval . The context on multiple benefits (and risks) from REDD was developed through an introductory presentation followed by an extended discussion session in which participants identified REDD+ actions that will contribute to each of the five major REDD+ activities (reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks) in Nigeria and identified potential social and environmental benefits and risks associated with a selection of them. They also identified options for enhancing the benefits and mitigating the risks.

This discussion highlighted the fact that many of the actions planned for REDD+ in Nigeria will contribute to more than one of the major REDD+ activities. For example: enforcement of anti-logging policies will contribute to reducing emissions from deforestation and from forest degradation, and will also contribute to enhancement of forest carbon stocks; establishment of woodlots would both reduce emissions from forest degradation and potentially enhance forest carbon stocks; and local land use planning could contribute to all five major REDD+ activities. The risk and benefit discussion focused on enforcement of anti-logging policies, enrichment planting and establishment and improved management of grazing reserves as example activities. Identified risks for these activities included conflict among interested stakeholders, reduced access to key resources for communities and negative impacts on employment patterns. Benefits included improved conservation status and ecosystem function of the forest, reduced incidence of fires and improved access to some resources (e.g. NTFPs from planted species) and enhanced nutritional status for local communities. The approaches participants identified for mitigating risk and enhancing benefits from these actions included early and extensive stakeholder participation (including in implementation) and education, provision of alternative sources of materials, e.g. through plantations and woodlots on non-forest land, careful selection of species and planning for replacement plantings and ongoing management. This discussion was very effective in building a common understanding among the group of what multiple benefits (and risks) encompass, and therefore provided a useful frame of reference for the next two days discussion. Full details of the discussions of social and environmental risks and benefits can be found in Annex C.

Following overview presentations on the UN-REDD Programme’s draft Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria (P & C) and on the UNFCCC’s discussions of social and environmental safeguards, the remainder of the consultation was devoted to a process of detailed parallel review of the National REDD+ Readiness Programme and draft UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria, determining for each criterion:

- a. What elements exist within the current programme that address the criterion?
- b. What elements could/should be added to the programme to address the criterion?
- c. How useful is the criterion in its present form? How can it be improved?

The national programme was examined principally through its results framework, but reference was made to the wider text as needed. The review also took into account, and identified responses to relevant comments from the Independent Technical Reviewers and Policy Board Members.

This review identified both a number of modifications to strengthen the national programme document and a substantial number of suggestions for modification (or clarification) of the P & C, for forwarding to the P & C drafting group. The group found that the existing document contained specific sections that addressed the issues raised by the P & C, and indicated that the National REDD Programme was likely to meet the criteria. However, in several instances the connections between activities and these issues had not been made explicit, and the group suggested additional wording and clarification in the results framework and/or the narrative to make these links clearer. In a few cases the group suggested adding new activities (or structures) to the programme and additional sections (e.g. one on indirect effects) to the document, and modifications to the institutional arrangements were suggested to respond to needs identified in the light of the principles and Criteria. Among the recommended specific changes to the Programme Document were: increasing the clarification of when special consideration needed to be paid to women, youth and other vulnerable groups; ensuring oversight of monitoring and reporting from NGOs/CSOs; inclusion of fiduciary oversight in the institutional arrangement; a proposal for a State Technical REDD+ Committee in Cross River; support to research; explicit attention to multiple functions of forests in activities like monitoring and national stratification of forests.

The consultation also identified cross-cutting changes, relevant for a variety of criteria, including specifying the particular types of training and awareness raising that are needed - to include training in multiple benefits and in the role and importance of land use planning, specifically community-based land use planning. The discussions and suggestions for revision of the Nigeria National Programme Document also helped to resolve many of the issues raised by the independent technical reviewers and Policy Board members. Annex D summarises the suggestions for changes to the programme document.

Participants discussed the usefulness of the Principles and Criteria and as an aide in formulating national REDD+ programmes that accord with the Cancun safeguards and in reviewing national programmes seeking UN-REDD funding. They identified a number of suggestions to be considered by the drafting committee for clarification of the ways the P & C are formulated. The participants frequently found that further elaboration and/or examples were needed to help with understanding the meanings of the P & C and how they should be applied. Therefore, the group emphasised the importance of the planned Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool to help with interpreting the P & C. The group recommended the inclusion of an additional criterion. It also suggested a number of additional entries to the glossary and recommended that formatting should be used to indicate where particular terms are included in the glossary. Annex E has suggested changes for the Principles and Criteria.

Finally, the participants discussed near-term next steps in the development of the REDD+ programme in Nigeria in addition to the recommended changes to the National Programme Document. A one page summary of the consultation process (Annex F) will be included in the national programme document when it is resubmitted to the UN-REDD Policy Board, as added evidence of the consideration of safeguards in the

development of the programme. The group also discussed upcoming events such as the REDD+ University to be held in Calabar, Nigeria and the CBD Regional Consultation on REDD+ and Biodiversity Safeguards to be held in Cape Town, South Africa, at which Nigeria would make a presentation to showcase efforts thus far.

Annex A.

Participants List

S/N	Name of participant	Organization
1	Alade Adeleke	Nigerian Conservation Foundation
2	Dzakwa Yah	Federal Ministry of Environment
3	Dr Augustine Ogogo	CRS Forestry Commission
4	Dr Valerie Kapos	UNEP WCMC
5	Salisu Dahiru	Federal Ministry of Environment, National Coordinator of REDD+
6	Odigha Odigha	CRS Forestry Commission
7	Ochuko Odibo	Consultant
8	James Odey	Development in Nigeria
9	Julie Greenwalt	UNEP
10	Edu Effiom	CRS Forestry Commission
11	Benedicta. O. Falana	Federal Ministry of Environment (Forestry)
12	Emmanuel Egbe	CRS Forestry Commission
13	Achakpa Priscilla	Women Environmental Programme
14	Sylvanus Abua	CRS Civil Society
15	Hauwa Umar	REDD Unit
16	Dr S. A. Adejuwon	SCCU, Federal Ministry of Environment
17	Ebomire O. Raymond	Federal Ministry of Environment
18	Queensley O. Ajuyakpe	Women Environment Programme

Annex B

Agenda

Day 1: Tuesday, 2 August 2011

9:30 am: Welcome and Opening Statement

Salisu Dahiru, REDD+ National Coordinator, Nigeria

Odigha Odigha, Chairman, Cross River State Forest Commission

Muyiwa Odele, Environment officer, UN-Nigeria

9:45 am: Round Table introduction of participants

10:00 am: Introduction to purpose of workshop and consultation
Valerie Kapos, Senior Programme Officer, UNEP WCMC
Julie Greenwalt, Programme Officer, UNEP UN-REDD
Questions and comments – adoption of agenda

10:30am Coffee break

11:00am: Status of REDD+ readiness in Nigeria: The draft Nigeria REDD+ Readiness Programme -
Odigha Odigha

11:30 am: Introduction to Multiple Benefits (and Risks) from REDD+ - *Valerie Kapos & Julie Greenwalt*

12:30pm Lunch

1:30pm: Working Session and Discussion

- Identifying the possible social and environmental benefits and risks from REDD+ activities in Nigeria
- Identifying options for enhancing benefits and mitigating risks

3:30pm: Status of UNFCCC REDD+ Negotiations, including safeguards - *Salisu Dahiru*

4:00pm: Making safeguards operational: Introduction to draft UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria - *Valerie Kapos & Julie Greenwalt*

Day 2: Wednesday, 3 August 2011

9am: Introduction to and Current Status of Nigeria's National REDD+ Readiness Programme document and logical framework

9:30am: Review of National REDD+ Readiness Programme in the light of draft UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria, determining for each criterion

- a. What elements exist within the current programme that address the criterion?
- b. What elements could/should be added to the programme to address the criterion?
- c. How useful is the criterion in its present form? How can it be improved?

Principle 1 – Comply with standards of democratic governance

Criterion 1 – Ensure the integrity and transparency of fiduciary and fund management systems

Criterion 2 – Develop and implement activities in a transparent, accountable, legitimate and responsive manner

Criterion 3 – Ensure the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in policy design and implementation, with special attention to the most vulnerable and marginalized groups

11am Coffee Break

Principle 2 – Respect and protect stakeholder rights

Criterion 4 – Promote and enhance gender equality and women's empowerment

Criterion 5 – Seek free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities

Criterion 6 – Avoid involuntary resettlement as a result of REDD+

Criterion 7 – Respect and protect cultural heritage and traditional knowledge

12:30pm Lunch

Principle 3 – Promote and enhance sustainable livelihoods

Criterion 8 – Ensure equitable and transparent benefit distribution among relevant stakeholders

Criterion 9 – Respect and enhance economic, social and political well-being

Principle 4 – Contribute to coherent low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sound development policy, consistent with commitments under international conventions and agreements

Criterion 10 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national climate policy objectives, including mitigation and adaptation strategies and international commitments

Criterion 11 – Address the risk of reversals including potential future risks to forest carbon stocks and other benefits to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of REDD+

Criterion 12 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national poverty reduction strategies and other sustainable development goals

Criterion 13 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national biodiversity conservation, other environmental and natural resource management policy objectives, national forest programmes, and international commitments

4pm Summary discussion:

Recommendations for National Programme

Recommendations for P & C

Annex C.

Social and Environmental Benefits and Risks from 3 example activities

Table 1: Enforcement of Anti-logging Enforcement

Benefits	Risks	Mitigation strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved conservation status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likelihood of conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing erosion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing invasive species and pests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricted use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing and empowering Anti-logging Task Force
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving ecosystem functioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased corruption opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community conflict management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of water bodies (flow regulation and quality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displacement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative livelihoods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat improvement for wildlife 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced revenue for government and communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting plantation forestry
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing carbon sequestration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating black market, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint action, monitoring

	driving up prices on timber products	and partnership
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetic value and air purification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced access to materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of alternative building supplies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced human/wildlife condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loyalty payments to communities (apart from carbon credits)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain NTFP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring habitat for pollinators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote ecotourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance nutrient cycling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects honey production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrichment of biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects forest cultural heritage – traditional knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserves forests for forest protection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment for enforcement responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reserves forest for future generation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Table 2: Enrichment Planting

Benefits	Risks	Mitigation strategies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased stock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communal conflict over ownership rights, equity issues, suspicion on tenure intent and harvest rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early community involvement/participatory approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration of wildlife habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pests/disease and fire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPIC and FMAT (free mutually agreed terms)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved availability of specific resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem “imbalance” – loss of other species, unanticipated impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for management roles – repeat or replacement planting for plantings lost to attrition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment – new opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post planting employment slump 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening existing community governance structures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased skills – silviculture and environmental stewardships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Blame” issues – cattle encroachment, trampling and fire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate plans and needs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased capacity and organisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empowerment 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food security 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased income from trees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

• Reduces vulnerability	•	•
• Encourages efficient use of land	•	•
•	•	•

Table 3: Establish and improve management of grazing reserves

Benefits	Risks	Mitigation strategies
• Conflict resolution across scales	• Disruption of traditional practices (e.g. nomadic culture)	• Community consultation
• Improved productivity in terms of nutrition, rotation and fertility addition	• Possibility of discrimination and conflicts	• Enacting and complementing grazing laws
• Reduce incidence of bush fires, if well managed	• Public outcry related to some revenue loss	• Flexible use options
• Improved livestock management e.g. disease management	• Animal disease- risk of transmission to wildlife	• Management training and extension – involve veterinary sector
• Increased opportunities for enhancement	• Overstocking of grazing lands when poor management happens	• Stakeholders consensus meetings
• Rotation for improved productivity	• New conflicts	• Enacting and implementing grazing laws
• Better access to nomadic education	• Vulnerability – extreme events and disease	• Large scale holistic planning – flexible use options; stock routes/corridor
• More available time	• Disruption of trade value chain	•
• Improved management structures/cooperation	• Increased transport costs	•
• Employment opportunities	•	•
• Improved production of livestock based products	•	•
• Reduced impacts on forest biodiversity	•	•
• Reduced conflicts in terms of protected area and grazing ranges	•	•

Annex D.
Recommended changes to the Nigeria REDD+ Readiness Document

<p>Criterion 1: fiduciary and funds management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tweaking - reflect the financial oversight in the organisational structure (institutional reference) • It should be clear in the institutional arrangement whose responsibility it is to monitor the project. Participants suggested oversight responsibility for CSOs • Make CSO role in monitoring explicit (including financial monitoring).
<p>Criterion 2: Develop and implement activities in a transparent, accountable, legitimate and responsive manner</p> <p>Felt the criterion was fully met by existing activities</p>
<p>Criterion 3: Ensure the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in policy design and implementation, with special attention to the most vulnerable and marginalized groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify consultation outcomes
<p>Criterion 4: Promote and enhance gender equality and women’s empowerment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.4.5 add “ including by women” • re-word output 2.1 • 3.2.2 add to activity • 2.1.2 “including situation and role of women vulnerable groups” youth. • 3.1.3 including in gender sensitivity and skills. • Add to 3.3.5 including consideration for women. • 3.3.7 including consideration for women and vulnerable groups • 2.3.3 including national guidelines for engagement with communities
<p>Criteria 5: Seek free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output 3.4 national guidelines for community forest management in development
<p>Criteria 6: Avoid involuntary resettlement as a result of REDD+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add definite statement in text and logframe • Make explicit that community-based land use planning as a means to eliminate need for involuntary resettlement • 2.3.2 build on exchange of land use plans as a means of knowledge and lessons
<p>Criterion 7: Respect and protect cultural heritage and traditional knowledge</p>
<p>Principle 3: Promote and enhance sustainable livelihoods</p>
<p>Criteria 8: Ensure equitable and transparent benefit distribution among relevant stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.3.1 add “traditional knowledge and cultural practices • 3.3.2 + “including customary laws and community by-laws associated with land use plans. • 1.3.2 + “and implications for benefit distribution”
<p>Criteria 9: Respect and enhance economic, social and political well-being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add an activity like “build REDD into national and state development plans” • Add “design of an equitable and transparent mechanism with input from relevant stakeholders to 3.3.7 • Possible addition to 2.1 • Assessment of forest contribution to national sustainable development

<p>Criterion 10: suggested as: “minimise adverse impacts on livelihoods”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis in text that: a) community ownership reduces risks of reversals; b) REDD in CRS is building on long-term stewardships • Make livelihoods connection and clearer in 4.2.1 wording
<p>Principle 4 – Contribute to coherent low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sound development policy, consistent with commitments under international conventions and agreements</p>
<p>Criterion 10 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national climate policy objectives, including mitigation and adaptation strategies and international commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add line to make explicit role of SCCU in consistency • Make explicit role of CRS implementation in enhancing national readiness • National constitution permits/facilitates staged development
<p>Criterion 11 – Address the risk of reversals including potential future risks to forest carbon stocks and other benefits to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of REDD+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasise in text that (a) Community ownership reduces risks of reversals (b) REDD in CRS is building on long term stewardship.
<p>Criterion 12 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national poverty reduction strategies and other sustainable development goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rephrase 3.3.1 to clarify that is: Assess existing policies and strategies including SEEDS AND LEEDS (add NEEDS) • add NBSAP + MEA commitments
<p>Criterion 13 –Ensure consistency with and contribution to national biodiversity conservation, other environmental and natural resource management policy objectives, national forest programmes, and international commitments</p>
<p>Principle 5 – Protect natural forest from degradation or conversion to other land uses, Including plantation forest</p>
<p>Criterion 14 – Ensure that REDD+ activities do not cause the conversion of natural forest to other land uses, including plantation forest, and make reducing conversion due to other causes (e.g. agriculture, timber and fuelwood extraction, infrastructure development) a REDD+ priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use planning • Add “training of Climate Change Council” • Add “for technical staff in other sectors” e.g. Agriculture Ministry • It was suggested that the REDD Technical Committee should raise awareness across ministries and engage with Agriculture Department or Ministry. • Add training for CCC to text and for technical staff in other sectors e.g agric. extension • 1.2.7 add “and engagement with”
<p>Criterion 15: Minimise degradation of natural forest by REDD+ activities and make reducing degradation due to other causes (e.g. agriculture, timber and fuelwood extraction, infrastructure development) a REDD+ priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To add research to support and training in adaptive management will be useful as a mitigation measure • Add text on incorporating existing scientific knowledge and supporting scientific research
<p>Principle 6 – Maintain and enhance multiple functions of forest to deliver benefits</p>

Principle 6 – Maintain and enhance multiple functions of forest to deliver benefits Including biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services
Criterion 16: Ensure that land use planning for REDD+ explicitly takes account of ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation in relation to local and other stakeholders’ values, and potential trade-offs between different benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to build in ecosystem values and functions into existing land use plans • Main text raise possibly of addressing multiple functions • It would be good to add community-based land use planning and strategy development to the text
Criterion 17: Ensure that new and existing forests are managed to maintain and enhance ecosystem services and biodiversity important in both local and national contexts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National policy addresses/recognises importance of multiple functions • Related core activities are 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3 and 1.3.4 but need to add in the text that managing the forest guarantees non-carbon related benefits as well. • Also related are 2.1.1 and 2.2.2, but add “multiple functions”;
Principle 7: Minimise indirect adverse impacts on ecosystem services and biodiversity
Criterion 18 – Minimise harmful effects on carbon stocks of forest and non-forest ecosystems resulting from displacement of changes in land use (including extractive activities)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a specific section on Addressing Indirect Effects • Prioritise development of monitoring in neighbouring states • Make explicit links between existing activities and limitations of indirect effects
Criterion 19 – Minimise harmful effects on biodiversity and other ecosystem services of forest and non-forest ecosystems resulting from displacement of changes in land use (including extractive activities)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise ID and monitoring of ‘down stream effects’ in multiple benefits assessment
Criterion 20 – Minimise other indirect impacts on biodiversity, such as those resulting from

Annex E

Full version 2 of the UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria with Proposed Changes as comments

**UN-REDD Programme Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria
Draft for Consultation – 30 June 2011**

Introduction and Purpose

The UN-REDD Programme is working with partners and REDD+ countries to develop tools and guidance to enhance the multiple benefits of, and reduce risks from REDD+. As part of this work, a set of Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria (P&C) are being developed, which consists of broad principles, within which more detailed criteria describe important issues to be considered in developing REDD+ programmes.

The Principles and Criteria will serve:

1. To provide the UN-REDD Programme with a framework to ensure that its activities promote social and environmental benefits and reduce risks from REDD+. In particular, the P&C will be used by the UN-REDD Programme:

- as an aid in formulating national REDD+ programmes and initiatives that seek UN-REDD funding
- in the review of national programmes prior to submission for UN-REDD funding
- to assess national programme delivery

2. To support countries in operationalizing UNFCCC agreements on safeguards for REDD+. Countries can use these P&C for various purposes, such as:

- to promote, apply and build on the Cancun safeguards¹
- in devising a national system for information on how the UNFCCC safeguards are being addressed and respected in REDD+ implementation
- in demonstrating their achievements beyond carbon, for example in reference to efforts on poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation

Process:

The draft Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria have been developed in collaboration between UNDP and UNEP, under the UN-REDD Programme. The P&C were presented at the UN-REDD Policy Board meeting in March 2011 ([‘UN-REDD Programme Social & Environmental Principles and Criteria, version 1’](#); UNREDD/PB6/2011/IV/1), and comments invited. Based on the valuable inputs received, the current document has been prepared as a basis for the UN-REDD Programme to work with key stakeholders and individual countries in testing and further refining the P&C. This process will support the initial operationalization of the Cancun guidance and safeguards, as will the use of other UN-REDD Programme tools and approaches. A finalised version of the P&C will be produced for presentation to the Policy Board in October 2011. Approval of the P&C for the purposes outlined above will be sought from the Policy Board at this time.

In addition to these general principles and criteria, a Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool is being developed to assist national REDD+ teams in developing national programmes in accordance with the Cancun safeguards. It may also support development of practical indicators for the social and environmental effects of REDD+ at the national level. A first version was presented to Policy Board 5 in November 2010. In collaboration with the countries involved in testing the P&C, the tool will now be broadened to include an environmental component and the positive effects of REDD+

¹ Paragraphs 69, 71d, 72, 76 and Appendix I in the UNFCCC Decision 1/CP.16 : The Cancun Agreements: Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (Decisions adopted by the UNFCCC on its sixteenth session, held in Cancun, Mexico from 29 November to 10 December 2010). **Referred to in this document as the ‘Cancun safeguards’.**

activities as well as the risks. A new version will be available subsequent to UNFCCC COP 17 (28 November – 9 December 2011) in Durban.

Further guidance is being developed on the use of both the P&C and the Risk Identification and Mitigation Tool.

Context

The Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria are coherent with and draw from the Cancun safeguards, and emerge from the existing rich body of knowledge and literature on safeguards, standards and certification. They seek to address the major potential opportunities and risks from REDD+ and to assist countries in promoting and supporting the safeguards in the implementation of their REDD+ activities as well as in identifying the information needed to report on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected, as called for in the UNFCCC Cancun decision ([FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1](#); 69, 71d, 72, Appendix 1, Appendix 2).

The P&C are also intended to help countries to meet their commitments under Multilateral Agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the International Labor Organization Convention 169, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (UNCERD), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and the UN Declaration of Human Rights. The framework reflects the UN-REDD Programme's responsibility to apply a human rights based approach, uphold UN conventions, treaties and declarations, and apply the UN agencies' policies and procedures (for example, UNDP's Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change prescriptive policy, UNEP's Framework for Ecosystems Management, and FAO's Environment and Social Impact Procedures). The Principles and Criteria are consistent with the readiness support offered by the UN-REDD Programme (UN-REDD Framework Document 2008) and reflect the Programme's issue-specific Operational Guidance.

The Cancun agreement provides broad guidance and a framework for safeguarding and enhancing the multiple benefits of REDD+; national approaches for promoting and supporting these will need to be developed.

The draft Principles include two on social issues, one on social and environmental policy coherence, and three on environmental issues. They do not include procedural criteria such as monitoring and reporting. These Principles and associated Criteria are shown in Table 1. In Annex 1, the Principles are related to the relevant text in the Cancun Decision.

Table 1: Proposed Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria (version 2; update to Table 1 of UNREDD/PB6/2011/IV/1)

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: General comment: It would be helpful to make more obvious which terms and concepts have additional explanation included in the glossary, perhaps using formatting (and hyperlinking). It would also be helpful to offer, for more complex terms, synonyms or substitutes that could be used in outreach materials aimed at a wider audience.

Principle 1 – Comply with standards of democratic governance	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM
Criterion 1 – Ensure the integrity and transparency of fiduciary and fund management systems	Comment: It would be good for this to include a criterion relating to Human Rights
Criterion 2 – Develop and implement activities in a transparent, accountable, legitimate and responsive manner	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM Comment: This term is problematic and needs clear connection to full explanation in glossary and provision of substitute language
Criterion 3 – Ensure the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in policy design and implementation, with special attention to the most vulnerable and marginalized groups	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM Comment: Sthis term similarly needs to be well defined – the group took it to relate to legal status, but is this correct?
Principle 2 – Respect and protect stakeholder rights	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM
Criterion 4 – Promote and enhance gender equality and women’s empowerment	Comment: Expand glossary entry to explicitly include women, youth and the disabled
Criterion 5 – Seek free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM Comment: It might be helpful to add a criterion on building knowledge and awareness of rights, and capacity to exercise them.
Criterion 6 – Avoid involuntary resettlement as a result of REDD+	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM Comment: Important to replace this word with ‘Equity’
Criterion 7 – Respect and protect cultural heritage and traditional knowledge	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM
Principle 3 – Promote and enhance sustainable livelihoods	Comment: It is important to note that “indigenous people” is not a relevant term in Nigeria (and other places), and it would be helpful if a glossary entry reflected this
Criterion 8 – Ensure equitable and transparent benefit distribution among relevant stakeholders	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM
Criterion 9 – Respect and enhance economic, social and political well-being	Comment: It would be good for the Risk Identification & Mitigation Tool to include an entry on community land use planning in relation to this criterion
Principle 4 – Contribute to coherent low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sound development policy, consistent with commitments under international conventions and agreements	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM
Criterion 10 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national climate policy objectives, including mitigation and adaptation strategies and international commitments	Comment: the wording of this criterion considered to be very vague and therefore the group emphasised the importance of using the Risk Identification & Mitigation Tool to make specific examples available
Criterion 11 – Address the risk of reversals including potential future risks to forest carbon stocks and other benefits to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of REDD+	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM Comment: Suggest rewording to read “Promote and enhance forests’ contribution to sustainable livelihoods”. Possibly add a new criterion: ‘Minimise adverse impacts on livelihoods’.
Criterion 12 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national poverty reduction strategies and other sustainable development goals	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM Comment: The group recognised that this covers a complex process, and therefore the Risk Identification & Mitigation Tool should address: analysis & research; formulas and ratios; planning; development of a mechanism; implementation of a mechanism; and oversight.
Criterion 13 – Ensure consistency with and contribution to national biodiversity conservation, other environmental and natural resource management policy objectives, national forest programmes, and international commitments	Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM Comment: It was felt that this criterion is very complex: consider splitting it.

Principle 5 – Protect natural forest from degradation or conversion to other land uses, including plantation forest

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: The glossary and tool need to include some discussion of implications of varying national definitions of forest

Criterion 14 – Ensure that REDD+ activities do not cause the conversion of natural forest to other land uses, including plantation forest, and make reducing conversion due to other causes (e.g. agriculture, timber and fuelwood extraction, infrastructure development) a REDD+ priority

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: There was considerable discussion for both this criterion and 15 about how conversion or degradation could possibly happen as a result of REDD activities. Eventually the group came up with several examples/scenarios, but it will be crucial to include such illustrations somewhere, so that they can make the risks clearer to those who have not thought about them previously

Criterion 15 – Minimise degradation of natural forest by REDD+ activities and make reducing degradation due to other causes (e.g. agriculture, timber and fuelwood extraction, infrastructure development) a REDD+ priority

Principle 6 – Maintain and enhance multiple functions of forest to deliver benefits including biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: The group thought this could be stronger, using 'avoid' rather than 'minimize', but after some discussion understood the reasoning behind this phrasing

Criterion 16 – Ensure that land use planning for REDD+ explicitly takes account of ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation in relation to local and other stakeholders' values, and potential trade-offs between different benefits

Criterion 17 – Ensure that new and existing forests are managed to maintain and enhance ecosystem services and biodiversity important in both local and national contexts

Principle 7 – Minimise indirect adverse impacts on ecosystem services and biodiversity

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: There needs to be a good glossary entry for this term

Criterion 18 – Minimise harmful effects on carbon stocks of forest and non-forest ecosystems resulting from displacement of changes in land use (including extractive activities)

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: There was some constructive discussion of whether an additional criterion is needed to deal with "downstream impacts" and aquatic systems – the resolution was that these are adequately covered by criteria 19 and 20. Ensure that these are adequately covered in glossary.

Criterion 19 – Minimise harmful effects on biodiversity and other ecosystem services of forest and non-forest ecosystems resulting from displacement of changes in land use (including extractive activities)

Criterion 20 – Minimise other indirect impacts on biodiversity, such as those resulting from intensification of land use

[A question was raised about whether the P & C should address somewhere the question of long term security of food resources](#)

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: Tool could usefully include reference to measures that enhance efficiency of use of forest products

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM

Comment: The tool should reference a range of effects and examples

Valerie Kapos 8/8/11 6:28 PM

Formatted: English (US)

Glossary

<p>Carbon stock: The quantity of carbon contained in a “pool”, meaning a reservoir or system which has the capacity to accumulate or release carbon, such as above-ground biomass or soil; also the total carbon contained within all the component pools of an ecosystem.</p>
<p>Conversion: The replacement of forest by other land uses.</p>
<p>Cultural heritage: The legacy of physical artifacts and intangible attributes of a group or society that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and bestowed for the benefit of future generations²; in a REDD+ context, this especially includes cultural values associated with specific forests or landscapes.</p>
<p>Degradation: Reduction in the capacity of a forest to provide goods and services.</p>
<p>Democratic governance: Democratic governance goes beyond the efficiency of institutions and rules, and aims for these to be fair and developed through democratic processes in which all people have a real political voice. Democratic governance emphasizes process and political legitimacy and promotes human development.</p> <p>UNDP’s “A Guide to UNDP Democratic Governance Practice” outlines democratic governance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fostering Inclusive Participation - Strengthening Accountable and Responsive Institutions - Grounding Democratic Governance in International Principles <p>UNDP Practice Note “Supporting Country-led Democratic Governance Assessments” identifies four principles of democratic governance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accountability - Participation - Transparency - Legitimacy
<p>Displacement of land use change: Occurrence of land use change, such as conversion to agriculture or pasture, or development of infrastructure or extractive activities, in a different location than that where it would have occurred in the absence of REDD+ intervention.</p>
<p>Economic, social and political well-being:</p> <p><i>Economic well-being</i> is embodied by access to and secure control over financial and material assets, land and territories, in particular those that are the basis for economic gain, income, food security, access to resources including water and timber, opportunity of employment and economic gain.</p> <p><i>Social well-being</i> is embodied by standing within the community, social networks and opportunities, and social security.</p> <p><i>Political well-being</i> is embodied by empowerment and influence on decision-making within the community and beyond. It furthermore includes the freedom to express opinion without the fear of negative consequences.</p>
<p>Equitable: Dealing fairly, justly and impartially with all relevant stakeholders.</p>
<p>Fiduciary and fund management risks: Risks associated with the transfer, management and distribution of funds and assets.</p>
<p>Forest: An area of land spanning more than 0.05 hectares with tree crown cover (or equivalent stocking level) of more than 10 percent with trees with the potential to reach a minimum height of 2-5 meters at maturity in situ (FRA 2010).</p>
<p>Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC): The collective right to give or withhold free, prior and informed</p>

² Mesik, J. (2007). Community Foundations – A Tool for Preservation of Cultural Heritage, *World Bank Social Development Notes* <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCHD/Resources/430063-1250192845352/sdn108-CommFoundations-web.pdf>

consent, which applies to all activities, projects, legislative or administrative measures and policies that take place in or impact the lands, territories, resources or otherwise affect the livelihoods of indigenous peoples³. Free, prior and informed consent is founded in the rights articulated in the [UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#) and further elaborated by the [International Workshop on Methodologies Regarding Free Prior and Informed Consent](#). Please see the draft UN-REDD Programme Guidelines for Seeking the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities ([insert hyperlink when draft is circulated for consultation](#)) for further information.

Full and effective (stakeholder) participation: Stakeholders are those groups that have a stake/interest/right in the forest and those that will be affected either negatively or positively by REDD+ activities. They include relevant government agencies, formal and informal forest users, private sector entities, civil society, indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities. Guidance for their full and effective participation is provided by [the UN-REDD Programme and FCPF Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+](#).

Indigenous peoples: The terms “indigenous peoples,” “indigenous ethnic minorities,” and “tribal groups” are used to describe social groups that share similar characteristics, namely a social and cultural identity that is distinct from dominant groups in society. United Nations human rights bodies, ILO, the World Bank and international law apply four criteria to distinguish indigenous peoples:

- (a) indigenous peoples usually live within (or maintain attachments to) geographically distinct ancestral territories;
- (b) they tend to maintain distinct social, economic, and political institutions within their territories;
- (c) they typically aspire to remain distinct culturally, geographically and institutionally rather than assimilate fully into national society; and
- (d) they self-identify as indigenous or tribal.

Despite common characteristics, there does not exist any single accepted definition of indigenous peoples that captures their diversity as peoples. Self-identification as indigenous or tribal is usually regarded as a fundamental criterion for determining whether groups are indigenous or tribal, sometimes in combination with other variables such as language spoken and geographic location or concentration.

Indirect land use change: Occurrence of land use change, such as conversion to agriculture or pasture, or development of infrastructure or extractive activities, in a different location than that where it would have occurred in the absence of REDD+ intervention.

Involuntary resettlement: Displacement or relocation without the displaced person’s informed consent or power of choice, or where the consent or choice is being exercised in the absence of reasonable alternative options.

Land use change: A change in the use or management of land by humans, which may lead to a change in land cover. Land cover and land use change may have an impact on the albedo, evapotranspiration, sources and sinks of greenhouse gases, or other properties of the climate system and may thus have an impact on climate, locally or globally.

Low carbon: Low carbon systems minimise carbon dioxide emissions from human activity.

Most vulnerable and marginalized groups: Relevant stakeholder groups that are lacking assets for secure livelihoods and/or lack influence over decision-making processes.

Multiple functions of forests: Production of goods, protection of soil and water, conservation of biodiversity and provision of socio-cultural services ([FAO Definitions](#)).

Natural ecosystems: Ecosystems composed primarily of indigenous species, not established by human intervention and with limited human impact.

Natural forest: A forest composed primarily of indigenous trees not established by planting or/and seeding

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM
Comment: It is important to note that “indigenous people” is not a relevant term in Nigeria (and other places), and it would be helpful if the glossary entry reflected this

Valerie Kapos 9/21/11 6:53 PM
Comment: Expand to explicitly include women, youth and the disabled

³ Synthesized from UNDRIP articles enumerated below, in particular Art 1, 19, 12, 32.

in the process of afforestation or reforestation.

Other forest dependent communities: The draft UN-REDD Programme Guidelines for Seeking the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent of Indigenous Peoples and other Forest Dependent Communities ([insert hyperlink when draft is circulated for consultation](#)) extends the right to free, prior and informed consent to indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities, defined as follows “Directly or indirectly affected indigenous peoples, tribal groups, ethnic minorities and other forest dependent communities have the right to give or withhold their consent, through their own representative institutions and following their own decision-making processes, regarding activities, proposals, legislative and administrative measures, and policies that may affect their land, territories, resources or livelihoods. All customary and formal rights holders should be represented in the decision-making process (including men, elders, women, youth, children, persons with disabilities, and the poor).”

Plantation: Forest/Other wooded land of native or introduced species, established through planting or seeding ([FAO Definitions](#)).

Relevant stakeholders: Stakeholders are defined as those groups that have a stake/interest/right in the forest and those that will be affected either negatively or positively by REDD+ activities. They include relevant government agencies, formal and informal forest users, private sector entities, indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities ([UN-REDD Programme and FCPF Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+](#)).

Traditional knowledge: “...the manifestations of [indigenous peoples] sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts” ([UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#)).

Annex 1: Relationship of Proposed Principles with UNFCCC LCA Decision (update to Exhibit 2 of UNREDD/PB5/2010/INF/4)

Principle	Relevant section of Cancun Agreement , Annex I
Principle 1 – Comply with standards of democratic governance	2(b) Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into account national legislation and sovereignty 2(d) The full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular, indigenous peoples and local communities (...)
Principle 2 – Respect and protect stakeholder rights	2(c) Respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities, by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the General Assembly has adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
Principle 3 – Promote and enhance sustainable livelihoods	2 (e) That actions are (...) used to (...) enhance other social and environmental benefits (...)Taking into account the need for sustainable livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities and their interdependence on forests in most countries . . .
Principle 4 – Contribute to coherent low-carbon, climate-resilient and environmentally sound development policy, consistent with commitments under international conventions and agreements	2(a) Actions complement or are consistent with the objectives of national forest programmes and relevant international conventions and agreements 2(f) Actions to address the risk of reversals
Principle 5 – Protect natural forest from degradation or conversion to other land uses, including plantation forest	2(e) Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity, ensuring that actions (...) are not used for the conversion of natural forests but are instead used to incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services (...)
Principle 6 – Maintain and enhance multiple functions of forest to deliver benefits including biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services	2(e) Actions (...) incentivize the protection and conservation of natural forests and their ecosystem services (...) 2(e) Actions are (...) used to (...) enhance other social and environmental benefits
Principle 7 – Minimise indirect adverse impacts on ecosystem services and biodiversity	2(e) Actions that are consistent with the conservation of... biological diversity... 2(g) Actions to reduce displacement of emissions

Annex F
Technical Consultation on Social and Environmental Safeguards in Nigeria
Annex Document

On 2-4 August 2011 in Abuja, Nigeria, a technical consultation was held to review the Nigeria National Programme Document in conjunction with the draft UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria. Through the course of the consultation 15-20 participants from the Federal Government, Cross River State Forestry Commission, federal and state NGOs and UNEP discussed aspects of social and environmental safeguards for REDD+ in Nigeria. After an initial day discussing the multiple benefits and risks of REDD+, the participants simultaneously reviewed the National Programme Document and the draft Principles and Criteria. This joint review process reinforced both the strengths of the Nigeria National Programme and the relevance and applicability of the draft Principles and Criteria.

For the National Programme, the consultation focused on the results framework and corresponding activities, the institutional arrangements, and narrative sections of the document as relevant, e.g. gender. It also took into account, and identified responses to relevant comments from the Independent Technical Reviewers and Policy Board Members. Specific sections of the document were highlighted as clearly indicating that the National REDD Programme satisfies the criteria, while in several instances additional wording and clarification were added to activities in the results framework and/or the narrative. Some activities were modified, and a few were added, and there were modifications to the institutional arrangements to respond to needs identified in the light of the principles and Criteria.

Some notable changes included: increasing the clarification of when special consideration needed to be paid to women, youth and other vulnerable groups; ensuring that oversight of monitoring and reporting from NGOs/CSOs; inclusion of fiduciary oversight in the institutional arrangement; a proposal for a State Technical REDD+ Committee; support to research; explicit attention to multiple functions of forests in activities like monitoring and national stratification of forests. The consultation also identified cross-cutting changes, relevant for a variety of criteria which included the need to specify the particular types of training and awareness raising that are needed, including training in multiple benefits and in the role and importance of land use planning, specifically community-based land use planning.

The consultation confirmed the usefulness of the UN-REDD Social and Environmental Principles and Criteria as an aide in formulating national REDD+ programmes that accord with the Cancun safeguards and in reviewing national programmes seeking UN-REDD funding. It also provided input and suggestions for consideration by the drafting committee of the Principles and Criteria, including clarifications, suggestions for the development of the risk assessment and mitigation tool, and a recommendation for an additional criterion.